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Abstract. Sustainable urban planning and development requires not only a fast-growing economic growth and modernity, but also social equity and environmental sustainability. Meanwhile, the global goals of sustainable development have fascinatingly set a promising urban development future by enhancing ecology based pro-poor policy program. Apparently, pro-poor development agenda has led to the notion of pro-poor tourism as part of urban development strategies on poverty alleviation. This research presents Jakarta Hidden Tour and Kampung Warna-warni as certain cases of pro-poor tourism in Indonesia. By the emergence of criticism on “pro-growth” paradigm, the critical analysis of this research focuses on the scenario of sustainable pro-poor tourism through eco-cultural based Kampung-Tour development. In accordance, debates and dilemma have been continuously arising as pros and cons regarding the ethical issues of poverty alleviation based Kampung-Tour development. Nevertheless, this paper tries to redefine Slum Kampung as potential; the writer wildly offers a concept of poverty alleviation by reinventing pro-poor tourism strategy; revitalizing slum site to eco-cultural based pro-poor tourism development as an embodiment of a sustainable urban development. By holding system thinking analysis as research method, sustainable pro-poor tourism highlights the urgency community based tourism and eco-tourism so that poverty alleviation based tourism can be tangibly perceived by the poor. In this sense, good local governance and public private partnership must be enhanced, it is due to, like any other development projects; sustainable pro-poor tourism needs a strong political commitment to alleviate urban poverty, as well as to pursue a better future of sustainable nation.

1. Introduction
In the era of uncertainty, Indonesia, as well as the developing nations in Asia is facing two major urban development problems which are poverty and environmental degradation. Indonesia has witnessed a transformational process associated with the drastic changes in economic stability, socio-cultural spheres, administrative and political reform, and environmental quality. In this context, poverty alleviation has become the leading agenda of international development which highly supported by the global deal of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [7].

Tourism is one of the world’s largest industries, generating an estimated 11% of global Gross Domestic Product (GDP), employing 200 million people and transporting nearly 700 million international travellers per year – a figure that is expected to double by 2020. International tourism arrivals in developing countries have grown by an average of 9.5% per year since 1990, compared to
4.6% worldwide. The tourism industry makes important contributions to the economies of developing countries, particularly to foreign exchange earnings, employment, and GDP [11].

Tourism sector as one of vital parts of development strategies has increasingly catalysed the growth of national income. The trend of modernization has encouraged the implementation of the principles of Sustainable Development Goals in urban development process. However, the overwhelming growth of economic development has been hectically risking the stability of socio-culture and ecology sectors. Meanwhile, the breakthrough led by eco-tourism and community based tourism has transformed the ideas of urban tourism into a brand new tourism development [3]. These tourism approaches promote eco-friendly tourism activities and community involvement in tourism sector. Yet, eco-tourism, somehow, practically depend on natural beauty/resources as the main tourism attraction, whereas community based tourism development does not always put the ecology aspect as main preference. The major point is whether two types of those tourisms can share benefit to the poor; and how much benefit the poor can tangibly perceive. In addition, due to a globalising and fast-changing world, tourism for the poor meets the need of sustainable urban development in the framework of pro-poor policy [13]. It needs to be noted that, in many cases, urban poverty has gained massive popularity due to the dynamic impacts on the dimensions of economy, socio-culture, politic, and ecology. Moreover, the complexity of urban poverty has turned pro-poor policy into a more creative poverty reduction strategy through pro-poor tourism. Indeed, the connection between pro-poor tourism and Pro-poor policy is close; as a means of poverty alleviation, pro-poor policy has been massively set to overcome the problem of urban poverty – which commonly caused by socio-economy disparity. Nevertheless, debates over pro-poor tourism came up with basic doubt on its effectiveness in reducing poverty and maintaining environmental sustainability.

There has been little consideration of the whole range of impacts on economic sustainability by not incorporating the principle of sustainability into the objectives of poverty elimination. To this extent, the current pro-poor tourism agenda has missed the potential to enhance job opportunities for the poor and sustainability for the environment. As a result, authorities, especially government institutions must promote sustainable pro-poor tourism, defined as tourism that generates net benefits for the poor; encompasses economic, socio-cultural and environmental sustainable benefits, at the same time as aiming to empower the poor rather than merely expanding the profit for the business sector.

Indonesia has experienced pro-poor tourism in some different programs. Jakarta Hidden Tour is one “wild” form of pro-poor tourism developed by private sector. The concept of tourism highlights the idea of social critics on disproportional urban development in the capital city. The attraction ultimately bases on the uniqueness of urban poverty to be exposed as tourism object. Kampung Warna-warni in Malang is another type of pro-poor tourism inspired by Santa Martha and “Favela Painting” in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. In the perspective of sustainable pro-poor tourism, these types of pro-poor tourism are expected to give economic benefits to the poor and maintain sustainability through community based tourism. Thus, the creation of tourism activities should be sustainably managed by community engagement incorporated with market industry and local authorities. Besides, the uniqueness of each Kampung must highlight indigenous values as local wisdom and heritage. In accordance to the attaining effort of sustainable pro-poor tourism, this research is conducted to display comprehensive analysis on pro-poor tourism in Indonesia by examining practices in Jakarta and Malang.

This paper assumed that pro-poor tourism in Indonesia is growing, and that this trend would show significant progress to achieve sustainable pro-poor tourism. Further, the emphasis is how pro-poor tourism’s contribution on sustainable development could be enhanced. The research’s problems emphasized on: 1) conceptual and theoretical analysis of pro-poor tourism and pro-poor policy; 2) comparative analysis on pro-poor tourism in Jakarta and Malang (forced field analysis); 3) scenario (system thinking) analysis of the establishment of sustainable pro-poor tourism through Eco-cultural based Thematic Kampung-Tour Development (Causal Loop Diagram, including the input-output diagram).
2. Literature Review

The term of “pro-poor” is embedded into the approach of poverty alleviation. Pro-poor policy is a set of explicit actions which aims to share equity for the poor. It responds to the fact that disproportional benefit of development often perceived by the poor – unemployment, low cost labour; minority group; and women [10], therefore, the unfavourable consequences on economic growth must be resolved by strategic pro-poor policies program including pro-poor tourism. In the late 1999, Department for International Development (DFID) firstly developed research on pro-poor tourism and presented it to the United Nations with ground breaking of “putting poverty at the heart of the tourism agenda”. This global controversial approach has led to the shifting paradigm of poverty alleviation as part of tourism activities. Given the complex impacts that pro-poor tourism has on economy; socio-cultural perspectives; and ecology, pro-poor tourism needs to become a central issue of national and local government. Yet, pro-poor tourism is generally viewed as an engine for economic growth rather than as a mechanism for delivering poverty reduction; and that kind of assumption has especially affected the indebted developing nations [9]. The emphasis of “trickle down” benefits is also criticized not to be as good as what it possibly expected. Benefits of the practice of pro-poor tourism come to the rich first, and later, the poor begin to experience the benefits when the rich start spending their gains. Thus, this benefit mechanism implies that the poor benefit from the economic growth only indirectly through vertical flow from the rich [6]. Moreover, the notion of “trickle down” approach in development was aligned with the “pro-growth” paradigm, a mind-set of economic development. Some doubt pro-poor tourism by revealing that in practice, pro-poor tourism is recognised not always to be “community based tourism”, the fact is about what some interest parties in tourism sector do for a living by using the brand of pro-poor tourism.

The rising of modernity; the interconnected developed and developing nations; and the linkage of global tourism and international development agendas are the significant points of the theory of Modernization (the liberal perspective) and the theory of dependency (the critical perspective). These platforms have affections at the evaluation of the development perspectives on tourism and poverty. Liberal perspective views modernization paradigm as the best means to achieve the betterment of development in developing countries. Modernization defines development process as an evolutionary of traditional society to a more modern community. The assumption has clearly directed to the massive support of governments in developing nations on pro-poor tourism to solve unemployment, slum settlement, and insufficient infrastructure. With the intention to take part in global governance, a series of pro-poor tourism is set to be well developed by foreign aid. Modernization theory believes that international assistance may contribute to realize the modern way of life for the poor by embedding sharing on pro-poor tourism development. However, theory of dependency sees pro-poor tourism as a product of liberalization which cannot provide instant answer to development. This strategy precisely has impacts on the environmental sustainability because the main goal of pro-poor tourism is “pro-growth” development for the poor.

The newly emerged pro-poor tourism was also influenced by Neo-liberal economy policies, as stated in Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). By the emergence of global development reform, gigantic monetary institutions associated with the international development institutions became active in supporting efforts on economic restructuring in developing nations. In this sense, revolutionary ideas of enterprising government and market oriented government have transformed development platform of government’s institution. This has linked the network of pro-poor tourism to a greater global scale, an alteration had dynamically occurred at development perspective regarding pro-poor tourism as one of approaches of sustainable development. As a consequence of the era of sustainability, alternative tourism perspective came out to fulfil the empty link to sustainability in tourism. Alternative tourism can be defined as forms of tourism that set out to be consistent with natural, social, and community values and which allow both hosts and guests to enjoy positive and worthwhile interaction and shared experiences [8]. This theoretical reference somehow strengthened the development of the renewed interest of sustainable pro-poor tourism.
3. Methods
A methodological guideline in this research is qualitative approach and specified into the framework of system thinking analysis as the research method. Qualitatively, system thinking can be used to capture the working of a system as a tool of thinking and understanding [12]. System thinking framework is also used as technical guideline to describe and define the complex process and transformation of sustainable pro-poor tourism with various influencing factors (forced field analysis). The data used in this research are primary data through observation and in-depth interview, and also collective secondary data obtained from various sources of local government official websites and the Indonesia Central Bureau of Statistics (relevant literatures from other sources are also included).

![System Thinking Analysis (Qualitative)](image)

Figure 1. System Thinking Analysis (Qualitative)
Source: Modified by writer (2017), adopted from [2]

4. Results

4.1 Sustainable Pro-poor Tourism in Urban Area
Urban poverty persistently became major concern of urban development due to its consistency of growing (10.34% and 59.35% poor people live in urban area in the late 2016). By the fact of fast-growing urbanization rate, the imbalance of population growth in urban and rural area caused unequal portion of urban spatial development (the unbalanced growth theory) which critically can affect urban sustainability. Urban development is a complex set of technical and political process to manage infrastructure – as part of modernization process; administer equity through public welfare enhancement for the poor; and maintain sustainability of the environment – including water and air management, and land use. Conceptually, urban tourism is core part of urban development, it is simply because tourism sector adds more value to brand image of a city. However, the real challenge of urban tourism development is to improve the sustainability of pro-poor tourism in such a way that pro-poor tourism as part of pro-poor policy fundamentally supports welfare for the poor and protects the environment. Therefore, sustainable pro-poor tourism (particularly in urban area) means not only as tourism for the poor; it is also acknowledged to be the platform of urban development which combines pro-poor tourism and sustainable development – hereinafter known as sustainable pro-poor tourism based urban development.

Like many other industrial developments, sustainable pro-poor tourism based urban development needs strong political attempt supported by green constitution. In Indonesia, urban tourism is latterly growing fast and unique. Whereas pro-poor tourism has to face modernity and culture at the same time, it has (also) to ensure the environmental sustainability and enable ecofeminism. Simply, core value which comes closest to meeting the public welfare in urban pro-poor tourism is set of principles of sustainable development. Principally, tourism relates very closely to sustainability for formerly, tourism always identically recognised as something beautiful, historical, and unique. Somehow, socio-cultural based tourism, like pro-poor tourism, is now globally phenomenal. In 1992, sustainable development became known worldwide by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio Earth Summit). This has led to the wider perspective of development – a significant change in the direction of development which facilitates public participation and sustainability.

The development of the pro-poor tourism approach over those ten years is discussed and is differentiated from eco-tourism and community-based tourism [3]. Pro-poor tourism is broadly
congruent with such ideas; it places greater emphasis on how tourism can benefit the poor. While eco-tourism focuses on issues such how tourism damages nature, culture and the environment, the response of the local community and investment in tourism [1]. However, pro-poor tourism, eco-tourism and community-based tourism rely on community participation.

Despite the difference of pro-poor tourism and eco-tourism, both of those two types of tourism and (also) sustainable development were embedded into “Agenda 21”. This prevented negative repercussions in tourism and development which might cause disproportionality by upholding local, national and international partnership. This prevented negative repercussions in tourism and development which might cause disproportionality by upholding local, national and international partnership. Further explanation of pro-poor tourism and eco-tourism is described in the picture below (Figure 2), meanwhile, detailed analysis of sustainable pro-poor tourism explained in Table 1 below:

![Figure 2. Illustration of Sustainable Pro-poor Tourism Degree](source)

Source: Modified by writer (2017)

| Pro-poor Tourism DOES NOT | Pro-poor Tourism DOES | Sustainable Pro-poor Tourism DOES |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| anti-capitalist; separate from wider tourism systems; a theory or model; a niche type of tourism; specific method; only about the poor; just about hunger and no/ inadequate incomes; only about individual benefits; only for those occupying the “moral high ground”. | focus on incorporating the poor into capitalist markets by increasing job and entrepreneurial opportunities and collective benefits. Like fair trade, it is a form of market intervention, which relies heavily on the private sector; depend on existing tourism structures and markets; orientates research to the net benefits from tourism that can or could accrue to the poor; apply to any kind or type of tourism, including large and small-scale tourism, even if the non-poor also benefit. Can be from regional or national policies or private sector involvement; use numerous methods, none of which are specific to PPT, including value chain analysis, to collect data and show how the poor are and can be further involved in tourism; recognize that the non-poor may also benefit from tourism, even disproportionately. It is less concerned with the relative than the absolute (net) benefits received by the poor; have a broad definition of poverty, including lack of freedom, opportunity, power, skills, and education. It is about development; focus on community benefits; water, sanitation, health, education, infrastructure, (etc.); require wide stakeholder cooperation and commitment, including national and local authorities, planners, the private sectors, (etc.); ideally combining to ensure the poor benefit from tourism. | enforces the spirit of Ecocracry (the sovereignty of environment): putting ecology as a core part of governance system; proposes Ecofeminism; promotes local arts and cultures; applies the spirit of Green Economy; balances Economy, Eco-culture, and Empowerment (3E); introduces Poor Public |
Partnership and Poor Private Partnership (this indicates that poor people can help providing solution for themselves); redefines the meaning of tourism: a way to share life experience and build empathy; bridging social gaps.

Source: Modified and analyzed by writer (2017); adopted from [4]

4.2 Case Analysis: Pilot Projects in Jakarta (Jakarta Hidden Tour) and Malang, East Java (Kampong Warna-warni)

The model of sustainable pro-poor tourism as poverty reduction program needs to be profound and complex. In accordance with the analysis of Jakarta Hidden Tour and Kampong Warna-warni, there are three models of sustainable pro-poor tourism linked with different impacts for the poor:

Table 2. Analysis of Sustainable Pro-poor Tourism Models on Jakarta Hidden Tour and Kampong Warna-warni

| Direct impacts Model | Jakarta Hidden Tour: Food selling, wages for children who assist and amuse international tourist | Kampong Warna-warni: service (parking lot); Food selling |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Indirect impacts Model| Jakarta Hidden Tour: Tour guides; Translator; Transportation sector | Kampong Warna-warni: Transportation sector; Local souvenir shop |
| Dynamic impacts Model | Jakarta Hidden Tour: International tourism development (Trip-Advisor); International aid from group or individual volunteers. Note: Jakarta Hidden Tour puts poverty as tourism attraction, therefore, dynamic impact tends to lead to social-economic critics and discourses on development that finally insist local government to reevaluate development and pro-poor tourism strategies. Kampong Warna-warni: Environmental preservation (effectively reduced the activity of littering in the river up to 95%, more greenery, clean and healthy environment); International tourism development (Trip-Advisor-one of best tourism destinations promoted by local government); Local economic growth (tourism sector contributes 5.61% to local revenue - it possibly increase to 6-7% per year); Public Private Partnership (local government of Malang and Paint Company Decofresh); Community development (community arts group) |

The synergy of three models is hardly implemented for most of tourism studies have only emphasized on one model. Yet, the combination of three models might be very effective to mitigate poverty. As a means of sustainable pro-poor tourism, Jakarta Hidden Tour and Kampong Warna-warni need to uphold (firstly) micro strategy in the form of guidance, counseling, stress management, and crisis intervention in order to maximize direct impacts to the poor [5]. Consequently, a future development of Jakarta Hidden Tour and Kampong Warna-warni as pilot project of eco-cultural based Kampong Tour must adopt mezzo strategy with the enhancement of education and training to give more supports on tourism supply – including the advance of community based local economic development. Jakarta Hidden Tour and Kampong Warna-warni also must meet the higher level through macro strategy development which connects the poor to policy-making process and conflict management.

Research result revealed some factual information which is irrelevant with the principles of sustainable pro-poor tourism. Jakarta Hidden Tour might contribute economically, yet, there is no sustainable and tangible impacts perceived by the poor; moreover, governmental support for the program is very poor. Jakarta Hidden Tour meets obstacles to be developed as sustainable Kampong-Tour for there is no active role of community in pro-poor tourism development. However in Malang, Kampong Warna-warni has apparently shared benefits of urban modernity more to the poor. Major principles of sustainable pro-poor tourism are found to be actively implemented in Kampong Warna-warni, thus, a further development of eco-cultural based Kampong Tour can be easily practiced. The achievements of
sustainable pro-poor tourism elements on Jakarta Hidden Tour and Kampong Warni-warni are briefly explained in Table 3 (below) completed with forced field analysis to describe constraining and supporting factors in Table 4 (below).

Table 3. Applied Principles of Sustainable Pro-poor Tourism on Jakarta Hidden Tour and Kampong Warni-warni

| Sustainable Pro-poor Tourism                                                                 | Jakarta Hidden Tour | Kampong Warni-warni |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Enforces the spirit of Ecocracy (the sovereignty of environment): putting ecology as a core part of governance system | -                   | ✓ (good)             |
| Proposes Ecofeminism                                                                        | -                   | -                    |
| Promotes local arts and cultures                                                              | ✓ (very poor)       | ✓ (fair)             |
| Applies the spirit of Green Economy                                                             | ✓ (poor)            | ✓ (poor)             |
| Balances Economy, Eco, culture, and Empowerment (3E)                                          | ✓ (poor)            | ✓ (poor)             |
| Introduces Poor Public Partnership and Poor Private Partnership                               | ✓ (poor)            | ✓ (fair)             |
| Redefines the meaning of tourism: a way to share life experience and build empathy             | ✓ (good)            | ✓ (fair)             |
| Bridging social gaps                                                                         | ✓ (poor)            | ✓ (fair)             |

Table 4. Comparative Forced Field Analysis of Kampong-Tour Development

| Driving Forces      | Jakarta Hidden Tour | Kampong Warni-warni |
|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Uniqueness          | 2 (sufficient)      | Political Support    | 2 (sufficient)      |
| Marketing management| 3 (average)         | Access               | 3 (average)         |
| City stories        | 4 (significant)     | Private support      | 4 (significant)     |
| Private support     | 5 (most significant)| Ecocracy             | 5 (most significant)|
|                     |                     | Social capital       |                      |

| Restraining Forces  | Score               | Restraining Forces  | Score               |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Ecocracy            | 5 (most significant)| Knowledge management| 5 (most significant)|
| Political Support   | 4 (significant)     | Public facility     | 4 (significant)     |
| Public facility     | 3 (average)         | Marketing management| 3 (average)         |
| Social capital      | 2 (sufficient)      | Integrated empowerment system | 2 (sufficient) |

4.1. Scenario of Eco-cultural based Kampong Tour Development

The result of system thinking analysis concluded five subsystems of Kampong-Tour development system, which are (a) Government’s role, (b) Community Development, (c) Economic Development, (d) Public Private Partnership, (e) Quality of Environment. All subsystems are displayed in figures below.
As a means of sustainable pro-poor tourism strategy, eco-cultural based Kampong Tour development must be commercially realistic, although the private sector cannot be expected to prioritize poverty objective, it must be included in the process of developing pro-poor tourism[1]. Eco-cultural based Kampong Tour development is a concept of urban development in tourism sector which highlights Kampong as tourism site. The idea was inspired from rural development concept “One Village One Product” which thematically promotes local uniqueness. Eco-cultural based Kampong Tour development aims to channel urban modernity to the need of the poor by enhancing pro-poor tourism sector. In addition, by relying on the framework of sustainable development, the principles of ecology
and socio-culture are major to be prioritized in Kampong-Tour development. Detailed explanation of inputs and outputs of eco-cultural based Kampong Tour development are explained in Figure 3 (below).

![Figure 4. The Input-output Diagram](source: adapted from [10])

5. Conclusions
Sustainable pro-poor tourism requires the balance of economy, eco-culture, and empowerment (3E) to succeed pro-poor policy program. Sustainable pro-poor tourism considered to be one of effective strategies of pro-poor policy to bridge socio-economy disparity and maintain eco-cultural development in urban area. The analysis of system thinking concludes that sustainable pro-poor tourism may combine community based tourism and eco-tourism. Practically, Kampong Warna-warni is recognized to be more sustainable than Jakarta Hidden Tour. The best supporting factors are social capital and Ecocracy. Direct impacts of Jakarta Hidden Tour are (still) very limited to simple education assistance for children; however Kampong Warna-warni has successfully developed significant benefits on economy and ecology. Research recommendation highlights the enhancement of Good Local Governance and Public Private Partnership in Kampong-Tour development to reinvent sustainable local tourism through community owned business development and Kampong-tour festival. Last, the most important thing in sustainable pro-poor tourism is institutional sustainability which determines the favor of pro-poor policy and urban development future.
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