

1 **Political Economy Analysis of Health Taxes (Tobacco, Alcohol Drink, and Sugar**
2 **Sweteened Beverage): Case Study of Three Provinces in Indonesia**

3 Abdillah Ahsan^{1,2*}, Nadira Amalia^{2,5}, Krisna Puji Rahmayanti³, Nadhila Adani⁴, Nur Hadi
4 Wiyono², Althof Endawansa², Maulida Gadis Utami², Adela Miranti Yuniar⁴, Erika Valentina
5 Anastasia², Yuyu Buono Ayuning Pertiwi²

6 ¹Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business Universitas Indonesia, Depok,
7 West Java, Indonesia

8 ²Demographic Institute, Faculty of Economics and Business Universitas Indonesia, Depok,
9 West Java, Indonesia

10 ³Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administrative Sciences Universitas
11 Indonesia, Depok, West Java, Indonesia

12 ⁴Center for Islamic Economics and Business, Faculty of Economics and Business Universitas
13 Indonesia, Depok, West Java, Indonesia

14 ⁵Monash University, Department of Economics, School of Business, Bandar Sunway,
15 Selangor, Malaysia

16

17 *Corresponding author:

18 Dr. Abdillah Ahsan

19 ahsanov@yahoo.com

20

21 Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business Universitas Indonesia, Depok,
22 West Java, Indonesia. Jl. Prof. DR. Sumitro Djojohadikusumo, Depok, West Java, 16424

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 **Abstract**

25 Efforts to implement health tax policies to control the consumption of harmful commodities
26 and enhance public health outcomes have garnered substantial recognition globally. However,
27 their successful adoption remains a complex endeavour. This study takes a problem-driven
28 political economy analysis (PEA) approach to investigate the challenges and opportunities
29 surrounding health tax implementation, with a particular focus on sub-national government in
30 Indonesia, where the decentralization context of health tax remains understudied. Employing a
31 qualitative methodology by collecting data from a total of twelve focus group discussions
32 (FGDs) conducted in three provinces—Lampung, Special Region of/*Daerah Istimewa* (DI)
33 Yogyakarta, and Bali, each chosen to represent a specific commodity: tobacco, sugar-
34 sweetened beverages (SSBs), and alcoholic beverages—we explore the multifaceted dynamics
35 of health tax policies. These FGDs involved 117 participants, representing governmental
36 institutions, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and consumers. Our findings reveal that
37 while health tax policies have the potential to contribute significantly to public health,
38 challenges such as a lack of consumer awareness, bureaucratic complexities, and decentralized
39 governance hinder implementation. Furthermore, this study underscores the importance of
40 effective policy communication. It highlights the importance of earmarking health tax revenues
41 for public health initiatives. It also reinforces the need to see health taxes as one intervention
42 as part of a comprehensive public health approach including complementary non-fiscal
43 measures like advertising restrictions and standardized packaging. Addressing these challenges
44 is critical for realizing the full potential of health tax policies.

45

46

47 **Introduction**

48 The implementation of health taxes has been successfully adopted in numerous countries and
49 is a pivotal policy instrument to control the consumption of harmful commodities and improve
50 public health outcomes(1-5). This approach has been endorsed as one of the "best buys" by the
51 World Health Organization (WHO) for addressing Non-Communicable Diseases (NCDs) (6-
52 9). Despite its importance, many countries, particularly low- and middle-income economies,
53 still struggle to adopt this policy(10). For this reason, global health leaders recently called
54 attention to the urgent need for research that sheds light on the politics of health tax policy
55 processes(11).

56 The political economy of a health system shapes policy development and implementation in
57 important ways(12). Conflicts of interests, poor interagency and multisectoral coordination, as
58 well as excessive bureaucracy were among the most common challenges to fully
59 institutionalizing evidence-informed health taxes policy recommendations(13-15). Public
60 sector decentralization may hinder the health policy adoption due to challenges including
61 limited shared understanding of health tax objectives among local authorities, political
62 complexities, and financing issues at the sub-national level, resulting in suboptimal
63 implementation (14, 16). Indonesia, as one of the largest countries with escalating concerns in
64 the healthcare sector, primarily due to rising the NCDs epidemic(17-19). The country faces
65 challenges in health policy adoption, primarily attributed to political contestation, industry
66 interference, and a rigid bureaucratic system, exacerbated by decentralization(20-23).

67 **The current status of health tax implementation in Indonesia**

68 Indonesia has been decentralizing since 2001—nearly 56 years after its independence(24). One
69 crucial aspect of decentralization is public finance, encompassing various fiscal policy
70 authorities, such as revenue generation, earmarking, and spending mandates, which has

71 recently undergone reforms through Law No. 1/2022 (25, 26). Regarding health tax policy,
72 both tobacco and alcoholic beverage taxes have been designed to involve sub-national
73 governments(27, 28). Specifically for the tobacco tax collected through the Ministry of
74 Finance, i.e., excise tax, the national government also enacted legislation to establish a tobacco-
75 tax sharing fund (*Dana Bagi Hasil Cukai Hasil Tembakau/DBHCHT*), with the purpose of
76 allocation to sub-national leaders based on their levels of tobacco farming production(29).

77 Table provides a summary of the division of roles between the national and sub-national
78 governments in Indonesia. There are many types of taxes for commodities that fall under
79 ‘unhealthy’ products category(30): (i) Excise Tax, regulated under Law No. 39/2007, in
80 conjunction with Law No. 7/2021; (ii) Local Tax, which currently exclusively applies to
81 tobacco products (as part of other five categories outlined in Law No. 28/2009, which have
82 been subsequently replaced by Law No. 1/2022); and (iii) Value-Added Tax. In Indonesian
83 case, health tax is more in line with excise tax, as one of its primary objectives is consumption
84 control—rather than solely revenue generation.

85 Currently, only two commodities are subject to health tax: tobacco and alcoholic beverages.
86 Although sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs) were proposed in 2019, these have not yet been
87 implemented(31). The national government primarily focuses on tax collection, while the sub-
88 national government plays a critical role in tax management and allocation. Additionally,
89 regulations mandate that sub-national governments allocate health taxes for the healthcare
90 sector, encompassing both promotive and preventive measures(20, 32).

91 **Table 1 The Division of Role in Health Tax Management between National and Sub-**
92 **National Governments in Indonesia**

Product Category	Regulation	Description	Responsibility
Tobacco	Law No. 39/2007 on Excise Tax (as has been replaced by Law No. 7/2021 on Tax Harmonization)	Article 4: Any tobacco product (produced locally or imported) is subject to an excise tax.	• National government: determine the tax rate and tax collection.
		Article 66A: Any excise tax collected from locally	• National government: disburse DBHCHT to

		produced tobacco product is to be shared with the producing provinces through tobacco excise sharing fund (DBHCHT).	the provinces based on the share of their production. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-national government: manage and allocate the DBHCHT following the mandate of Ministry of Finance (MoF).
	Law No. 28/2009 on Regional Tax and Retribution (as has been repealed by Law No. 1/2022)	Article 33: 10% of the excise tax on tobacco is to be dedicated for local tobacco tax.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National government: collection and disbursement to the local government based on population size (MoF). • Sub-national government: manage and allocate the local tobacco tax following the law mandate.
Alcoholic Beverages	Law No. 39/2007 on Excise Tax (as has been replaced by Law No. 7/2021 on Tax Harmonization)	Article 4: Ethyl alcohol and any beverages containing ethyl alcohol (produced locally or imported) is subject to an excise tax.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National government: determine the tax rate and tax collection.
Sugar-Sweetened Beverages (SSBs)	N/A	A regulatory bill has been proposed since 2019; delayed implementation.	N/A; current regulatory draft is under MoF.

93 With the current practice of health taxation, criticisms have emerged. The health tax initiative
94 relies heavily on the national government with the Ministry of Finance (MoF) and Ministry of
95 Health (MoH) as policy champions(23). The reliance on the national government may be
96 exacerbated by a limited understanding of the objectives of health taxation and complicated
97 politics implement, particularly among sub-national governments (22, 33). The current practice
98 prioritizes revenue generation over consumption control, especially for sub-national leaders
99 who aim to protect revenues (20). Finally, decentralization continues to face several issues,
100 with one of the most significant being financing despite regulations mandating health tax
101 allocation for this sector(18, 34, 35). The financing issues include budget insufficiency and
102 sub-optimal public insurance coverage due to disparities in revenue generation across
103 region(35).

104 While decentralization becomes central to policy implementation, understanding the sub-
105 national government behaviour in response to health tax remains important, yet understudied.
106 This study fills this gap by exploring the political economy of health tax policy implementation
107 at sub-national level. We selected three provinces to represent three different taxable
108 commodities: tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and SSBs. The rationale for choosing these diverse
109 commodities as the focus of the study is to investigate the political economy in light of their
110 distinct attributes and characteristics. Furthermore, our focus is exclusively on the sub-national
111 level, as there is an abundance of evidence regarding the political economy of health taxation
112 in Indonesia at the national level (20, 21, 23, 36-39). The next section will describe the
113 methodology and analytical approach used in this study, followed by results, and finally
114 discussion and future recommendation.

115 **Material and methods**

116 **Study design and case selection**

117 This study is qualitative. We used an extensive case study approach as the information to be
118 gathered requires in-depth insights and is highly contextual(40). A case study is also more
119 suitable to answer the “why” and “how” questions which make them more explanatory and
120 descriptive(41), aligning it with the objectives of this research.

121 The sub-national context is documented at the provincial level, which represents the highest
122 tier of local government. We choose the provincial level government because it plays an
123 important role in communicating the central government health policy while simultaneously
124 hold a discretion over districts’ budgeting process(42). Each province was selected based on
125 their level of consumption for each commodity (see Appendix S1). Lampung, Special Region
126 of/Daerah Istimewa (DI) Yogyakarta, and Bali, were chosen for tobacco, SSBs, and alcoholic
127 beverages, respectively.

128 Analytical approach and stakeholders' identification

129 We used a problem-driven Political Economic Analysis (PEA) adapted from Overseas
130 Development Institute (ODI) framework(14, 15, 43) to guide our analysis. This framework
131 offers flexibility in analyzing specific policies across a wide spectrum of issues(44, 45). Figure
132 1 below illustrates our adoption of the problem-driven PEA framework modified from Carriedo
133 et al., 2021 (15). We adopted the framework by repeatedly aligning it with our problem
134 statement and findings. We identified the current policy circumstances as a challenge for the
135 health tax implementation at sub-national level in Indonesia. The structural issues include the
136 social context and institutional arrangements, while agency issues encompass stakeholders and
137 incentives. In our analysis of both structural and agency issues, we concentrated on
138 organizations and institutions, including their roles, relationships, and interactions in the
139 implementation of health taxation policies at the sub-national government level. Ultimately,
140 through this analysis, we identified opportunities and barriers and proposed policy actions to
141 be taken.

142 Figure 1

Figure 1 Problem-Driven Political Economy Analysis Approach, Adopted from Overseas Development Institute

1. Problem identification	
The current policy circumstances hinder the health tax implementation at sub-national	
2a. Structural diagnosis	2b. Agency diagnosis
a. Social context	a. Stakeholders
b. Institutional arrangement	b. Incentive
3. Prescription	
a. Identification of opportunities and barriers	
b. Recommended policy actions	

143

144 We identified three relevant categories of participants. The first category is governmental
145 institutions, which have in-depth information about governmental progress and cross-sectoral
146 coordination and relationships. For each province, we recruited local government's officer who
147 are in charge of: (i) public finance; (ii) public health; (iii) human capital development; and (iv)
148 development planning.

149 The second group comprises non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or experts. The
150 information gained from these groups can serve as a counterbalance to the governmental
151 institutions. For each province, the NGOs/experts recruited were from: (i) public health or
152 economic experts from public/private higher education institution; (ii) local public health or
153 economic NGOs; and (iii) local faith- or religious-based organizations.

154 Finally, the third group consists of consumers to better understand the social context and
155 confirm the local government's effort in increasing consumer awareness. Exploring
156 consumers' opinions also helped us gain more information from their perspective. The
157 eligibility criteria for consumers to participate were those above the age of consent (18 years
158 old) who regularly consume the researched commodity. Institutional stakeholders were
159 recruited through close invitations, while individual (consumer) participants were recruited
160 through open online invitations.

161 **Data collection**

162 Semi-structured (see Appendix S2 for guiding questions) focus group discussions (FGD) were
163 our primary source of data. This was selected based on our desire to explore a range of views,
164 while observing the social interaction between participants(46). We conducted four separate
165 FGDs in each province for each category of participants (see Table 1). Specifically for

166 consumers, we organized FGDs for those aged 30 and above separately from those aged 18 to
167 30 to understand different behaviour among different age groups. In total, we conducted twelve
168 FGDs between July and September 2022. Each FGD lasted approximately 120 minutes,
169 accommodated a maximum of 15 participants, and arranged in a U-Shaped room setting. To
170 ensure that participants understood the study's context, each FGD began with a presentation by
171 the researcher. All FGD activities were audio recorded and complemented with researchers'
172 notes. We reached data saturation at the last FGD and no additional data were collected.

173 **Table 1 Summary of Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) Conducted**

Topic	Participant Category	Total Number of FGDs Conducted (N = 12)
Tobacco (Lampung)	Governmental institutions	1
	NGOs and experts	1
	Consumers	2
SSBs (DI Yogyakarta)	Governmental institutions	1
	NGOs and experts	1
	Consumers	2
Alcoholic beverages (Bali)	Governmental institutions	1
	NGOs and experts	1
	Consumers	2

174

175 **Ethical consideration**

176 This study received approval from the Ethical Review Board of Universitas Katolik Indonesia
177 Atmajaya (Approval No. 00061/III/PPPE.PM.10.05/07/2022) and adhered to the Declaration
178 of Helsinki(47). Prior to their participation, all individuals signed an informed consent, with
179 the understanding that any subsequent publications arising from the study would not contain
180 personal identifiers. To ensure the preservation of confidentiality, throughout this manuscript,
181 participants are denoted by assigned pseudonyms.

182 **Data analysis**

183 We employed framework analysis(48, 49) using the transcribed verbatim from all the audio
184 records of the FGD. We constructed a matrix to display the participants' arguments against the
185 PEA framework, from which we derived keywords to align with the themes and sub-themes
186 outlined in the PEA for each commodity category (see Appendix S3), adopted from Rodríguez
187 et al., 2023 (14). A cross-member checking was performed to ensure rigorous data analysis
188 process. The matrix for each commodity was independently developed by at least two
189 researchers (e.g., KPR, YBAP and AE for alcoholic beverages; NHW, AE, and N Adhani for
190 tobacco; and N Amalia, NHW, EVA, and MGU for SSBs) based on the verbatim transcript.
191 The matrix appropriateness for each theme, sub-theme, and categories was iteratively reviewed
192 by all team members. Regular research meetings were attended by all researchers to critically
193 assess our findings before reporting the results. Disagreements among members were
194 discussed, resolved, and managed accordingly.

195 **Results**

196 We utilized the PEA framework to structure our findings into three key sections. Firstly, we
197 provide an analysis of the context surrounding the health tax policy in each province. This
198 analysis encompasses both structural and agency-related factors. Secondly, we explore and
199 elucidate the barriers and challenges that are anticipated in the implementation of the policy.
200 Lastly, we present the recommendations proposed by stakeholders to tackle these identified
201 issues. In the results section, we compare the characteristics attributed to each commodity,
202 highlighting how these differences shape the circumstances of each province's case.

203 **Structural diagnosis**

204 Structural diagnosis concerns the structural factors that shapes the stakeholders' behaviour(45).
205 We identified two sub-themes under the domain of the structural diagnosis in our PEA, i.e.,
206 social context and institutional arrangement.

207 **Social context**

208 The social context defines the factors that shape health systems. In our case selection, where
209 we have chosen cases based on the highest consumption levels for each commodity, this is
210 closely linked to the underlying factors contributing to high consumption in each province, to
211 gain a deeper understanding of the necessary policy interventions. Our qualitative analysis,
212 conducted across three provinces, has identified three recurring keywords or categories. Firstly,
213 cultural factors emerged as a significant determinant. Our focus group discussions with
214 consumers and NGOs/experts revealed that high consumption rates are predominantly
215 influenced by cultural factors, in addition to price-related factors, which underscore the need
216 for reinforcing health taxes. Remarkably, this pattern holds true across all provinces, despite
217 variations in the specific commodity category. For example, in Lampung, tobacco consumption
218 is deeply ingrained in local traditions:

219 *“Tobacco is a cultural item in Lampung during wedding ceremonies.” (NGOs 1,*
220 *Lampung)*

221 This also applies to alcoholic beverages. Alcohol consumption in Bali is common during
222 celebrations, ceremonies, or religious activities:

223 *“Most Balinese people have arak (distilled spirit, traditional alcoholic drinks*
224 *commonly found in Bali) at home for ceremonies, and there are numerous*
225 *traditional alcoholic beverage producers in Bali. Therefore, owning alcohol in Bali*
226 *is common. However, it is not consumed regularly; it is more of a by-occasion”*
227 *(NGOs 1, Bali)*

228 Finally, in DI Yogyakarta, like other provinces, the consumption of sweetened foods and
229 beverages appears to be commonplace due to the inclusion of sugary ingredients in many

230 traditional food and beverage items. All three products are easily accessible at nearby stores
231 and come at a affordable price, starting as low as IDR 500 (=USD 0.03):

232 *“A sachet beverage can be as cheap as Rp 500 per pack, relatively inexpensive*
233 *compared to daily expenses” (Consumer 1, DI Yogyakarta)*

234 A second aspect of the social context is consumer awareness. Our findings indicate that there
235 may be varying levels of consumer awareness regarding regulated and unregulated
236 commodities. In the case of regulated items such as tobacco and alcoholic beverages, despite
237 high consumption rates, consumers are generally aware of the harm associated with these
238 products, although many remain unaware of the specific purpose of taxing them. Conversely,
239 in the case of SSBs, which are still unregulated, some consumers lack awareness of the long-
240 term disadvantages of SSB consumption. As a common case in Asia, this is especially true for
241 certain types of SSBs marketed as 'healthy,' such as dairy products or probiotic drinks, which
242 mislead consumers into believing in their health benefits while remaining unaware of the sugar
243 content:

244 *“In my house, we usually stock up ready-to-drink tea and coffee and consume them*
245 *up to three times a week. For probiotic drinks, it can be as much as three times a*
246 *day” (Consumer 2, DI Yogyakarta)*

247 Consumers argued that due to current packaging, it is difficult to easily understand the
248 nutritional content. Moreover, as there is no age limit for SSBs consumption, unlike tobacco
249 and alcoholic beverages, parents make consumption decisions for children in their households,
250 contributing to a relatively high SSBs consumption rate among individuals aged 3 and above.
251 This common misconception among parents, exacerbates SSBs consumption as it can begin at
252 an early age and lead to developing unhealthy dietary habits. Additionally, in the case of SSBs,
253 advertising and packaging are recognized as two significant factors driving their purchase:

254 *“The packaging is attractive, leading to curiosity. As in case for probiotic drinks,*
255 *[I usually consume] for health” (Consumer 3, DI Yogyakarta)*

256 The third aspect is interlinked with the second factor in that consumer awareness shapes the
257 social perception of a commodity. Regulated commodities such as tobacco and alcoholic
258 beverages, which the government has labelled as harmful products, are also viewed negatively
259 by consumers. Consumers have a stronger inclination to quit or at least reduce their
260 consumption of these products. In contrast, SSBs, which have never been marketed negatively,
261 are still seen as relatively normal and harmless commodities. Consequently, the
262 implementation of health taxes is likely to be more challenging for SSBs compared to tobacco
263 and alcoholic beverages.

264 **Institutional arrangement**

265 In the institutional arrangement, we focus our discussion on the governmental and non-
266 governmental institutions as well as the rules that shape power dynamics and outcomes, and
267 the shared understanding between these institutions in adopting the national government
268 policy. We identified two categories under the institutional arrangements dimension, e.g.,
269 ideology on the health tax objective and regulation and programs.

270 Firstly, the ideological perspective on the health tax objective concerns the shared
271 understanding of policy objectives among each institution, with a primary focus on institutional
272 participants. Majority of the institutions agreed that fiscal measure through health tax is needed
273 for consumption control, particularly among specific demographic groups, including minors
274 and lower-income individuals. Nevertheless, some disagreements emerged during these
275 discussions. Institutions with a vested interest in industry and trade protection expressed
276 reservations about the concept of health taxes. Their arguments centred on the potential
277 disadvantages that health taxes could pose to local businesses operating at a micro-to-small

278 scale. This concern is particularly relevant in the case of alcoholic beverages and SSBs, given
279 that two provinces also host local businesses engaged in the production of these commodities:

280 *“The sugary food and beverage industry is among the most popular in DI*
281 *Yogyakarta. When Small and Microenterprises (SMEs) are asked to change their*
282 *products, they will clearly refuse. Therefore, consumers are encouraged to control*
283 *their intake.” (Dinkes, DI Yogyakarta)*

284 The second aspect of the institutional arrangement pertains to regulations and programs. The
285 majority of sub-national level institutions argued that the authority for implementing fiscal
286 measures to control NCDs lies solely with the national government. Sub-national governments
287 primarily concentrate on the adoption of non-fiscal measures. This is particularly evident in the
288 implementation of tobacco taxes, where the national government clearly defines the non-fiscal
289 measures to be adopted by sub-national governments in accordance with Law No. 17/2023 on
290 Health(50). In tobacco and alcoholic beverages cases, these measures include smoke-free area
291 (specific for tobacco) and limit or ban advertising.

292 In the case of alcoholic beverages, although advertisements are more prominently visible in
293 tourism areas, the sale of *arak* by micro enterprises remains prevalent. To address the potential
294 impact of *arak* production, the Governor of Bali issued Governor Regulation No. 1/2020 on
295 the Management of Balinese Fermented and/or Distilled Beverages(51). However, the
296 orientation of this regulation is towards industry development, rather than protecting minors
297 from alcohol consumption:

298 *“There is Governor Regulation No. 1 of 2020, which aims to be a solution for*
299 *marginalized Balinese alcoholic beverages [arak]. Many people in Bali used to*
300 *consume imported beverages. Meanwhile, in Bali, we have our own distinctive*
301 *Balinese alcoholic beverages, but due to regulations, they seem to be illegal,*

302 *causing traditional drinks to be undermined. [As a result] they are consumed less*
303 *by our local community, which is unfair. Balinese beverages, distinct to Bali, have*
304 *become illegal, while imported ones are considered legal." (DinkopUKM, Bali)*

305 In the case of tobacco, even though Lampung has already established local regulations for
306 Smoke-Free Areas (*Kawasan Tanpa Rokok/KTR*), tobacco advertisements can still be
307 prominently observed along the main roads. This is compounded by the fact that
308 microenterprises continue to sell tobacco to minors. Furthermore, the implementation of KTR
309 itself remains notably weak:

310 *"Many people continue to smoke in places where KTR have been designated. A*
311 *significant portion of the population remains unaware of the KTR policy, and there*
312 *are still people who smoke in hospital/health center areas." (NGOs 1, Lampung)*

313 Regarding SSBs, while the fiscal measure has not yet been implemented, the non-fiscal
314 measures that the sub-national government can take have not been clearly outlined. The
315 initiative to raise issues related to limiting SSB consumption primarily came from public health
316 government officials or NGOs/experts responsible for public health. Even in the governmental
317 institutions responsible for the education sector or women and child empowerment, these
318 initiatives have not been specifically adopted:

319 *"Educational outreach to schools, especially in high schools and vocational*
320 *schools, regarding health (the dangers of NCDs) has not specifically addressed*
321 *SSBs." (Disdik, DI Yogyakarta)*

322 **Agency Diagnosis**

323 Agency diagnosis outlines power, incentives, and behavior(43). These three aspects are closely
324 related to the stakeholders or actors who shape policy implementation. In our case, we are
325 interested in discussing the main stakeholder's power surrounding the implementation of health

326 taxes at the sub-national level, as well as the factors influencing their behavior (i.e., motives)
327 and their interactions. While sub-national governments do not have a role in tax collection
328 itself, they play a strategic role in tax allocation and in assisting national government agencies
329 in their areas (e.g., the Customs and Excise Office or *Kantor Perwakilan Bea dan*
330 *Cukai/KPBC*). We have identified two main aspects of agency diagnosis in our case, namely
331 stakeholders and incentives. See Figure 2 for a summary of the stakeholders, their decision-
332 making power, and their motives that we have determined from our analysis.

333 **Stakeholders**

334 This sub-theme identifies key stakeholders in the implementation of sub-national health taxes,
335 their roles, and their interactions (see Figure 2). Two topics have been derived from this sub-
336 theme, i.e., key actors at the sub-national level and the power and relationships between actors
337 at the sub-national level.

338 The first aspect comprises actors responsible for decision-making at the sub-national level.
339 Based on our FGD findings, we have identified three categories (see Figure 2, the colour of
340 each institution differs based on their roles) of actors at the sub-national level who can influence
341 the adoption of health tax policies. While they may not be exactly the same across all provinces,
342 they typically share similar sets of institutions/agencies. The first category (yellow coloured)
343 includes actors responsible for strategic policy development and priority setting. At the
344 provincial level, this includes the governor, the provincial regional legislative council (*Dewan*
345 *Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah/DPRD*), the regional secretariat (*Sekretariat Daerah/Setda*), the
346 regional agency of development planning (*Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan*
347 *Daerah/Bappeda*), and the regional agency of finance and budgeting (*Badan Perencanaan*
348 *Keuangan dan Anggaran Daerah/BPKAD*).

349 The second category comprises actors concerned with human capital development (orange
350 coloured), including the regional department of health (*Dinas Kesehatan/Dinkes*), the
351 department of education (*Dinas Pendidikan/Disdik*), and the department of child protection
352 and women empowerment (*Dinas Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak/DP3A*).
353 Finally, the third category comprises actors in the economic sector (purple coloured), including
354 the regional department of trade and industry (*Dinas Perdagangan dan*
355 *Perindustrian/Disperindag*) and the department for cooperative and micro, small, and medium
356 enterprises (*Dinas Koperasi dan UMKM/DinkopUKM*). In addition to these sub-national
357 policy makers, there are actors without decision-making roles who interact with them: the local
358 agency of the Customs and Excise Office—the representative of the Ministry of Finance in
359 each region—assumes the responsibility for revenue collection and supervision at the local
360 level, and the local agency of the Food and Drug Authority (*Badan Pengawas Obat dan*
361 *Makanan/BPOM*), which exercises authority over nutritional value and safety in consumed
362 products.


363 The second aspect is the power and relationships between the identified stakeholders. In this
364 aspect, we identified four categories (see Figure 2). The four categories ranked from highest
365 position in the strategic decision-making include the policy agenda and priority setting, policy
366 coordination and planning, policy budgeting, and policy implementation, respectively.

367 The first category of actors holds higher positions in terms of regional decision-making
368 compared to the other two categories. This is because they have the authority to set policy
369 targets and priorities, which are then translated into policy planning and budget allocation by
370 Bappeda in collaboration with BPKAD. Additionally, Setda and Bappeda coordinate and
371 supervise intersectoral policy implementation. Actors in the human capital development sector
372 and the economic sector mostly implement policies but can propose programs for prioritization
373 before the budgeting process. They must provide evidence for why certain programs should be

374 prioritized during the annual budgeting and planning process. Finally, the local KPBC does not
375 hold a vertical position with other policymakers. However, in terms of implementing its
376 supervisory role (i.e., eradicating illicit trade), it can collaborate with the sub-national
377 government.

378 **Motives**

Figure 2 Key Actors Relationship in Supporting Health Tax Implementation at Sub-National Level in Indonesia



379 This sub-theme pertains to the factors that shape the behavior of stakeholders. We have
380 identified three main keywords that emerged from our analysis in this domain: the actors'
381 orientation/position towards public health and their incentive to support the health tax policy.
382 First is the actors' orientation/position towards public health. To illustrate each institution's
383 objectives, we have created a spectrum of the actors' orientation, ranging from public health
384 motives to economic motives (see Figure 2). At the implementor level, Dinkes is the main actor
385 with a public health orientation, along with other actors in human capital development.

386 However, they maintain a relatively neutral stance towards the health tax policy issue since it
387 is not their core institutional motive, but they actively engage in public health advocacy:

388 *“There are provincial and district programs for child-friendly areas with*
389 *indicators that include a smoking ban. There are child forums throughout*
390 *Indonesia that have actively campaigned against smoking with active outreach in*
391 *schools. DP3A has also conducted anti-smoking campaigns at the neighborhood*
392 *level, and there are regional regulations supporting smoke-free child-friendly*
393 *areas. Disdik needs to be involved in raising awareness about the dangers of*
394 *smoking.” (DP3A, Lampung).*

395 While at the right hindside, for Disperindag and DinkopUKM, the orientation is more towards
396 economy, in this case industry protection:

397 *“As supporters of MSMEs, we agree because this excise tax applies to large*
398 *manufacturers. Therefore, it can enable UMKMs to compete with large*
399 *manufacturers.” (DinkopUKM, DI Yogyakarta)*

400 As for the coordinating bodies, BPKAD's position leans more towards the economic aspect
401 since their motive is to collect revenue for the regional government. We position Bappeda and
402 Setda in a more neutral role since they both house units for human capital policy and economic
403 policy development and primarily function as coordinators:

404 *“This tax serves as an instrument to reduce consumption or circulation. I agree that*
405 *this tax should increase, especially if there is revenue-sharing. The revenue-sharing*
406 *from the tax can be used for SMEs in the alcoholic beverage industry and for awareness*
407 *campaigns to improve the understanding that alcoholic beverages are detrimental to*
408 *health.” (Bappeda, Bali)*

409 Lastly, political actors like the governor and DPRD are also in a neutral position due to their
410 political motives, which can change with each election year.

411 Considering each actor's motive, we can also identify their incentives for supporting and
412 prioritizing the health tax policy. For Dinkes, their main performance indicator focuses on
413 enhancing public health status, making them staunch supporters of adopting the health tax. In
414 addition to the potential reduction in unhealthy consumption, this move offers substantial
415 public health benefits. Furthermore, the public health sector anticipates receiving allocations
416 from the tobacco tax and expects similar outcomes for other types of health taxes:

417 *“I agree with the health tax and revenue-sharing that can be used to improve the*
418 *quality and the healthcare sector.” (Dinkes, Bali)*

419 As for DP3A and Disdik, their support is somewhat conditional, hinging on the expectation
420 that health tax revenue will be allocated to programs that bolster the implementation of health
421 taxes. These programs could include initiatives to raise public awareness about unhealthy
422 consumption in educational institutions or to aid women entrepreneurs in developing healthier
423 product alternatives. These conditions are especially relevant in the case of SSBs, where there
424 are currently no regulations in place to curb consumption, and public awareness is lacking:

425 *“For health and for the education of children, women, families in rural areas, and*
426 *SMEs. Because many of the supported families also produce juices and beverages,*
427 *so they can have better awareness [on the harm of SSBs].” (DP3A, DI Yogyakarta)*

428 Conversely, Disperindag and DinkopUKM are primarily driven by the motive of safeguarding
429 the local industry. Consequently, their support for health taxes hinges on whether these
430 measures will protect local businesses. For instance, if the tax structure is tailored to the size
431 of the industry, if it contributes to industrial development with an export focus, or if, in the case

432 of SSBs, it serves to educate local industries about adopting healthier alternatives, these factors
433 can influence their support:

434 *“It [health tax] can be used for education and development of MSMEs [in the*
435 *sector].” (DinkopUKM, DI Yogyakarta)*

436 Regarding BPKAD, their support for the health tax is more pronounced when the tax revenue
437 can be earmarked for local government revenue, mirroring the structure of the tobacco tax. In
438 the case of Bappeda, they maintain a more neutral stance toward the incentive, as policy
439 priorities are subject to a bottom-up discussion, beginning with sector-specific priorities and
440 later being communicated and decided upon by higher-ranking government entities such as
441 Setda, the governor, and the DPRD.

442 **Way Forward**

443 In this subsection, we delve into the main barriers and opportunities associated with the
444 implementation of health tax policies at the sub-national level. Recommendations for
445 addressing these barriers and optimizing opportunities will be discussed in the subsequent
446 section.

447 **Barriers**

448 After conducting the structural and agency diagnosis, we can now identify potential barriers
449 that may impede the implementation of health tax policies at the sub-national level. Three main
450 barriers have been identified: a lack of awareness, distrust towards governmental institutions,
451 and the existence of product substitution.

452 First and foremost is the issue of awareness. As discussed previously in the social context, there
453 remains a significant lack of awareness among consumers regarding the health risks associated
454 with the consumption of certain products. This lack of awareness is particularly pronounced in

455 the cases of tobacco and SSBs. Concerning tobacco, the early age at which consumers often
456 initiate smoking, combined with the addictive nature of tobacco, presents a formidable
457 challenge in curbing consumption through the imposition of health taxes. While alcoholic
458 beverages are also considered addictive substances, we do not observe the same patterns of
459 consumption:

460 *“It is somewhat impossible that Bali has the highest alcohol consumption rate.*
461 *Most of it is related to traditional and religious purposes (it should be emphasized*
462 *whether the factors driving this high alcohol consumption are for traditional and*
463 *religious ceremonies or for recreational purposes and regular consumption).”*
464 *(NGOs 2, Bali)*

465 Regarding SSBs consumption, the public still lacks a negative perception of these products,
466 unlike the clear aversion to tobacco and alcoholic beverages. Furthermore, consumers currently
467 struggle with understanding how to interpret the nutritional information on packaging and
468 determining a safe sugar intake limit. Consequently, shifting their perspective on these products
469 and raising awareness about limiting their consumption poses a significant challenge.

470 Secondly, there is an issue of trust in governmental institutions. Both consumers and
471 institutions share a lack of trust in the government's intent behind imposing health taxes.
472 Presently, health taxes are predominantly viewed as revenue-generation tools rather than
473 instruments for controlling consumption:

474 *“I want this tax to be clearly used for a specific purpose. Let's not allow it to be*
475 *used solely for new political targets just to increase revenue.” (Consumer 3, DI*
476 *Yogyakarta)*

477 Hence, consumers and institutions driven by the motive of safeguarding local industries still
478 harbor reservations about the necessity of implementing health taxes, fearing potential harm to

479 the local economy. The absence of transparent policy communication at the sub-national level,
480 particularly to consumers, regarding the public health benefits of health tax implementation
481 exacerbates this barrier.

482 Finally, there's the challenge of product substitution and non-commercial consumption.
483 Consumer substitution toward illicit alternatives represents a potential loss for both public
484 health and revenue generation:

485 *"I disagree because if the tax is high, it can trigger illicit tobacco due to low*
486 *supervision in Indonesia. So, it shouldn't be increased continuously; its upper limit*
487 *should be assessed. The funds for law enforcement need to be increased to improve*
488 *supervision."* (Bappeda, Lampung)

489 However, an additional challenge arises from the fact that health taxes are levied on the end
490 product rather than on the main ingredients of those products. In contrast to alcohol, tobacco is
491 only taxed at the final product stage. Consequently, we can still observe instances where
492 consumers purchase tobacco and hand-roll their own cigarettes, a practice known as "linting
493 dewe." In this scenario, the government has little control over the trade of these self-rolled
494 cigarettes, and there are no limits on the quantity of tobacco that can be used, in contrast to
495 commercially marketed products where such limits exist, potentially posing a health risk to the
496 public:

497 *"I don't agree [with the increase in tobacco tax]. If it's raised, I will still buy, maybe*
498 *reduce a bit, I can do 'linting dewe' or choose cheaper cigarettes, but still stick to*
499 *stick my smoking habits."* (Consumer 3, Lampung)

500 This is also a concern raised by consumers and NGOs/experts regarding the implementation of
501 taxes on sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs). Many small-scale SSB manufacturers are
502 unaware of the sugar content in their products. This lack of awareness extends to homemade

503 SSBs as well, where consumers, lacking an understanding of the potential health risks
504 associated with excessive sugar consumption, like homemade soy milk, may add as much sugar
505 as they desire without recognizing the potential health drawbacks:

506 *“Homemade SSBs are actually more risky because there are no [limit] for the*
507 *sugar doses.” (Consumer 6, DI Yogyakarta)*

508 As a result of health tax implementation, which can lead to higher product prices, consumers
509 are increasingly inclined to consider more affordable alternatives, including homemade
510 options.

511 **Opportunities**

512 Regarding opportunities, we have identified two primary avenues to bolster the implementation
513 of health taxes at the sub-national level. The first opportunity lies in garnering public support.
514 While the lack of consumer awareness presents a challenge, there are individuals with a
515 heightened awareness of the adverse health effects associated with tobacco, alcohol, and sugar-
516 sweetened beverages (SSBs) who wholeheartedly endorse the health tax policy, even if they
517 are consumers themselves. Consumers tend to rally behind policies that promise health benefits
518 rather than revenue generation motives:

519 *“I agree, because it relates to the non-communicable disease (NCD) prevention*
520 *program. Because not all of the population is educated yet. If, for example, the*
521 *price increases, it will compete with healthier food and drinks that are relatively*
522 *expensive. But it's also necessary to raise the base ingredients of sweetened*
523 *beverages. It should be supported by education. Previous policies should also be*
524 *maintained to support the tax.” (Consumer 7, DI Yogyakarta)*

525 The second opportunity centres around engagement with non-governmental organizations
526 (NGOs). At times, sub-national governments lack the initiative to enhance public awareness,

527 potentially undermining the effectiveness of health tax implementation. Local NGOs and
528 academic institutions exhibit greater proactiveness in advocacy efforts. This presents an
529 opportunity because focusing solely on engaging NGOs and academics at the national level
530 may limit outreach to broader segments of society, especially beyond the Java region.

531 **Discussion**

532 Indonesia, as one of the most decentralized nations, has encountered challenges in exercising
533 local government autonomy, particularly in implementing fiscal autonomy (revenue
534 generation) and delays in adopting national government regulations(20, 22, 52). Recognizing
535 the complex nature of health tax implementation not only horizontally among national actors
536 but also vertically among local actors, we built upon our previous work, specifically focusing
537 on national-level policy debates on health taxes(53). This extension to the sub-national level
538 becomes imperative as limited fiscal resources lead sub-national governments to prioritize
539 curative over preventive or promotive measures in public health(54). Therefore, promoting
540 health taxes as an additional source of funding for preventive and promotive actions earmarked
541 for relevant programs in each institution is likely to gain more support from sub-national
542 governments, as our findings suggest. This insight is especially important as political work to-
543 date on sub-national health taxes, is limited to a small set of research on SSBs taxes in the
544 US(55). Our findings also align with previous studies emphasizing the importance of
545 earmarking health taxes for public health rather than framing them as revenue-generation
546 tools(56-59). Although, detailing the well-intention of the health tax generation invites
547 counteractive arguments from anti-tax opposition (55).

548 The same principle applies to policy communication. In Indonesia, policies driven by economic
549 motives seem less likely to garner public support, whereas those driven by public health
550 motives have a better chance of gaining popularity. Although more mixed supports suggested

551 that emphasising the revenue streams for wider purposes, such as education initiatives, appear
552 to be more appealing to voters(55). While recent cross-country work in LMICs has painted a
553 rather mixed view about which arguments resonate in which settings, our findings are
554 consistent with previous studies, suggesting that communicating health taxes as an effective
555 measure to combat NCDs is likely to be publicly acceptable(60-63). However, without
556 providing a convincing moral case for health taxes that resonates with diverse sets of interests,
557 these measures might face challenges in the face of competing arguments from opponents(64,
558 65). Therefore, generating evidence to counter arguments from industry proponents should be
559 a part of the policy agenda, as public acceptability is likely to be higher when strong evidence,
560 provided by a credible source, supports a compelling claim(65-67).

561 In addition to allocating funds for promotive and preventive activities, health tax
562 implementation can be complemented by other fiscal measures that are more applicable for
563 sub-national governments. This could include subsidies for healthier alternatives, incentives
564 for cessation(68-70), and regulatory and fiscal support for industries producing healthy
565 products (71). Furthermore, health taxes often lead industries to reformulate their products to
566 avoid the tax (72, 73), which could be an important tax design consideration(74). Therefore,
567 health tax revenue can also be allocated to enable sub-national governments to promote and
568 ensure proper product reformulation for healthier alternatives by engaging local enterprises.
569 This is consistent with our finding that institutions with industry protection motives support
570 health taxes because they can benefit local enterprises, particularly for promoting healthier
571 alternatives.

572 In addition to fiscal measures, non-fiscal measures are equally important. While the majority
573 of past studies have shown a negative relationship between health taxes and unhealthy
574 consumption or NCD prevalence(70, 75-80), anticipating consumers' substitution with cheaper
575 but equally harmful alternatives is important(68, 81). Therefore, increasing consumer

576 awareness to consciously limit their consumption of unhealthy products should be a priority.
577 This can be achieved through extensive efforts to promote a healthy lifestyle through mass
578 campaigns, civil society engagement, and women's empowerment(60, 61, 82-84). Our findings
579 support the importance of optimizing the engagement of local NGOs and academics, as well
580 as raising awareness among institutions interested in women's empowerment and children(63),
581 such as Disdik and DP3A.

582 Another critical non-fiscal measure that should be strongly enforced is a complete ban or strict
583 limitations on advertising. While regulatory frameworks for tobacco advertising are in place,
584 lack of local government commitment and weak surveillance systems hinder adoption at the
585 sub-national level(22, 85). While we found no issues with alcohol advertising, our findings
586 suggest potential disadvantages of advertising and packaging information for SSBs. Since there
587 are currently no specific interventions for SSBs, past studies have suggested Front-of-Pack
588 (FOP) or 'traffic-light' nutritional labeling (86-88). This should be accompanied by extensive
589 consumer education to increase their understanding of nutritional labeling, as previous studies
590 have noted a lack of comprehension among consumers(89). Furthermore, in the realm of law
591 enforcement, the health tax can also be leveraged to impose more stringent penalties, enhance
592 monitoring efforts, and provide counselling for sellers found illegally selling tobacco and
593 alcohol to minors.(90-92).

594 Finally, given the cross-sectoral nature of health tax implementation, sub-national and national
595 governments must share a common understanding of the policy objectives to avoid policy
596 polarization. With health financing problems being one of the decentralization issues facing
597 the healthcare sector in Indonesia(35), framing health taxes as a means of health financing will
598 be crucial to avoid conflicting interests in tax allocation. This should be a clear priority during
599 the planning process to ensure budget alignment and avoid implementation delays(14, 16, 93).

600 We propose three crucial recommendations for advancing the implementation of health taxes,
601 applicable to both sub-national and national governments.

602 First and foremost is the aspect of policy communication, which holds paramount importance
603 in gaining the trust and support of the public. When communicating the health tax policy,
604 advocates should consider a wider range of arguments in support of health taxes, such as ones
605 based on health impacts, as opposed to prioritizing just the revenue-generation potential of
606 these taxes.

607 Secondly, the health tax earmarking should be a key consideration. Even though sub-national
608 governments may not directly engage in health tax collection, they can actively participate in
609 the allocation of health tax revenues. Although hard earmarking is subject to a debate, a soft
610 earmarking which allows a more flexible funding priorities and aligns with decentralization,
611 can garner greater public and sub-national government support for health taxes.

612 In addition to the health sector, as is currently the case with tobacco, some broader
613 recommendations for funding allocation includes: (i) enhancing public awareness through
614 preventive and promotive actions; (ii) supporting industrial development with an export
615 orientation, especially for alcoholic beverages, which may have unique local specialties
616 suitable for export; (iii) raising awareness among local small and micro-enterprises to
617 encourage shifts toward healthier product alternatives, such as product reformulation
618 (particularly for SSBs); (iv) providing subsidies for healthier alternatives, particularly targeting
619 lower-income households; and (v) strengthening law enforcement, which includes eradicating
620 the illicit trade of cigarettes and imposing fines on those who sell alcoholic beverages and
621 tobacco to minors.

622 Lastly, non-fiscal measures are equally critical alongside fiscal ones. Some significant non-
623 fiscal measures that deserve prioritization include: (i) implementing bans or limitations on

624 advertising, an area currently under sub-national government authority. This restriction should
625 also extend to SSBs. Furthermore, the national government should consider reinforcing the
626 regulatory framework to encourage sub-national governments to adopt this policy; (ii)
627 enforcing standardized packaging, similar to the tobacco industry, which features easily
628 recognizable packaging with pictorial health warnings. We propose that this approach be
629 applied to SSBs as well. The government should contemplate implementing mandatory Front-
630 of-Pack or 'traffic light' labelling to mitigate consumer confusion; and (iii) launching extensive
631 promotional campaigns, particularly for SSBs. In the case of tobacco, which has long been
632 marketed as a 'harmful' product, similar efforts should be directed toward raising awareness
633 about the health risks associated with SSB consumption.

634 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to analyze the political economy of health
635 taxes for three different commodities (tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and SSBs) at the sub-
636 national level in Indonesia. However, this study is subject to certain limitations. Firstly, it is
637 constrained by its focus on specific provinces, potentially posing a threat to external validity.
638 However, we took steps to mitigate this limitation by broadening our sample to encompass
639 three provinces, each with different commodities under scrutiny. Additionally, the inclusion of
640 multiple stakeholders from various sectors, including government, non-governmental
641 organizations, and consumers, provides a more comprehensive perspective that may be
642 applicable in other settings.

643 Secondly, our study did not involve elected policy actors such as governors or members of the
644 DPRD. These individuals may offer valuable insights into the political economy of health
645 taxes. Future research should consider expanding the pool of informants to include these
646 elected officials, thereby enriching our understanding of the subject.

647 Lastly, our study's scope is limited in terms of SSBs knowledge. This limitation arises because,
648 at the time of our data collection, the tax on SSBs had not been implemented. Subsequent

649 studies should consider conducting research specifically on SSBs after the implementation of
650 relevant regulations to provide a more comprehensive analysis of the impact of health taxes on
651 this particular commodity.

652 **Conclusion**

653 This study aims to understand the political economy of health tax policy implementation at the
654 sub-national level by critically exploring the case of Indonesia as one of the most decentralized
655 countries. The findings of this study identify lessons learned for countries facing similar
656 challenges of a complex decentralized decision-making process.

657 Sub-national governments, constrained by limited fiscal resources, tend to prioritize curative
658 actions over preventive measures. To address this, promoting health taxes as a funding source
659 for preventive initiatives is crucial, aligning with findings from limited research on sub-national
660 health taxes. However, counteractive arguments from anti-tax opposition should be anticipated
661 and addressed through comprehensive communication strategies.

662 Policy communication should emphasize a wide range of arguments, including health impacts,
663 to gain public support. Earmarking health tax revenues, with a preference for soft earmarking,
664 allows flexibility and aligns with decentralization principles, garnering greater support.
665 Recommendations include prioritizing public awareness, supporting industrial development,
666 and providing subsidies for healthier alternatives. Non-fiscal measures, such as advertising
667 restrictions and standardized packaging, are crucial. The study, focusing on tobacco, alcoholic
668 beverages, and SSBs at the sub-national level, acknowledges limitations and suggests future
669 research directions, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive understanding of health taxes'
670 political economy.

671 **Acknowledgement** The authors would like to thank Robert Marten and Kaung Suu Lwin at
672 the Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research (a WHO-hosted partnership), as well as
673 Adam Koon for the comments and insights during the preparation of this manuscript. This
674 research study is part of a series of analytical country case studies to better understand the
675 political economy of advancing health taxes supported by the Alliance for Health Policy and
676 Systems Research, in collaboration with WHO Departments and the Inter-Agency Working
677 Group on Health Taxes.

678 **References**

- 679 1. Marten R, Kadandale S, Butler J, Aguayo VM, Axelrod S, Banatvala N, et al. Sugar, tobacco, and
680 alcohol taxes to achieve the SDGs. *The Lancet*. 2018;391(10138):2400-1.
- 681 2. Miracolo A, Sophiea M, Mills M, Kanavos P. Sin taxes and their effect on consumption, revenue
682 generation and health improvement: a systematic literature review in Latin America. *Health Policy and*
683 *Planning*. 2021;36(5):790-810.
- 684 3. Flynn J. Do sugar-sweetened beverage taxes improve public health for high school aged
685 adolescents? *Health Economics*. 2023;32(1):47-64.
- 686 4. Sánchez-Romero LM, Canto-Osorio F, González-Morales R, Colchero MA, Ng S-W, Ramírez-
687 Palacios P, et al. Association between tax on sugar sweetened beverages and soft drink consumption
688 in adults in Mexico: open cohort longitudinal analysis of Health Workers Cohort Study. *Bmj*. 2020.
- 689 5. Javadinasab H, Masoudi Asl I, Vosoogh-Moghaddam A, Najafi B. Comparing selected countries
690 using sin tax policy in sustainable health financing: Implications for developing countries. *International*
691 *Journal of Health Planning and Management*. 2020;35(1).
- 692 6. World Health O. Tackling NCDs: 'Best buys' and other recommended interventions for the
693 prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases. 2017.
- 694 7. NCD Alliance. The Financial Burden of NCDs 2022 [Available from:
695 <https://ncdalliance.org/why-ncds/the-financial-burden-of-ncds#:~:text=In%20total%20the%20five%20leading,US%24%20%20trillion%20per%20year>.
- 696 [ncds#:~:text=In%20total%20the%20five%20leading,US%24%20%20trillion%20per%20year](https://ncdalliance.org/why-ncds/the-financial-burden-of-ncds#:~:text=In%20total%20the%20five%20leading,US%24%20%20trillion%20per%20year).
- 697 8. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable Diseases 2022 [Available from:
698 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases>.
- 699 9. World Health Organization. Health taxes 2022 [Available from: [https://www.who.int/health-](https://www.who.int/health-topics/health-taxes#tab=tab_1)
700 [topics/health-taxes#tab=tab_1](https://www.who.int/health-topics/health-taxes#tab=tab_1).
- 701 10. Elliott LM, Dalglish SL, Topp SM. Health taxes on tobacco, alcohol, food and drinks in low-and
702 middle-income countries: a scoping review of policy content, actors, process and context.
703 *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*. 2022;11(4):414-28.
- 704 11. Ghebreyesus TA, Clark H. Health taxes for healthier lives: an opportunity for all governments.
705 *BMJ Global Health*. 2023;8(Suppl 8):e013761.
- 706 12. Sparkes SP, Rivera PAC, Jang H, Marten R, Rajan D, Robb A, Shroff ZC. Normalizing the political
707 economy of improving health. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 2022;100(4):276.

- 708 13. Rahman-Shepherd A, Balasubramaniam P, Gautham M, Hutchinson E, Kitutu FE, Marten R,
709 Khan MS. Conflicts of interest: an invisible force shaping health systems and policies. *The Lancet Global*
710 *Health*. 2021;9(8):e1055-e6.
- 711 14. Rodríguez DC, Balaji LN, Chamdimba E, Kafumba J, Koon AD, Mazalale J, et al. Political
712 economy analysis of subnational health management in Kenya, Malawi and Uganda. *Health Policy and*
713 *Planning*. 2023;38(5):631-47.
- 714 15. Carriedo A, Koon AD, Encarnación LM, Lee K, Smith R, Walls H. The political economy of sugar-
715 sweetened beverage taxation in Latin America: lessons from Mexico, Chile and Colombia.
716 *Globalization and health*. 2021;17(1):1-14.
- 717 16. Tsofa B, Waweru E, Munywoki J, Soe K, Rodriguez DC, Koon AD. Political economy analysis of
718 sub-national health sector planning and budgeting: A case study of three counties in Kenya. *PLoS*
719 *Global Public Health*. 2023;3(1):e0001401.
- 720 17. Ministry of Health of Indonesia. *Laporan Nasional Riset Kesehatan Dasar 2018*. 2018.
- 721 18. Agustina R, Dartanto T, Sitompul R, Susiloretni KA, Suparmi, Achadi EL, et al. Universal health
722 coverage in Indonesia: concept, progress, and challenges. *The Lancet*. 2019;393(10166):75-102.
- 723 19. Bloom DE, Chen S, McGovern M, Prettner K, Candeias V, Bernaert A, Cristin S. Economics of
724 non-communicable diseases in Indonesia. 2015.
- 725 20. Ahsan A, Kramer E, Adani N, Muhammad A, Amalia N. The politics of funding universal
726 healthcare: Diverting local tobacco taxes to subsidise the national health scheme in Indonesia. *Asia &*
727 *the Pacific Policy Studies*. 2021;8(3):351-66.
- 728 21. Barber S, Ahsan A. The tobacco excise system in Indonesia: hindering effective tobacco control
729 for health. *Journal of public health policy*. 2009;30:208-25.
- 730 22. Astuti PAS, Assunta M, Freeman B. Why is tobacco control progress in Indonesia stalled?-a
731 qualitative analysis of interviews with tobacco control experts. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1-12.
- 732 23. Kramer E, Ahsan A, Rees VW. Policy incoherence and tobacco control in Indonesia: an analysis
733 of the national tobacco-related policy mix. *Tobacco Control*. 2021.
- 734 24. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah,
735 Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia(1999).
- 736 25. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 1999 tentang Perimbangan Keuangan
737 antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Daerah, Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia(1999).
- 738 26. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2022 tentang Hubungan Keuangan
739 Antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Pemerintah Daerah, Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik
740 Indonesia(2022).
- 741 27. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 28 Tahun 2009 tentang Pajak Daerah dan
742 Retribusi Daerah, Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia(2009).
- 743 28. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 7 Tahun 2021 tentang Harmonisasi Peraturan
744 Perpajakan, Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia(2021).
- 745 29. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 39 Tahun 2007 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-
746 Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 1995 tentang Cukai, Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia(2007).
- 747 30. World Bank. Health Taxes 2023 [Available from:
748 [https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/nutrition/brief/health-](https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/nutrition/brief/health-taxes#:~:text=Health%20taxes%20are%20taxes%20imposed,cancer%2C%20obesity%2C%20and%20diabetes)
749 [taxes#:~:text=Health%20taxes%20are%20taxes%20imposed,cancer%2C%20obesity%2C%20and%20](https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/nutrition/brief/health-taxes#:~:text=Health%20taxes%20are%20taxes%20imposed,cancer%2C%20obesity%2C%20and%20diabetes)
750 [diabetes](https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/nutrition/brief/health-taxes#:~:text=Health%20taxes%20are%20taxes%20imposed,cancer%2C%20obesity%2C%20and%20diabetes).

- 751 31. Penerapan Cukai Minuman Berpemanis, Kemenkeu Mundur Teratur? [press release]. 2023.
- 752 32. Pinto R, Masaki E, Harimurti P. Indonesia health financing system assessment: Spend more,
753 spend right, spend better: World Bank; 2016.
- 754 33. Wright A, Smith KE, Hellowell M. Policy lessons from health taxes: a systematic review of
755 empirical studies. *BMC public health*. 2017;17(1):1-14.
- 756 34. Prastyani A. Who'll pay for Indonesia's national health insurance. *New Mandala*, published
757 February. 2019;28.
- 758 35. Rakmawati T, Hinchcliff R, Pardosi JF. District-level impacts of health system decentralization
759 in Indonesia: A systematic review. *The International journal of health planning and management*.
760 2019;34(2):e1026-e53.
- 761 36. Nurhasana R, Ratih SP, Dartanto T, Moeis FR, Hartono RK, Satrya A, Thabrany H. Public support
762 for cigarette price increase in Indonesia. *Tobacco Control*. 2022;31(3):483-6.
- 763 37. Christiani Y, Dugdale P, Tavener M, Byles JE. The dynamic of non-communicable disease
764 control policy in Indonesia. *Australian Health Review*. 2016;41(2):207-13.
- 765 38. Moeis FR, Nurhasana R, Rahardi F, Novitasari D, Shellasih NM, Inayati, et al. The Framework
766 Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) and implementation of tobacco control policies: Lessons
767 learned from Indonesia and Thailand. *World Medical & Health Policy*. 2022;14(4):750-72.
- 768 39. Ahsan A, Subekti VS, Wiyono NH. Peran kekuatan-kekuatan politik dalam perdebatan
769 penentuan tarif cukai rokok maksimal pada pembahasan undang-undang no.39 tahun 2007 tentang
770 cukai. Jakarta: UI Publishing; 2021.
- 771 40. Tracy SJ. *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating
772 impact*: John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
- 773 41. Yin RK. *Case study research: Design and methods*: sage; 2009.
- 774 42. Heywood P, Harahap NP. Public funding of health at the district level in Indonesia after
775 decentralization—sources, flows and contradictions. *Health Research Policy and Systems*. 2009;7:1-14.
- 776 43. Harris D. *Applied political economy analysis: a problem-driven framework--Toolkits*. 2013.
- 777 44. United Kingdom-Department for International Development. *Political Economy Analysis How
778 To Note—A DFID Practice Paper*. 2009.
- 779 45. Fritz V, Levy B, Ort R. *Problem-driven political economy analysis: The World Bank's experience*:
780 World Bank Publications; 2014.
- 781 46. Flick U. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative Research Design*: Sage; 2022.
- 782 47. World Medical Association. *World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical
783 principles for medical research involving human subjects*. *Jama*. 2013;310(20):2191-4.
- 784 48. Smith J, Firth J. *Qualitative data analysis: the framework approach*. *Nurse researcher*.
785 2011;18(2).
- 786 49. Ritchie J, Spencer L. *Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research*. *Analyzing qualitative
787 data*: Routledge; 2002. p. 173-94.
- 788 50. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 17 Tahun 2023 tentang Kesehatan, Dewan
789 Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia(2023).
- 790 51. Peraturan Gubernur Bali Nomor 1 Tahun 2020 tentang Tata Kelola Minuman Fermentasi
791 Dan/atau Destilasi Khas Bali, (2020).

- 792 52. Negara SD, Hutchinson FE. The Impact of Indonesia's Decentralization Reforms Two Decades
793 On. *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies*. 2021;38(3):289-95.
- 794 53. Ahsan A, Amalia N, Rahmayanti KP, Adani N, Wiyono NH, Endawansa A, et al. Health taxes in
795 Indonesia: a review of policy debates on the tobacco, alcoholic beverages and sugar-sweetened
796 beverage taxes in the media. *BMJ Global Health*. 2023;8(Suppl 8):e012042.
- 797 54. McCollum R, Limato R, Otiso L, Theobald S, Taegtmeier M. Health system governance
798 following devolution: comparing experiences of decentralisation in Kenya and Indonesia. *BMJ global
799 health*. 2018;3(5):e000939.
- 800 55. Koon AD, Marten R. Framing health taxes: A Scoping review. *BMJ Global Health*. 2023;8(Suppl
801 8):e012055.
- 802 56. Vardavas CI, Filippidis FT, Agaku I, Mytaras V, Bertic M, Connolly GN, et al. Tobacco taxation:
803 the importance of earmarking the revenue to health care and tobacco control. *Tobacco induced
804 diseases*. 2012;10(1):1-5.
- 805 57. Julia C, Méjean C, Vicari F, Péneau S, Hercberg S. Public perception and characteristics related
806 to acceptance of the sugar-sweetened beverage taxation launched in France in 2012. *Public health
807 nutrition*. 2015;18(14):2679-88.
- 808 58. Bødker M, Pisinger C, Toft U, Jørgensen T. The rise and fall of the world's first fat tax. *Health
809 policy*. 2015;119(6):737-42.
- 810 59. Singh A, Smith K, Hellowell M, Logo DD, Marten R, Lwin KS, Owusu-Dabo E. An exploration of
811 stakeholder views and perceptions on taxing tobacco, alcohol and sugar-sweetened beverages in
812 Ghana. *BMJ Global Health*. 2023;8(5):e012054.
- 813 60. Baker P, Jones A, Thow AM. Accelerating the Worldwide Adoption of Sugar-Sweetened
814 Beverage Taxes: Strengthening Commitment and Capacity Comment on "The Untapped Power of Soda
815 Taxes: Incentivizing Consumers, Generating Revenue, and Altering Corporate Behavior". *International
816 Journal of Health Policy and Management*. 2017;7(5):474-8.
- 817 61. Donaldson EA, Cohen JE, Rutkow L, Villanti AC, Kanarek NF, Barry CL. Public support for a
818 sugar-sweetened beverage tax and pro-tax messages in a Mid-Atlantic US state. *Public Health
819 Nutrition*. 2014;18(12):2263-73.
- 820 62. Thow AM, Downs SM, Mayes C, Trevena H, Waqanivalu T, Cawley J. Fiscal policy to improve
821 diets and prevent noncommunicable diseases: from recommendations to action. *Bulletin of the World
822 Health Organization*. 2018;96(3):201.
- 823 63. Lwin KS, Koon AD, Rasanathan K, Ahsan A, Erku D, Mialon M, et al. Framing health taxes:
824 learning from low-and middle-income countries. *BMJ Global Health*. 2023;8(Suppl 8):e012955.
- 825 64. Hellowell M, Smith KE, Wright A. Hard to avoid but difficult to sustain: Scotland's innovative
826 health tax on large retailers selling tobacco and alcohol. *The Milbank Quarterly*. 2016;94(4):800-31.
- 827 65. Eykelenboom M, Van Stralen MM, Olthof MR, Schoonmade LJ, Steenhuis IH, Renders CM.
828 Political and public acceptability of a sugar-sweetened beverages tax: a mixed-method systematic
829 review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*.
830 2019;16(1):1-19.
- 831 66. Barry CL, Niederdeppe J, Gollust SE. Taxes on sugar-sweetened beverages: results from a 2011
832 national public opinion survey. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2013;44(2):158-63.
- 833 67. Shill J, Mavoia H, Allender S, Lawrence M, Sacks G, Peeters A, et al. Government regulation to
834 promote healthy food environments—a view from inside state governments. *Obesity reviews*.
835 2012;13(2):162-73.

- 836 68. Thow AM, Downs S, Jan S. A systematic review of the effectiveness of food taxes and subsidies
837 to improve diets: understanding the recent evidence. *Nutrition reviews*. 2014;72(9):551-65.
- 838 69. Eyles H, Ni Mhurchu C, Nghiem N, Blakely T. Food pricing strategies, population diets, and non-
839 communicable disease: a systematic review of simulation studies. *PLoS medicine*.
840 2012;9(12):e1001353.
- 841 70. Hoffman SJ, Tan C. Overview of systematic reviews on the health-related effects of
842 government tobacco control policies. *BMC public health*. 2015;15(1):1-11.
- 843 71. Kooshkebaghi M, Emamgholipour S, Dargahi H. Explaining specific taxes management and use
844 in the health sector: a qualitative study. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2022;22(1):1220.
- 845 72. Barahona N, Otero C, Otero S. Equilibrium effects of food labeling policies. *Econometrica*.
846 2023;91(3):839-68.
- 847 73. Phonsuk P, Vongmongkol V, Ponguttha S, Suphanchaimat R, Rojroongwasinkul N, Swinburn
848 BA. Impacts of a sugar sweetened beverage tax on body mass index and obesity in Thailand: A
849 modelling study. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(4):e0250841.
- 850 74. Curtis CJ, Marklund M, Saxena A, Goyena E, Desnacido JP, Koon AD, et al. Considerations for
851 modelling a broad food tax in the Philippines and other low-income and middle-income countries.
852 *BMJ Global Health*. 2023;8(Suppl 8):e012068.
- 853 75. Bourke EJ, Veerman JL. The potential impact of taxing sugar drinks on health inequality in
854 Indonesia. *BMJ global health*. 2018;3(6):e000923.
- 855 76. Colchero MA, Paraje G, Popkin BM. The impacts on food purchases and tax revenues of a tax
856 based on Chile's nutrient profiling model. *Plos one*. 2021;16(12):e0260693.
- 857 77. Salgado Hernández JC, Ng SW. Simulating international tax designs on sugar-sweetened
858 beverages in Mexico. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(8):e0253748.
- 859 78. Etilé F, Sharma A. Do high consumers of sugar-sweetened beverages respond differently to
860 price changes? A finite mixture IV-Tobit approach. *Health economics*. 2015;24(9):1147-63.
- 861 79. Taillie LS, Rivera JA, Popkin BM, Batis C. Do high vs. low purchasers respond differently to a
862 nonessential energy-dense food tax? Two-year evaluation of Mexico's 8% nonessential food tax.
863 *Preventive medicine*. 2017;105:S37-S42.
- 864 80. Chaloupka FJ, Powell LM, Warner KE. The Use of Excise Taxes to Reduce Tobacco, Alcohol, and
865 Sugary Beverage Consumption. 2019.
- 866 81. Powell LM, Leider J. Impact of the Seattle Sweetened Beverage Tax on substitution to alcoholic
867 beverages. *Plos one*. 2022;17(1):e0262578.
- 868 82. Zhang D, Giabbanelli PJ, Arah OA, Zimmerman FJ. Impact of different policies on unhealthy
869 dietary behaviors in an urban adult population: an agent-based simulation model. *American journal*
870 *of public health*. 2014;104(7):1217-22.
- 871 83. Li Y, Zhang D, Pagán JA. Social norms and the consumption of fruits and vegetables across New
872 York City neighborhoods. *Journal of Urban Health*. 2016;93:244-55.
- 873 84. Beeken RJ, Wardle J. Public beliefs about the causes of obesity and attitudes towards policy
874 initiatives in Great Britain. *Public health nutrition*. 2013;16(12):2132-7.
- 875 85. Sebayang SK, Dewi DMSK, Lailiyah Su, Ahsan A. Mixed-methods evaluation of a ban on tobacco
876 advertising and promotion in Banyuwangi District, Indonesia. *Tobacco control*. 2019;28(6):651-6.
- 877 86. Allais O, Etilé F, Lecocq S. Mandatory labels, taxes and market forces: An empirical evaluation
878 of fat policies. *Journal of health economics*. 2015;43:27-44.

- 879 87. Fichera E, von Hinke S. The response to nutritional labels: Evidence from a quasi-experiment.
880 *Journal of Health Economics*. 2020;72:102326.
- 881 88. Sacks G, Veerman JL, Moodie M, Swinburn B. ‘Traffic-light’ nutrition labelling and ‘junk-
882 food’ tax: a modelled comparison of cost-effectiveness for obesity prevention. *International journal of*
883 *obesity*. 2011;35(7):1001-9.
- 884 89. Juffrie M, Sartika RAD, Sparringa RA, Wibowo L, Lukito W. Consumption patterns of
885 sweetened condensed milk in the diet of young Indonesian children and its potential nutritional health
886 consequences. *Asia Pacific journal of clinical nutrition*. 2020;29(1):16-26.
- 887 90. Dicksit DD, Ramachandra SS. Sale of tobacco products among minors in a satellite township
888 near Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. An observational study. *Tobacco Induced Diseases*. 2018;16(1).
- 889 91. Chen M-L, Chou L-N, Zheng Y-C. Empowering retailers to refuse to sell tobacco products to
890 minors. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2018;15(2):245.
- 891 92. Roodbeen RT, Schelleman-Offermans K, Lemmens PH. Can vendors’ age limit control
892 measures increase compliance with the alcohol age limit? An evaluation of measures implemented by
893 three Dutch liquor store chains. *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 2018;61:7-14.
- 894 93. Liwanag HJ, Wyss K. What conditions enable decentralization to improve the health system?
895 Qualitative analysis of perspectives on decision space after 25 years of devolution in the Philippines.
896 *PLoS One*. 2018;13(11):e0206809.

897

898

899 **Appendix S1 The Prevalence of Tobacco, Alcoholic Beverages, and Sugar-Sweetened**
900 **Beverages (SSBs) in Indonesia by Province, 2018***

Province	Tobacco ^a	Alcoholic Beverages ^b	Sugar-Sweetened Beverages (SSBs) ^c
Aceh	24.0	0.4	59.81
North Sumatera	22.4	5.5	58.51
West Sumatera	26.9	1.5	60.63
Riau	25.3	2.2	62.39
Jambi	21.5	0.7	54.46
South Sumatera	25.3	1.2	63.82
Bengkulu	27.8	1.7	55.81
Lampung	28.1	1.8	65.95
Bangka Belitung	24.8	3.0	57.26
Kepulauan Riau	22.3	3.3	59.58
DKI Jakarta	22.9	3.0	61.72
West Java	27.1	1.7	63.91
Central Java	23.2	1.9	68.82
DI Yogyakarta	19.5	3.2	71.01
East Java	23.9	1.8	57.00
Banten	26.8	2.1	61.46
Bali	18.9	14.0	42.90
West Nusa Tenggara	26.3	3.4	51.73
East Nusa Tenggara	19.0	15.6	53.60
West Kalimantan	23.5	7.5	59.05
Central Kalimantan	24.3	4.2	64.57
South Kalimantan	20.6	1.3	70.82
East Kalimantan	21.9	2.9	61.57
North Kalimantan	22.5	4.5	67.53
North Sulawesi	23.5	16.0	60.94
Central Sulawesi	26.1	8.8	58.67
South Sulawesi	22.0	6.3	56.29
Southeast Sulawesi	22.3	6.2	52.66
Gorontalo	27.4	11.3	56.16
West Sulawesi	21.8	4.1	58.25
Maluku	22.1	11.1	62.06
North Maluku	23.9	7.2	59.40
West Papua	22.1	7.5	59.18
Papua	18.8	4.9	53.45

901 *Source: Basic Health Research Report, Ministry of Health of Republic of
902 Indonesia, 2018

903 ^aPopulation aged 10+, consume daily

904 ^bPopulation aged 10+, based on past month consumption

905 ^cPopulation aged 3+, consume at least once per day.

906

907

908

909 **Appendix S2 Focus Group Guide and Informed Consent**

910

911

Informed Consent Form

912

“Health Taxes Implementation Challenges in Indonesia: Case Study of Three Provinces”

913

I hereby declare that:

914

a. My participation is voluntary, and I may withdraw from this Focus Group Discussion (FGD) at any time without the obligation to provide reasons. Should I choose to withdraw, all related data will be promptly erased and will not be utilized further;

915

916

917

b. I agree that the information I provide within this FGD will exclusively serve research purposes and the subsequent publication of research findings;

918

919

c. I consent to the understanding that my personal data will not be employed or disclosed in any form within this research;

920

921

d. I agree to the recording of the FGD process and the documentation of salient points presented therein;

922

923

e. I have perused and comprehended the information pertaining to this research. I have had the opportunity to pose questions and have received satisfactory and adequate responses concerning this research.

924

925

926

In light of the aforementioned considerations, I willingly consent to participate as an informant in this research, fully cognizant and free from any coercion or duress.

927

Name	Date	Signature

928

929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958

Focus Group Discussion

“Health Taxes Implementation Challenges in Indonesia: Case Study of Three Provinces”

Introduction:

Good morning/afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. We are a team of researchers from Universitas Indonesia. My name is _____, and I will serve as the moderator for this Focus Group Discussion (FGD) session. Firstly, we'd like to thank you for your participation in this FGD. The session today is expected to last no more than 120 minutes, and each participant will have the opportunity to share their opinions on each question.

We want to reassure you that this FGD session will be fully audio-recorded, and all information gathered during and after this FGD will be used exclusively for research purposes. The confidentiality of your personal information is of utmost importance to us. We have provided you with an informed consent form, ensuring that your participation remains completely anonymous. We will not disclose any personal identifiers or the identity of your institution.

Before we dive into the session, we will begin with a brief presentation outlining the objectives and context of this research.

List of questions (for institutions):

1. What are the primary public health issues on your institution's agenda?
Probe: are there any related to diseases caused by the consumption of tobacco/alcohol/SSBs?
2. How does your institution position itself in efforts to control non-communicable diseases caused by the consumption of tobacco/alcohol/SSBs?
Probe: health motive, economic motive
3. Can you please describe your understanding of a tobacco/alcohol/SSBs taxes?
4. Can you briefly explain your institution's opinion on the current implementation of tobacco/alcohol/SSBs taxes in your province?
5. How would you evaluate the current implementation of tobacco/alcohol/SSBs taxes implementation in your province?

959 **List of questions (for consumers):**

960 1. Can you describe your consumption patterns for cigarettes/alcohol/SSBs?

961 Probe: total daily consumption, percentage of your budget spent, the type/brand you
962 consumemost frequently.

963 2. Why do you think it's important for you to regularly consume cigarettes/alcohol/SSBs?

964 Probe: taste, any events, emotions, or situations associated with consumption.

965 3. In your opinion, how does the consumption of cigarettes/alcohol/SSBs in your family and
966 community compare to five years ago?

967 Check: has it increased or decreased

968 4. Can you describe your feelings when you watch/see advertisements for
969 cigarettes/alcohol/SSBs?

970 Probe: negative/positive emotions, purchase intention.

971 5. Can you describe your feelings when you watch/read news or public health information in
972 the media about cigarettes/alcohol/SSBs?

973 Probe: negative/positive emotions, awareness, sense of control.

974 6. What is your understanding of cigarette/alcohol/SSBs taxes?

975 7. If the price of cigarettes/alcohol/SSBs were to increase due to taxes, how would you
976 respond?

977 Investigate: agree or disagree, why

978 8. In your opinion, what should the government do to reduce alcohol consumption?

979 Investigate: public awareness campaigns, clear regulations, etc.

980

981

Appendix S3 Abstraction Matrix for Framework Analysis using Political Economy Approach

Theme	STRUCTURAL DIAGNOSIS		AGENCY DIAGNOSIS		WAY FORWARD		
Sub-theme	Social context	Institutional arrangement	Stakeholders	Incentive	Barriers	Opportunities	Recommendation
Definition	<i>(Contextual factors that impact the problem)</i>	<i>(Institutions and rules that shape power dynamics and outcomes as well as the shared understanding between institutions in adopting the national government policy)</i>	<i>(Identification of stakeholders, their role, and their interaction)</i>	<i>(Factors that shape stakeholders' behavior)</i>	<i>(Barriers that hinder the policy implementation)</i>	<i>(Opportunities that could support the policy implementation)</i>	<i>(Recommended actions to overcome barriers and optimizing opportunities)</i>
Keywords	Cultural factors	Ideology on the health tax objective	Key actors	Actors orientation/position towards public health	Lack of awareness	Public support	Policy communication
	Consumers' awareness	Current regulations and programs	Power and relationships between actors	Incentive to support and prioritize the policy	Trust towards governmental institution	NGO engagement	Earmarking
	Social construct of the commodity attribute				Product substitution and not-for-commercial consumption		Non-fiscal measure