



# **Challenges of the Social Forestry Program in Indonesia and the Roles of CSOs**

**Edi Purwanto (Editor)**

# Challenges of the Social Forestry Program in Indonesia and the Roles of CSOs

Edi Purwanto (Editor)

Workshop Proceeding  
"Strengthening Strategy on the Social Forestry and the Roles of CSOs"  
The Sahira Hotel, Bogor, Indonesia  
22-23 October 2015

Tropenbos Indonesia

Copyright: Tropenbos Indonesia, 2017  
All rights reserved

Published by: Tropenbos Indonesia, Bogor, Indonesia

Citation: Purwanto, E. (ed), 2017. Challenges of the Social Forestry Program in Indonesia and the Roles of CSOs. Workshop proceeding "Strengthening Strategy on the Social Forestry and the Roles of CSOs", Bogor, 22-23 October 2015. Bogor, Indonesia: Tropenbos Indonesia.

Editor: Dr. Edi Purwanto  
Natural resources management analyst and Director of Tropenbos Indonesia

Design & Layout: La Ode M. Erwin

First Edition: July, 2017

ISBN: 978-602-61993-0-0

Photos: Irpan (cover, page. x, 24), Tropenbos Indonesia (page. 42)

Printed by: Debut Press, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Available from: Tropenbos Indonesia  
Taman Cimanggu  
Jl. Akasia Raya Blok P6 / 23 RT03/RW05,  
Kedung Waringin, Tanah Sareal, Bogor, 16163  
Phn: +62 251 8316156  
Fax: +62 251 8316157  
E-mail: [edipurwanto@tropenbos-indonesia.org](mailto:edipurwanto@tropenbos-indonesia.org)  
Web site: [www.tropenbos.org](http://www.tropenbos.org)

Making knowledge work for forests and people

Tropenbos Indonesia  
Bogor, 2017



## Editor's Note



**P**resident Joko Widodo's policy to allocate 12.7 million ha of land for the Social Forestry Program (SF) until 2019 has spurred the excitement of CSOs working in SF. Tropenbos International Indonesia Programme (now Tropenbos Indonesia), tried to present and document this momentum by organizing a workshop titled "Strategy for Strengthening Social Forestry and the Roles of CSOs" at The Sahira Hotel, Bogor on 22 and 23 October 2015.

The target can be said to be very big (compared to the previous achievement) and raises new questions to answer. Can these slow-moving "vehicles" be forced to speed up to reach the new target? Which spare-parts should be repaired or replaced? Is the provided fuel enough? What is the capacity of the drivers and their assistants?

On the other hand, the commitment of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) to simplify license which previously long, complicated and difficult to undertake by community groups has resulted in a new enabling condition to pave the way of SF vehicle to achieve the target area and number of beneficiaries.

The workshop attempts to answer questions and hot issues that have implications for policy restructuring, a simpler and quicker land preparation procedure and, more importantly, how development strategy of sustainable livelihood for community groups who hold permits to not transfer their rights to free riders group. Furthermore, how the role and readiness of CSOs are as the key government partners in anticipating sharp soaring target area.

As predicted the discussion topic attracted participation of senior activists who have long been active in both SF concept and implementation levels, such as Hery Santoso (Javlec), Hasbi Berliani, Suwito (Partnership/Kemitraan), Rudi Syaf (WARSI), Muayyat Ali Muhsi (KpSHK), Mirza Indra (AMAN), La Ode Ifrisal (FKKM), etc. A number of senior researchers such as Fauzi Mas'ud and Ngaloken Ginting (Forest Research and

Development, MoEF), Agus Mulyana and Ani Nawir (CIFOR). Donor representatives: Tony Djogo (USAID), Lili Hasanuddin (TAF) and Azis Khan (World Bank). And international NGOs: Rizal Bukhari (TNC), Sugeng Raharjo (FFI) and Hasbie Hasbilah (TFF). No less appreciated is the special attention given by the Director of Social Forestry Area Preparation, Wiratno (now Director General of Natural Resource and Ecosystem, MoEF), along with core staff who attended the event up to the end.

Apart from presenting the key conclusions of the workshop, the proceeding also includes interviews with SF activists as well as interview with WARSI as an experienced institution working in SF and has succeeded in developing best practices. While other issues rising from the discussion groups were excerpted in several separate articles, context of the workshop results and the latest issues have been knitted by Pak Wiratno in Foreword.

Our deep gratitude goes to the IUCN of the Netherlands for additional funding in organizing workshop that enabled representatives of the “Ecosystem Alliance” (WALHI, WARSI, NTFP-EP Indonesia, Pundi Sumatra, Akar, GARSi and Ulayat) to participate in the workshop.

Edi Purwanto  
Director of Tropenbos Indonesia



# Preface



The issuance of social forestry program in RPJMN 2010-2014 with a target area of 2.5 million ha followed by another 12.7 million ha or 10% of state forest area in RPJMN 2015-2019 shows the government's big political commitment to provide management space to the community especially those who live in nearby forest area. However, challenges at implementation level for this program are no less burdensome and complex. Whatsoever, opportunities widely open to various parties, either to district or provincial government, CSO, and private sector to support and participate to succeed the program.

Former experiences show that the program for surrounding community forests should not only limited to issuing permit or management right, in the form of social forestry, village forest, community plantation forest, forest partnership and conservation partnership, but also ensuring assistance process before and after giving the license permit/management right. In this context, social forestry program should cover the upstream to downstream process. Without holistic mentoring process, it will be difficult to achieve the benefit impact of social, economic and sustainability of the forest area. Strengthening institution, which will be positive to ensure stronger area governance, and the increasing capacity and capability of license or management right holder group will promote forest area management model that balance various interests between social, economic, and preservation of forest and environment.

In such the scope, a multi-stakeholders workshop initiative that reviewed the roles of government, CSO, and other parties in supporting social forestry program as initiated by Tropenbos International Indonesia on 22-23 October 2015 has been very important, relevant, and gaining its momentum. Constructive suggestions to Indicative Maps of Social Forestry Area or PIAPS are well understood especially on the importance to conduct field ground check to make sure that PIAPS have some spaces for revision, observation, and review based on high variety of factual conditions at field level. Condition of vegetation cover in PIAPS based on high resolution imagery

checking (in 11.4 million ha of PIAPS area) that leaves only 10% of primary forest indirectly shows that social forestry program implementation at field level will have to face more complex facts. Once more, ensuring community's typology such as what types of poor villages' typology that deserves to receive management access in PIAPS becomes crucial and urgent. The goal is for the program to reach the right target as directed by President Joko Widodo, i.e. poor people, have only small land or no land, and those who have been for long completely depend on various forms of forest resources.

Results of the workshop also mentioned some criticism to the role of CSO with all of its limited capacity in supporting and guarding this program since 2010, need to discuss further to solve the problem in the future. It includes the importance to map the roles of social forestry partners. Directorate of Social Forestry Preparation conducted a workshop entitled "Investment Mapping of Social Forestry Partners" in Safari Garden Hotel on 22-24 November 2016, which was attended by most of Social Forestry partners from all over Indonesia. Result of the workshop initiated by Tropenbos International Indonesia in collaboration with IUCN National Committee of the Netherlands combined with conclusion result of the Safari Garden workshop will be very valuable. In general, some concentration of investment to support social forestry is indeed found in several provinces or districts. However, empty support is also found in many provinces especially in East Indonesia. The initial finding can be used for further review to spur more integrated and proportionate investments.

Future challenge is how result conclusions of the various workshops, including the conclusion of the National Workshop Community-based Management: "Strengthening Strategy of Social Forestry and the Role of CSO" organized by Tropenbos become revision material for various ongoing policy and strategy. The issuance of Ministerial Decree of Life Environment and Forestry No. 83 year 2016, along with several regulations of Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environment Partnership (PSKL), which are openly done and involving many CSOs, hopefully have responded the various inputs.

The success of social forestry program is determined by how effective the collective performance of multi-stakeholders (government, provincial government, district government, CSO, and private) done consistently and persistently. The collective work is to answer internal problem within the government such as change of bureaucracy culture, limited funding, human resources, Technical Management Unit (UPT) PSKL which is limited to regional level, so that strengthening the speed up of social forestry working group in every province is in scale of priority, the role of FMU (KPH) at grass root level, counseling strategy, sustainability of Young Professional Forester programme (Bakti Rimbawan), thematic KKN, and support of activists and champions at grass root level as determiner factor of success for the program.

Meanwhile, limitation of CSO also relates to funding which depends much on donor, and limited scope of assistance. Therefore, social forestry program with such big target needs political budget support manifested in Government's Work Plan, integrated support from cross-ministries, cross-echelon 1 Ministry of Environment and Forestry, as well as other parties in an integrated and consistent way. Since

the very start, developing Collaborative Agenda on management cycle (planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation) becomes important precondition to build mutual respect, mutual trust, and mutual benefit among parties. At least “5K” principles, i.e. pioneering, aligning, awareness, consistency, and strong leadership with integrity are required for the program to be successful. The five principles should become the foundation and mental attitude of the stakeholders.

Result of the workshop should be followed up in the form of concrete action practice in field. Consistent and persistent mentoring, by eliminating community’s dependency to the mentor, continuous monitoring and evaluation, and learning process documentation, will become important series to succeed the program. Various result of review and research have proven to us that many small scale success have been achieved and reasons of unsuccessful efforts have been identified. It is hoped that the small scale success can be lifted and replicated in other places with various adjustment. The success of government’s political support such as in West Sumatra and East Kalimantan provinces can inspire other provinces, such as stronger support in Jambi, West Kalimantan, Central Sulawesi, and South Sulawesi.

Social Forestry can hopefully be enabling condition for the decentralization process of forest natural resources management at provincial level involving multi-stakeholders. Social Forestry is supposed able to proof itself as a specific Indonesian characteristic for forest management model: more human, just, able to strengthen democratization process and community’s togetherness, providing benefit which is balance and proportionate between economic, ecological, and social-cultural needs.

W i r a t n o

Director of Social Forestry Area  
Preparation





# Table of Content

Editor's note	iii
Preface	v
Chapter 1. Workshop recommendations	1
A. Problems identification on policy and enforcement strategy	1
B. Preparation of "clean and clear" SF area	3
C. Problems identification on community facilitation to build sustainable livelihood	4
D. The strengths and weaknesses of CSO	6
E. Roles of CSO	7
Chapter 2. Questioning 12.7 million ha target and roles of CSOs: interview with key SF's Facilitators	10
Chapter 3. Strategy on Social Forestry facilitations	15
Appendixes A. Highlight issues	23
- Social Forestry in Indonesia	25
- Conflicting land tenure	28
- CSOs: from challenges to consolidation	31
Appendixes B. Terms of reference	34
Appendixes C. List of participants	40
Appendixes D. Photo documentation	42
About Tropenbos Indonesia	43





# Chapter 1.

## Workshop Recommendations

### A. Problems identification on policy and enforcement strategy

1. **S**ocial Forestry (SF) Program relates to poverty alleviation of 6.8 million people living in and surrounding forest, relates to effort to reduce carbon emission and adaptation to climate change<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, mainstreaming SF Program and its strategy to redistribute forest area in the right manner need the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders (and sectors) of various categories, including private industries, research/education, CSOs etc. at central and regional level. The implication, SF Program should become a national agenda and not a sectoral program.
2. So far, the program is still “isolated” within the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF), in which the only key driver is the Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership (DG-SFEP). The DG is facing big obstacles both internally (within MoEF) and externally (inter ministerial level/ between ministries). So far, the idea and ways of expanding access of land to local and indigenous people have not yet been solid at the government level, at the centre and regional level.
3. Considering the above, the program needs wider and stronger law and political support as enabling power to consolidate views, commitments, and rapid programmatic multi-sectors and multi-stakeholder resources and power movements in central and regional level simultaneously. The ambitious program should be enforced by Presidential Decree or Presidential Instruction.
4. Considering the beneficiary target of SF program is powerless community, mainstreaming SF needs strong bureaucratic working culture changes, from massive and instructive into proactive and massive facilitations, from regulative into empowering approaches. The program needs bureaucracy reform to such an extent that bureaucracy will not be insulated rigidly in cramped rooms, but able to move and synergize quickly with various spectrum of development agents in central and regional level.

---

<sup>1</sup> Indonesia planned to reduce carbon emission by 29% from BAU by 2030 including from social forestry program (INDC, 2015)

5. With the past 8 years achievement (since 2007) was only 318,000 ha and best practices at hands are limited, the giant target area of 12.7 million ha in a relatively short period (4 years) program needs policy and bureaucracy reforms as well as rational funding supports aligned with the setting target.
6. Based on rough calculation using the budgeting standard of MoEF at least a half trillion rupiah per year of budgeting support will be needed.
7. Until today, ongoing efforts to reform policy are conducted through revisions of Ministerial Decree on Community Forestry (HKm), Village Forest (HD), and Community Plantation Forest (HTR), which are intended to short-cut the existing long permit procedures, while also opening opportunities for proactive (unilateral) determination by Central Government (if regional government is considered too slow to response community's permit proposals). This implicates to the revision of Government Regulation No. 6/2007 on Forestry Planning as the regulation umbrella of the ongoing revised Ministerial Regulations. Unfortunately, so far the afformentioned Government Regulation and Ministerial decrees have not yet been completed. This led to the uncertainty of SF program implementation, while the setting target for year 2016 is 2.5 million ha.
8. Considering the above, the key enabling conditions to accelerate SF program which guarantee optimum output and outcome (sustainable forest and prosperous community) can be done through:
  - a. Accelerating the completion of Government Regulation on Forest Planning and the associated Ministerial Decree on Community Forestry (HKm), Village Forest (HD), and Community Plantation Forest (HTR).
  - b. Developing sinergized programs with other ministries, especially Ministry of Village, Disadvantage Regions and Transmigration, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Cooperatives and Small Medium Enterprises;
  - c. Building support and commitment from the provincial government, especially to drive and facilitate the work of Multi-stakeholder Working Group on Social Forestry Acceleration and Conflict Resolution (P2SPK). The support and commitments shown by West Sumatra Provincial Government should be possible to replicate in the 32 other provinces;
  - d. Building a sinergetic program among Directorate Generals (Echelon 1) and Directorates (Echelon 2) within MoEF, either to design a forest estate or to utilize resources to strengthen community in the field by optimizing the roles of MoEF technical implementing units (UPT) at regional level, such as Regional Centre for Watershed Management (BPDAS), Regional Centre for Forest Gazetting (BPKH), Regional Centre for Controlling and Managing Production Forest (BP2HP) and Regional Centre for Education and Training (BDK) and Regional Center for Forestry Extension.
  - e. Building partnerships with the private sector and related development agents in the regional level, and it may be useful to decentralize SF permits to provincial level. Based on past experience, the governor frequently refused or



took a long time to issue permits for Village Forest, therefore the governor's authority in giving permit should be limited to a certain period before it is taken over by the central government.

- f. Expanding the capital support provided by the Agency on Capital Support for Small Scale Forestry Enterprises (BLU, MoEF), which now only support Community Plantation Forest (HTR), to cover other types of Social Forestry, either state (HKm, HD, HTR, HK/Partnership Forest, HA/Customary Forest) and non-state program (People Forest, Hutan rakyat), .
- g. Achieving the giant target (12.7 million ha) of the social forestry state program, the government should establish a new and massive strategy to ensure the delivery of intensive facilitation and technical assistances to the beneficiaries at grass-root level; it is similar to the "BIMAS" program for self-sufficient rice production during the new order era. The giant target can only be achieved by developing community facilitation through structural, strategic and systematic program.

## B. Preparation of "clean and clear" SF area

1. DG SFEP with data from the Customary Areas Registration Agency (BRWA)/ the Alliance of Indigenous Peoples (AMAN), the Participatory Mapping Working Network (JKPP) and Consortium for Community Forestry (KpSHK) have started to develop a map on Social Forestry Indicative Area (PIASP) to be used as a reference for the permits' application of SF State Program, i.e. HKm, HTR, HD, HK, and HA. The PIASP map version dated 22 October 2015 conveys 12,739,224 ha including the areas with free-permits state production forest (4,545,797 ha), proposed customary forest area as registered by BRWA/AMAN (3,921,841 ha), prospective areas of SF resulted from JKPP (595,659 ha), proposed SF areas as registered by KpSHK (1,607,877 ha), excluded Land Allocated for Agrarian Reform/TORA in South Kalimantan, West Nusa Tenggara, Lampung and Bali Provinces (197,310 ha) and including ongoing SF permit process, as facilitated by BPDAS (1,870,740 ha).
2. PIASP comprises free-permit (non-encumbered) state forest area (production forest, watershed protection forest/hutan lindung and conservation forest). There are two weaknesses PIASP, first, a lack of accuracy in mapped area, as the basic data derived from various sources and different periods in time. Second, it does not depict the land cover/use status (forested or not, used by local community or not) and the terrain condition, whether the area is located on top of the hill or in a valley, slope steepness etc, which are key to establish how suitable and workable the area is to be managed by local and indigenous communities.
3. In many cases, there are forest areas which de jure still restricted by permits but the concession holders are no longer active. Those areas are potential to become SF after the land tenure conflict is resolved. On the other hand, there are non-encumbered permit area but de facto have been acquired and managed by local community as agriculture and plantation areas. Therefore,



the PIASP map needs to be completed by the present conflict/source of conflict map and land tenure map. The information provided by the map will be needed as guidance in conflict resolution.

4. Based on the above, PIASP map could at least differentiate two areas: a free licensed area which has big potential to be directly defined as SF areas and second, the existing encumbered permit area, whether the license holders are still active or not and where conflict resolution assistance is required.
5. PIASP map should also be complemented with the existing Land Tenure maps, either TORA or KPH (Forest Management Unit) and the map produced by land inventarization, tenure, ownership, use and utilization working group led by the Agrarian Ministry.
6. To guarantee that the SF Program will achieve the right target, PIASP map needs to consider the spatial distribution of poor villages inside and outside state forest area.
7. From the above, it is clear that conflict resolution over land tenure is not simple due to the existing multi-layer tenures at the government and community level. Therefore, key prerequisites of SF area preparation and land conflict resolution can be conducted through: (a) Enriching the existing PIASP map with other relevant information; (b) Strengthening capacity and authorities of Multi-stakeholders Working Group on Social Forestry Acceleration and Conflict Resolution (P2SPK); (c) Strengthening synergy with Directorate General of Planology and Environmental Governance (MoEF) to formulate the model of collaborative management with KPH<sup>2</sup>.

## C. Problems identification in strengthening community to build sustainable livelihood

1. SF Program needs to give a clear description for the beneficiaries on the financial/economic potential of the business model developed (HKM, HTR, HD). If the only focus is land acquisition through SF, without considering the benefits for the program's beneficiary, there is a huge risk that the land will be abandoned or transferred to other stakeholders.
2. Various government policies related to market development which are potential obstacles for the development of sustainable livelihoods are: (a) determination of the prime commodities that should be produced by the central government; HKM experience shows that the government has determined the types of prime commodity but unfortunately, the prime commodity has uniformity in characteristic and its determination is not based on scientific research which considers land suitability aspect, market need, etc. (b) The policy regarding the use of wood products is not clear. According to the policy, wood products from concession areas that are not used (sold?) by the concession holders themselves cannot be used by local communities. (c) Administering management of forest products is ego-sectoral, for example, in the case of rattan as long as it is still

<sup>2</sup> In terms of the use and allocation of state forest land SF has potential conflict with the existing KPH.

in the production area (upstream), the MoEF is responsible, but the processing of harvested products (downstream) falls under the Ministry of Industry. Product retribution policy of Non-Timber Forest Products is also unclear, for example rattan of various qualities has the same price. (d) the policy is not yet pro people; farmers who harvest timber from HTR must pay forest resource provision fees to the local forestry agency, while community timbers in the local market has to compete with cheap timber from illegal loggers.

3. Market continuity: in many cases, community produce limited volume of product with poor continuity, while the market needs continuous supply on certain level of volume.
4. Limited government budget: budget of the forestry sector is very low compared to other sector therefore it is difficult to achieve a real change. On the other hand, farmers face difficulties to grow their business on forestry products due to limited capital. Bank loans to add capital is not easy as forest plantations cannot be calculated as an asset, which is contradictory to businesses outside the forestry sector such as agriculture and livestock which easily get loans from the bank. The difficulty in capital access from bank loan makes them turn to loan sharks.
5. Working cultures that are not synchronized between three actors: (a) communities with producer mentality, (b) CSO positioning itself in an entrepreneurship regime, and (c) government in a license regime. Usually the community still has the culture of farmer, tiller, or gatherer. They are requested to make work plans when they face the license regime. They are not used to work according to a plan; they do not know market need standards, cash flow, and network development. The low capacity of the community has caused the management system (for example HKm, HD) to depend on the role of their facilitators, and the time provided for the facilitators to capacitate community is limited.
6. The low price of products produced by the community is rooted from: (a) low quality of the product; unavailability of wood industry and or (b) low capability to export; export quality commodity must be certified, which implies a certain knowledge and extra costs.
7. The number of staff to handle forestry affairs in the central government is very limited. MoEF should decentralize their work at provincial level by enhancing the roles of their UPT.
8. SF Program has to become a minor programme. On the other hand, the government has no grass-root facilitation culture; most of the government affairs are completed on the table, whereas livelihood development needs an intensive and long term facilitation.
9. Taking the above into account, several strategies are needed:
  - a. In order to develop the right type of prime commodity, an initial analysis on land suitability and market needs should be done. Additionally, a review to evaluate SF contribution to environment, economy, climate, food and water.

- b. As long as the community has no capability to provide continuous products in accordance to the market demands, the role is tackled by middle-man. In the future, communities are able to provide their products continuously following the markets needs. Therefore, collective market which has been standardized needs to be developed. In order to satisfy the market, communities should be encouraged to produce large volumes of their products. Two approaches that are needed to define the commodity price are: (a) improvement of product quality through the availability of community's wood industry, or (b) export, communities have access facilitation and funding to certify their products.
- c. To overcome the limited budget of the government, third parties should be involved through partnerships with the private sector; company's CSR or by strengthening community's saving.
- d. To reduce the community's dependency on government facilitators, a solid partnership needs to be established between government, CSO and private sector.
- e. Government should promote SF as the prime program which is entitled to receive big resources and supports.

## D. The strengths and weaknesses of CSO

The strengths of CSO: (a) have a strong network at national and regional levels so that the flow of information, communication can be effective; (b) no bureaucracy, have flexibility in management of activities, mentoring approach, and budget accountability; (c) usually have good basic field data; (d) able to provide intensive community facilitation on the ground.

The weaknesses of CSO: (a) its activity often driven by the policy of the donor institution which implicates to the high fluctuation of funding resources; (b) most of funding resources are for short-term period (2 years); (c) CSO usually bring specific political interests; (d) have variety in capacity and usually do not have the capacity to manage big amounts of funds; (e) CSO usually has low capacity in sustainable livelihood facilitation; (f) uneven distribution of CSO in terms of quality and quantity all over Indonesia; (g) not many CSOs succeed to encourage community to be independent; (h) local CSOs which have a good relationship with regional government, private sector and MoEF are limited; (i) facilitation coverage of CSO are mostly limited in areas, they only facilitate several villages.

There is an urgent need to understand the limited capacities of CSO to support the implementation of SF program, a national movement that involves various actors. A "Movement on Community Empowerment in Social Forestry" from the New graduates should be mobilized (with special incentives) as community facilitators, from the forestry education either vocational (5 Forestry high schools/SKMA) or graduate program (55 Faculties of Forestry) in the country. Students should be stimulated to support beneficiaries target of SF during field work program. It is ideal if each Faculty of Forestry could develop "living lab" of "learning lab" on SF facilitations, from defining areas for SF, obtaining permits to building sustainable livelihoods.

## E. Roles of CSO

Considering the above, some ideas that CSO could act as a backbone of SF program is an over-expectation. However the role CSO can play is really important, especially as a pressure group, for example in the fight for the issuance of a Presidential Decree or as an initiator to develop and promote best practices on SF facilitation and technical assistances. The general role of CSO is more strategic than practical, i.e. as think-tank, facilitator, lobby and advocacy, facilitates relations between center and region. For the practical side, MoEF can assign forestry extension workers and other forestry officials implementing unbe at regional level (UPT) to do the jobs.

To strengthen CSO roles to support SF program, they have to work together to combine and learn from each other strengths, issues, agenda and approaches. The workshop forum assigned Kemitraan, KpSHK, AMAN and Tropenbos International Indonesia Program to act as facilitator on CSO consolidation to support SF program.

Based on the problem identification of the actual SF program, the roles, strategies and capacity needs of CSOs have been identified as shown in table 1.

Table 1. CSO roles, strategies and capacity needs

No	Roles of CSO	Strategy	Capacity needs
A. Policy Enforcement			
1.	Promote SF Program to be in the national political agenda	Intensive approach to Presidential Staff Office	CSO consolidation at central and regional levels, trainings on communication, lobby and advocacy.
2.	Accelerate the revision of the Ministerial Decree on HKm, HD and HTR	Lobbying and approaching MoEF's Law Bureau and Secretary General	
3.	Encourage the revision of Government Regulation No. 6/20076.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build alliance with KPK<sup>3</sup>, GNSFDA and DKN</li> <li>• Lobbying and approaching Cabinet Secretariat Office</li> </ul>	
4.	Build a synergy program with related ministries, especially Ministry of Village, Disadvantage Regions and Transmigration, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Cooperatives and Small Medium Enterprises	Driving multi-stakeholders forums at national level/Social Forestry Forum of the Archipelago (Forum Pesona).	Consolidation of CSO at central and regional levels, trainings on communication, lobby and advocacy.

<sup>3</sup> KPK: Corruption Eradication Commission, GNSFDA: National Movement on Natural Resources Management (a movement initiated by KPK); DKN: Indonesian Forestry Council.

No	Roles of CSO	Strategy	Capacity needs
5.	Support and build commitments with provincial government to strengthen CSOs	Stimulate provincial government to support P2SPK Working Group. Stimulate provincial government to allocate budget for SF facilitation	Consolidation of CSO at central and regional levels, trainings on communication, lobby and advocacy.
6.	Build partnerships with the private sector and relevant development agents.	Promote social forestry program to private sector and other development agents	
B. Prepare clean and clear SF Area			
1.	Refining PIASP map to be a guideline which can be implemented in field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Facilitate PIAPS consultation with various stakeholders at provincial and district levels.</li><li>• Enrich information of the existing PIAPS map</li></ul>	Consolidation of CSO at central and regional levels, trainings on communication, lobby and advocacy.
2.	Strengthening capacity of the P2SPK Working Group	Ensuring the membership of P2SPK in terms of representation, commitment and competence..	
3.	Strengthen the relationship between DG PSEP and DG Planology and Environmental Governance	Facilitate dialogue between DG Planology and DG PSEP.	
C. Developing sustainable livelihoods			
1.	Strengthen the economic institution of communities and synergize local government power (policy, fund) to develop sustainable livelihood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strengthen local institutions and build independent communities group.</li><li>• Mainstream SF program to potential local stakeholders to support SF program.</li><li>• CSO act as an intermediary agent linking SF beneficiaries with other local development agents.</li></ul>	Training on institutional strengthening of the communities' economy
2.	Build market network of SF products at supra village level. .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Establish forest farmer association at village to (sub)district level</li><li>• Select and strengthen local champions</li><li>• Reviving and maintaining farmers' network.</li></ul>	Training on building and maintaining market network
3.	Establish and maintain multi-stakeholders forum in building SF market products.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify existing forums that have a potential to support the SF program. Renew the information available.</li><li>• Mainstream SF program to the existing active forums.</li><li>• Raise multi-stakeholders forum to build collective-marketing of SF products.</li></ul>	Training on product marketing strategy
4.	Conduct research on key potential SF commodities	Collaborate with research institution or university to conduct research	Training on research methodology

No	Roles of CSO	Strategy	Capacity needs
5.	Conduct research on SF roles in regional economic development, biodiversity preservation and carbon emission reduction.		
6.	Promoting SF Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Publishing SF program through various media</li><li>• Promote SF smart practices</li></ul>	Training on communication strategy and production of various communication and awareness media





## Chapter 2.

# Questioning 12.7 million ha Target and Roles of CSOs

- Interviews with Key SF's Facilitators

*The government has targeted 12.7 million ha for Social Forestry (SF). What's the major problem to achieve that?*

Herry Santoso:

There are two major problems. At the policy level I saw that the policy has not been able to consolidate all potential of existing strengths and resources. Why? It is because the policy is still sectorial, only in the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK), whereas the foundation resources of social forestry is multi-sectorial. Therefore, in my opinion, more powerful policy is required, for example Presidential Decree (*Keppres*) or Presidential Instruction (*Inpres*). Therefore, the resources at local and central levels and between sectors can be consolidated. Second, the management governance tends to be passive, while pro-active governance arrangement is required for community empowerment such as social forestry. Both obstacles I think become our challenges to solve if we want to achieve the 12.7 ha.

Hasbie Berliani (Kemitraan):

Asked about the obstacle, indeed this time although it has been trying to simplify procedure, the determination process of permit area is still long in its implementation. Therefore, the policy to speed up and expand should be done by stronger regulation to support the acceleration. Coordination between central and local is also weak, because if we ask the local government, either the Governor or the Regent, about the 12.7 million ha, no one has the information. Maybe I can only mention that only West Sumatra has it, but what about the other 32 provinces? That's one of the obstacles because the 12.7 million ha is only targeted by the central government, but not the local government. Third, is about funding which is still far from the need that should be provided.

### Jusupta Tarigan:

At one side, with the target of 12.7 million ha, the CSOs consider this as something that we should greet festively. It means there is a shifted paradigm in KLHK that the former 2.5 million ha has increased to 12.7 million ha. This should be appreciated. The problem is about the location of the 12.7 million ha. Indeed there are several initiatives done by the government, CSO, and several other initiatives. But so far, many are overlapped. Many people have managed several areas. It should be cleared from the start, so that the several initiatives can be in line with the government initiation.

### *What strategy should be done in the future to strengthen SF?*

### Herry Santoso:

First, I think there should be support from many stakeholders especially CSOs to assure KLHK that the SF program is a big program related to national defense because it is also related to alleviating poverty of 6.8 million poor people living in surrounding forest; it is also related to reducing emission. So, this program is related to the nation's fate. Therefore, encouragement should come from various stakeholders to raise the issue of SF as a national movement, no longer as a program or a forestry project.

### Hasbie Berliani (Kemitraan):

With 12.7 million ha to achieve in 5 years there should be changes in strategy, program, and funding. I think it has been encouraged in the regulation by the CSOs to make a regulation that has stronger position in this case *Perpres* or *Inpres*. *Inpres* has actually been approved by KLHK although the procedure is in the process to prepare the draft and submitted to the President. I think that's important so that the higher regulation can become the umbrella to support SF for various parties including local government and related ministries. So, the regulation needs to be strengthened. Second is how to realize this to become local government target. There should be a more intensive coordination between central government and local government. Third is about funding. I think the funding is still far from what is needed. If it is a priority program, KLHK needs to allocate adequate funding to SF.

### Muh. Djauhari (KpSHK):

From the policy side, the government should make it easier for the proposal procedure of SF from the community. So far the procedure involves 16 tables that should be passed by the ministry. The procedure must be easier, shorter, and verified soon. Second, ensuring area is important. The government seems not serious so far, where is the 12.7 million ha. The area has to be clear.

### Jusupta Tarigan:

I think the urgent thing is how to validate all information data collected by CSOs and the government, so those can be overlapping to see where area can still be allocated for SF to meet the target.

## *How is the role of CSO in strengthening SF?*

Herry Santoso :

CSO should be put as strategic dynamist to upscale policy level to more powerful policy equal to the level of Keppres, for example to support governance arrangement to be more decentralized, to support this to become national movement program. So, the CSO can be the pioneer to develop championship, example, done everywhere. But when CSO is meant as manpower ready to support the 12.7 million ha, I disagree, CSO is not able to do that, the number of CSO is very limited for that. So, I think it is only needed in strategic area, not in practical area. In practical area there are many counselors, many other human resources such as fresh graduate from Faculty of Forestry, or students who are now in internship to facilitate the development of SF in the regions. So, CSO as the pioneer realizing championship has been done in the last 5-10 years and in the future if we want to support the bigger movement the CSO should only play strategic role instead of technical role.

Hasbie Berliani (Kemitraan):

I think CSO can play its role in all aspects. Especially to aspects of how to develop more conducive regulation, then to facilitate collaboration between central government and local government, help the organization of community to be ready to manage SF. Those are the roles of CSO that have been done so far.

Muh. Djauhari (KpSHK):

The role of CSO is more on how to strengthen, give input to the government, because the government is not serious in allocating SF. So, it is still in debate in KLHK, where the 12.7 million ha is to be given to the community. Thus, the role of CSO is to provide the right data and information to the government, and at the same time to give pressure in case the 12.7 million ha is only a fake promise of KLHK.

Jusupta Tarigan:

I think the role of CSO is on how it can work in collaboration with the government especially in assisting community which will manage SF later on. The assistance should be continuous and intensive, not in short term because to achieve a stable effort longer time will be needed. The other role is consolidation of CSO because not all CSO is good in business. Some is good in advocacy, some others in lobby. We have to map these first, so that their role and capabilities can be identified.

Rudi Syaf (WARSI):

The position of CSO is as facilitator. Many people might have been interacting with forest and managing it well, but do not understand this scheme. Here is the function of CSSO to facilitate this to rise to the government. We know that the number of CSO here is not as many as for a big country like Indonesia. We had strategy with KLHK last time to test this by involving students. The students entered villages; facilitated, helped

the process of drafting proposal and the proposal can be improved significantly. In WARSI's experience in the last 3 years, 26 SF in this case Village Forest, Nagari Forest, community Forest can be facilitated. Those are in 3 years. But when we were with the students, only in six months the proposal can be submitted, already 14 proposals in 6 months. It means the CSO should have extended hands to facilitate the process in the community.

### *What are the strengths and the weaknesses of CSO?*

Herry Santoso:

First, sustainability, the sustainability of CSO is in question mark. CSO can work, whatsoever, because of donor support. The major strength of CSO is network. The network of CSOs is very strong at national or local level, so that communication of information flow can be very fast. Next strength is flexibility. That's not had by the bureaucrat. The bureaucrat may have good network but weak flexibility. Third, I think is the mastery of data. It has to be admitted that CSO is better in field data mastery at present compared to bureaucrat. With the fast development of digital and communication technology that can be accessed by everybody, the capability of CSO to consolidate data and information is better.

### *What efforts need to be done to strengthen the roles of CSO at this moment?*

Herry Santoso:

First, CSO has a tendency to be bias in politic depends on each CSO's interest. Some CSOs work in facilitation aspect, some CSOs put stress on advocacy, and other CSOs give more stress on political issues. If they are not careful, they can be fragmented. Therefore, consolidation among CSOs is important although it has big challenge. Without consolidation, I think CSO can be fragmented to group's interests, political interests, technical interests, etc.

Jusupta Tarigan:

In general the first capacity is lobby. The capability of lobby means doing solid engagement and in long term with the government and various parties is important. Second, capability of CSO to establish entrepreneurship based on forestry. That's still very minor to find for now.

Rudi Syaf (WARSI):

First, resources, that's the most important thing. Facilitator should understand on issues, meaning capacity building must be done internally. Facilitator number is also important because it is about direct facilitation, cannot hit and run. If we come only for two days, then go, if you made proposal, it's never been done. But for the

number, we make strategy by involving third party, for instance, college students. And at the meantime, we also involve community organization at the villages. But all need improvement of resources, improvement of capacity, support for mobilization, etc.

*How optimistic the 12.7 million ha program can be achieved in the next 4 years?*

**Herry Santoso:**

Honestly, I have a mix feeling. At one side I am happy because the 12.7 million is a significant number, relatively big and it has become what CSOs want since a long time ago, since decades so that the forest will be managed by the community in significant portion, not in small portions. And now when the government determined 12.7 million I think we have to give big appreciation to the goodwill, to the government's political will. I said I have a mix feeling because to achieve the 12.7 million, I think I know exactly with all CSOs partners we have been working that it is not an easy work to achieve that. It will need policy reformation, bureaucracy reformation, and the most important thing is very strong political funding. The three are not impossible to do, but if that's not done I believe the 12.7 million cannot be achieved without the existence of policy reformation, bureaucracy reformation, and political funding which side with the community. And now, although the speed is not yet maximal, the government has actually done this. Several policies have been revised, bureaucratic culture has started to change, political funding is not clear yet, but hopefully I think the goodness will find its way for the better of all.



## Chapter 3.

# Strategy on Social Forestry Facilitations

**A**lthough it is not the best choice for communities especially in terms of land tenure, the issuance of a policy related to Social Forestry in 2007-2008 provides hope to strengthen conservation efforts and to ensure that important areas for communities do not change into other land use forms, such as mining, industrial plantation forest (HTI) or oil palm plantation.

However, in fact, obtaining a Social Forestry permit is not easy. Many conditions must be met, part from the various steps and processes, even when the permit is finally acquired, people should gain enough confidence on their abilities to manage the area. In this case, support from facilitating parties is absolutely required.

The following conversation between Edi Purwanto of Tropenbos Indonesia and Rainal Daus of WARSI, an NGO which has been involved for long in facilitating Social Forestry in West Sumatra and Jambi on March 15, 2017, tried to capture important issues related to Social Forestry.

### *What is WARSI approach in facilitating Social Forestry, WARSI experience in facilitating Village Forest?*

First, WARSI conducted a study to see the community's potential, either in social, economy, local wisdom, or natural resources. From the study, WARSI developed several strategies to strengthen every location. WARSI is very careful in developing agreements at community level. In one village, its community has to agree with all the offered schemes. Every choice has some risks and consequences, and people should know so that when they select village forest, CF, Customary Forest, etc, they know what they will face and what they should prepare in the future.

Second, which area they want to propose.

Third, which form of institution they agree.



Starting from those three approaches, facilitating process is executed in field. Those three are important because local institutions and distribution of benefit at local level are key for the future management. Weak institution will cause bad distribution of benefit which will result in new conflict at community level.

Very few bureaucrats have good understanding about Social Forestry. WARSI organizes socialization, training, field visit for invited parties such as the government staff. We have an interesting experience in West Sumatra with the provincial government. They went to field, stayed for the night with WARSI's facilitator in field and realized that building agreement is required. It is different from the approach used so far through projects done at government level. Since then the point of view has changed, there is a different point of view; another approach which was not calculated formerly is available to support community empowerment. The approach is now started to develop.

In 2014, Ministry of Forestry's regulation changed, but still partially. The overall change was in 2016. There were Customary Forest, Village Forest, Community Forest, partnership, Community Plantation Forest, including environmental partnership in conservation area. The biggest challenge is how we and community prove that Social Forestry indeed give contribution to improvement of community's economic resources. On the other hand, it also reduces forest degradation, because the community protect their area, the institution periodically patrol in the area to prevent theft from outsiders, etc. The development process of the economic side needs longer time due to limitation of utilization in Social Forestry and complexity of its regulation.

### *Why is Social Forestry's activity interesting for conservation?*

WARSI supports local values to a play role in natural resources management at local level. Initially, WARSI encouraged a Community Based Forest Management (CBFM) scheme. We called it "Customary Forest" before the issuance of regulation about Customary Forest. However, we have no reference on regulation. Decision letter (SK) of the District Head (Bupati) about Customary Village Forest A or Customary Community Forest A inside forest area is violating law because the District Head cannot determine Customary Forest inside forest area.

The regulation on Social Forestry released in 2007-2008 was not the best choice for community especially related to land tenure rights, however, the scheme can be used to strengthen (1) conservation, (2) ensuring that important areas for community do not change to other management forms such as for mining, industrial plantation forest, oil palm plantation, etc. The major remaining forest can be safe, although it's valid for 35 years, 1-2 years is important.

Social Forestry is not about ownership, not yet ideal for community, but management right is proven to be enough. Recently we conducted carbon stock study at 11 village forests since they received decision letter and they manage until today, it is proven that the carbon stock increased compared to prior time before the implementation of management scheme of Social Forestry.

### *What is the consideration on selection of schemes in Social Forestry between Village Forest, Community Forest, Customary Forest, Partnership Forest, etc?*

At initial step WARSI worked more on Village Forest, because the based area where WARSI works, the village, has strong customary values socially. All forest areas inside the village can be proposed as Village Forest. Community Forest is proposed by group and the proposed area - not all areas in the village - has been managed by the group.

The crucial difference between Village Forest and other schemes is the communal strength of village forest is guaranteed, because by the village government, all village community has to be informed. Meanwhile, Community Forest and Community Plantation Forest are only for certain group and provide benefit only for the group.

After 2009, after the first Village Forest has been obtained, WARSI supported all schemes, but the choice is done by the community depending on situation of their village. At the moment WARSI assists 21 group of Community Forest. WARSI is not in the position to determine that one scheme is better than the other scheme. If the community agrees with Customary Forest with all its consequences, then we will support the Customary Forest.

### *Isn't it legalizing the illegal activity?*

If we want to use that point of view, yes. But, we can also use the opposite point of view, i.e., helping people to ensure their sources of life.

### *What is the difference between Community Plantation Forest (HTR) and Community Forest (HKm)?*

HTR can only be in production forest and it is suggested in critical condition of production forest. It cannot utilize the existing wood. The community can only utilize and harvest what they grow. The approach is production, that's the main difference with HKm. HKm still accommodates conservation approach, but only for certain group. HTR can be individual and its main objective is production.

### *What benefit received by HKm group?*

Environmental services or agroforestry if they have managed it legally.

### *What is it like the permit procedure of SF?*

Before the issuance of Ministry of Forestry and Environment regulation No.83 year 2016, permit process is complicated. The community and local government have to acquire PAK (*Penetapan Areal Kerja*/Determination of Working Area) from Ministry of Forestry. Prior to that, several preconditions must be met by the community, such as: general description of the village, proposed village map with scale 1:50.000, institution, general description of the community's plan for the proposed area.

The preconditions are then submitted to the District to verify using the District's budget (Forest District Agency). The agency provides technical recommendation to the Regent, who will make proposal letter to the Minister of Forestry. The proposal received by the Minister will be verified again by verification team to the field. The verification team comes from *BPDASPS* and Palonogy.

They will send the letter to the law bureau to draft the decision letter (SK) that require long process. From the law bureau, it will enter the Secretary General, before returning to the Minister. If it is signed, the SK that determines working area will be released, the SK that states the proposed area has been determined for Social Forestry scheme. It has secured the area from being taken by other parties, from being used for other utilization permit.

Meanwhile, in field we prepare to propose Village Forest Management Rights (*HPHD/Hak Pengelolaan Hutan Desa*), institution, legality of institution, structure of institution, management planning for 35 years, village regulation of Nagari Forest in Social Forestry's management scheme, and village regulation about institution. When it's been ready, attached is the map that has received Decision Letter (SK) from the Minister.

HKM is proposed to the Regent, village forest is proposed to the Governor (now all have one permit), a team of the Governor will verify afterwards.

### *Where does the budget come from?*

Some parts have been allocated from village budget (*Anggaran Dana Desa/ADD*), some others still supported by WARSI. But, most have been budgeted, because the process is encouraged through mid-term development plan (*RPJM*).

### *How long will it take?*

Long enough based on our experience, but not as long as in the ministry, faster in West Sumatra. After the decision letter of *HPHD* released by the Governor, together with the community we formulate village forest annual plan (*Rencana Tahunan Hutan Desa/RTHD*), that should be endorsed by the Regent or delegated to District Forest Agency Head. The decision letter of 35 years *RTHD* is also released by the Governor when we arrange the *HPHD*.

### *What's the challenge?*

What difficult is both types of the planning format. Based on our experiences, no community can fulfill the format without assistance. After *RTHD* being legalized, community can start the management, planning, business development, strengthen institution. But the first thing to do is to mark borderline, where the borderline in all area of the village forest can be fitted.

### *Is the instalation of the borderline only for the community?*

Our understanding is different from the ministry. The Ministry uses zonation as regulated. Who has the right to do the zonation is the license holder. The scheme of

Social forestry should not permit, but empowerment scheme. The zonation should be facilitated by the government. The community cannot do what the company can do. Finally we facilitate the community in our way, in accordance with our capacity to do the zonation then we report it to the Planology Agency or *BPKH*.

### *What's the next challenge of facilitating SF?*

Based on our experience, the hardest part is when the community has been allowed to manage and utilize the SF. The annual plan that we need to facilitate is very participative because everyone in the village should know what is needed, what should be done, and what should be developed in the future. After the annual plan formulated, we facilitate community (Village Forest Management Institution/*Lembaga Pengelola Hutan Desa/LPHD* group) to present their plan in front of the Regent and all *SKPD* (Agriculture, Cooperatives, Plantation, Fishery, etc) because the annual plan cannot be facilitated only by the Forestry Agency. Furthermore, the agencies will offer their programs in Village Forest.

From then on, connection is gradually built between community planning and local planning. Starting to continue year by year, and now the connection has been relatively strong. In the last 2-3 years we always support *RPJM* because the main financial source that we think long lasting is *APBD/APBN*, not external or from NGO, because *APBD/APBN* is available every year. The legal formal entry road is *RPJM* and it becomes legal base for every agency to allocate the budget.

### *In 2-3 years before the community get the real benefit which is well distributed, will not they courage decrease?*

The dynamic exists. That's why I said it's the most difficult part because there is a possibility where community feeling exhausted. There should be many strategies to ensure the community that they are able to manage. For instance, by assuring the community that they will be supported if they are serious in formulating good planning. The support can also come from other parties outside the government, such as business institutions that concentrate in environment, or to other NGOs which have different concentrations with *WARSI*. Once we also connected to spice processing agencies.

### *Is there any case examples on utilization and marketing of Non Timber Forest Product (HHBK)?*

Many cases; one of the examples in Jambi is a group of village forest manager that succeeds to increase capacity in utilization of bamboo, rattan, and pandan. We support them to district level so that the district government provided gallery to collect the product, and that has been working. Then we try to facilitate the development of gallery in province and all stocks are sold out. To increase capacity in processing raw material to become various products, we found well known experts from Java (Cirebon) to become trainers. After being trained they give training to other places.

Other HHBK/NTFPs, for examples oyster mushroom and ecotourism – several village forests are potential for tourism.

There is also village forest which goal is not to utilize forest area, but to ensure the protection of agriculture land because it is the only source of water for their managed agricultural land. There is a village with 250 ha of agricultural land that probably will no longer exists if it was changed into coal mining.

There is also the main goal of restoration because the proposed area is critical, so they restore it with various productive plants that can improve the environmental condition. The village can also reduce its poverty rate because the barrent forest land is planted with annual plants (fruits, sap producer, woods, etc) and people can enjoy the result.

### *What are the principal differences between SK 2007-2008 and SK 2014?*

The differences in the Minister regulation:

1. What is issued by the Minister is already a direct management permit, because the minister has issued Social Forestry indicative area map (PIAPS). To put it simpler it is called PAK, but has been communaled to be allocated for Social Forestry. What happens now is cut off, from the community to the Minister, no longer through the Regent.
2. The Minister issues the permit, all has been included.
3. Based on PIAPS, the dependency to Directorate General of PSKL to Planology is not too high because they have the agreement allocated through PIAPS.

### *How about the role of the Governor and the Regent, then?*

The role of the Governor and the Regent now is to fill the permit. Input the support of community empowerment to Social Forestry that has received permit. To arrange permit, in the minister regulation No.83 year 2016, the Minister can give authority to give permit to the Governor with several preconditions:

1. The Provincial Government has budgeted Social Forestry in APBD (the State Budget Revenue).
2. Has been included in local planning
3. Has owned working group for Social Foretry service at province level. The working group includes government, NGO and other civil communities.

So, in our experience acceleration is extra ordinary with the working group (Pokja), so that 120 villages in West Sumatra are now willing to manage Social Forestry. That's adopted at national level, and now provincial working group has been set up everywhere.

If the preconditions have been fulfilled, the Minister can give the authority. West Sumatra has prepared Governor Regulation about Social Forestry's scheme.

All conditions are now easy; the process is no longer long. However, it seems that the Ministry of Environment and Forestry is not ready with so many inputs received because of limited human resources to serve.

*Rumor spreads about conflict between Forest Management Unit (Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan/KPH) and Social Forestry because KPH has unencumbered area; Social Forestry has also unencumbered area. Does competition take place in West Sumatra and Jambi?*

The competition does not take place. What happens is no synchronization between planning of KPH and existing allocation of Social Forestry. KPH made a plan which is not based on recent field condition. But, when it is discussed with KPH several KPH want to revise their plan, adjusted to the allocation of Social Forestry. Indeed, there are several locations of KPH, where the Heads refuse to change the RPHJP that they have determined even actually there has been decision letter about Village forest. In several KPHs both can be combined, depend on how the Head of KPH understand the connection between management of KPH and Social Forestry's scheme. Both situation faced by WARSI. Even until the authority of forestry withdrawn to the province, the problem has not been solved yet. There is a case where community's suggestion jammed for two years only because of that. But, in many places, Heads of KPH including in West Sumatra and Jambi can synchronize that. They revised the RPHJP so that all can work together.

*So, the hope is the existence of KPH can ease the permit process of Social Forestry?*

That's the thought at the initial establishment of KPH. Pak Hariyadi of IPB also stated, that is the goal in first initiation of KPH, to draw closer service from Jakarta to the people, not to give new ruler to the area. Eventually, don't know where the miss, there are Heads of KPH who have such understanding. However, several progressive Heads of KPH are willing to break through.

*How many years the Long-term Forest Management Plan/RPHJP?*

It can be revised every 5 years, but the planning has been longer.

*Is there any zonation in RPHJP?*

It is, among others are empowerment zone, utilization zone, core zone (protection zone).



*Is there any case where all permit have been completed then abandoned with no activities?*

No, because of the continuous assistance, but the progress is slow because WARSI cannot assist all at once.

*How is the system of assistance done by WARSI?*

One facilitator can facilitate 3 villages based on the topographic cluster of the area. If one village is far from the other villages, the access is far and difficult, one person is for only one village. There is also one facilitator for 5 villages if the access to all villages is easy.

When WARSI chose village A, B, C, and so on, was that in accordance with input from the proposed party of the Village Forest, or WARSI who determined, promoted and did the socialization?

At first, especially in between 2010 and 2012, WARSI gave direct socialization to provide information. Then, the community was encouraged to have a discussion, if they were interested they could contact WARSI. But after Provincial Pokja had been established in 2012, Pokja had also done the socialization.

*Where did the budget of Pokja come from?*

From APBD and other sources of funding. An NGO which saw it's good, for instance, might collaborate with Pokja. Some came directly, some others were chosen by WARSI. With the consideration, for instance, illegal activities in that area were very high. But the strategy would of course be different because the risk was also high, so as threats for WARSI.

So we select the three models: the worse, in between good and bad, the best (strong social capital, having less disturbed forest, and potential capacity of community to develop). By selecting the three models, WARSI will get experience in those three situations (year 2009). The worse is also taken so that we understand the right strategy to approach.



## Appendix A. Highlight Issues







# Social Forestry in Indonesia<sup>4</sup>

*Even assumed as “cost center” instead of “profit center”, Social Forestry (SF) is a hope to open the gate of forest management with the involvement of community.*

**S**ocial Forestry is a new paradigm in forest development which focuses on the needs of people, especially the nearby forest communities. It has participative approach and people become the major player in forestry development which is no longer wood oriented but forest resource (as a whole) oriented. The goal of SF is to achieve sustainable forest management implemented through participatory collaboration of various stakeholders by considering local specific situation. It has several principles such as collaboration or partnership, understanding of each role, sharing input and output, benefit balance in economy and ecology/environment, and legality/law assurance.

SF has become an umbrella for five priority programs of the government, i.e. eradication of illegal logging, countermeasure of forest fire, restructure of forestry sector, rehabilitation and conservation of forest resources and strengthen forestry decentralization. SF has been developed since 1984 although various challenges make it less well known. In fact the success of SF is quite determined by the land biophysical condition and social economic situation of its nearby community. Therefore, a certain model of social forestry which is successful in a certain location is not necessarily successful in other locations. Various alternatives of social forestry models need to be developed in accordance with characteristics of each specific location<sup>5</sup>.

An important milestone in the role of community in SF of Indonesia was the enactment of Law 41/1999 that replaced the Forestry Law No. 5/1967, which was considered pay less attention to people's right since authority to manage forest including control over planning, administration, exploitation and protection of forests was in the hand of the central government. The new law provides bigger attention to people's involvement in forest management through a new model of forest management based upon the empowerment of forest communities. To put it simply, it transfers the management of state forest to forest communities. The law also specifically mentions about Hutan Adat (Customary Forest) as a state forest managed by indigenous communities.

<sup>4</sup> Author: Irene Koesoetjahjo

<sup>5</sup> Santoso et.al. (2015), Penyusunan Rekomendasi Kebijakan Percepatan Proses Pengelolaan Hutan Berbasis Masyarakat, Partnership Policy Paper No.6/2015. The Partnership for Governance Reform. Kemitraan.

It is clear that social forestry program might take a lead in the future to accommodate people's hope to their involvement in forest management. The development of SF in forest management is no longer top down but now bottom up by mainstreaming local community's participation. If it can offer an optimum strategy to provide opportunity for a better forest management by involving people and providing incentives for efficiency and sustainability, then more prospective result will be on hand.

Unfortunately, SF program is often seen in a framework of single interest of each stakeholder. There is no collaborative framework yet to make it a collaborative interest involving all stakeholders. Although local government supports the SF program formally and legally, coordination performance between local and central government is still in question. Bigger hope, though, addressed to the local government to put more efforts in fighting more for its own people's prosperity. It might be lack of staff to reach the community in field but it can support in term of easier permit release in the future when the people need it. The facilitator role can be backed up by NGOs.

Promoting SF whatsoever needs support from various actors. Unfortunately, many actors remain silent due to the lack of incentives in term of political economic point of view. Even in the internal body of MoEF lack of support is still unresolved problem. It seems that no solid movement supports the SF program. Thus, a suggestion appeared during the workshop to not only provide incentive for those who support the SF program but also to give disincentive for those who do not support the SF program.

Those who do not support might consider the SF program uninteresting and assume it as "cost center" rather than "profit center". The local government, for instance, is more interested in oil palm or mining projects, instead of SF project. At the same time, carbon trading, climate change, and social forestry might be clear for NGO, research institution or environmental activists but less understood by local government. But, a question addressed is always, "What is the real benefit of SF for the region?" Then, there should be a clear mechanism to control the local government's responsibility. The President Instruction that all districts must be responsible for conservation and environment as regulated by the central government has to be addressed properly by the local government as the driver of the implementation of Social Forestry in the regions.

Distributing 12.7 million ha of SF area above the "fragile" institution is really frustrating. Clear concept of SF as a new model in land tenure should be established to avoid stakeholders' confusion. Accurate data and information especially in spatial planning and forest mapping is very important to establish a one map policy. Past mistakes on forest mapping should not be repeated. Don't let the judgment that forest status seems to be more important than forest function to provide better livelihood for the people becomes true. \*\*



### *A New Hope with Revised Regulation<sup>6</sup>*

*It is proven that indigenous people or local community can preserve environment by using management system based on local wisdom. Unfortunately, until today there is no umbrella of regulation to protect the community's right to have room for participating in preserving and conserving biodiversity.*

*The arising conflict resulted from expansion and appointment of conservation area after the reformation era, which is in fact overlapping with the living space of the community. Conflict is triggered especially in natural resources management of the area.*

*Thanks to revision of the government (Minister of Agrarian and Spatial Planning) regulation No.5/1999 which has been scheduled. The community will have a chance and room to take part in managing not only their living space but also the biodiversity of the conservation area and the place where they belong. Preservation, protection, and utilization are a three-pillar conservation that should be synergized with the community's participation. Therefore, there will no accusation anymore addressed to the community as trouble maker in the destruction of environment, forest degradation and deforestation.*

\*\*\*

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.worldagroforestry.org/downloads/Publications/PDFS/wp05161.pdf>



## Conflicting Land Tenure<sup>7</sup>

*Not all parties happy to receive the government decision to hand over 12.7 million ha of state forest to the communities. Skepticism lies on conflicting land tenure which remains unresolved, but will PIAPS help?*

**B**ukit 12 National Park is included in PIAPS – the map on Social Forestry indicative area. That could be good news for some people, but could be not for some others. The area is the living place for *orang rimba*, the indigenous tribe of the area. *orang rimba* is still nomadic. They will move from one place to another place within the forest area. They have no permanent place to live because they consider the forest is their home. They just take their food from forest, collecting fruit, tuber, and anything edible, and hunting. So, when the forest provides nothing, they will even die because of hunger as what recently happen due to the long dry season. They refused modernization; they still follow the traditional way of living inherited from their ancestor. They do not even realize that their “home” is in conflict due to ownership right.

A local CSO, WARSI, has been facilitating *orang rimba* for years. They focus to empower *orang rimba*, to make them more civilized. The first effort is to protect their living. A lot of permits, from HPH – forest concessionaire - to HTI – industrial plantation forest have threatened the *orang rimba*’s space for living. It is WARSI, which tries to advocate them to prepare their space for living. Several scenarios have appeared including the formation of National Park as well as an acknowledgement by the local government to their existence. How confusing then, when the 60.500 ha national park suddenly has to turned to be included into PIAPS. What about the type of the scheme? What about the place for the living of *orang rimba*? When the questions addressed by WARSI to the body in charged, the Directorate General of Forest Planology, the answer is because there is a proposal for it so just listed first.

It is doubtful whether the impact will be good or turn to be bad for *orang rimba*. When the management of the national park was under the authority of the government, everyone knows that the national park is available and legally become the space for living of *orang rimba* under the protection of the government (see box 1). If the authority is handed over to another party, even if it is the community or the customary, uncertainty arises. Prior to the present administration, Jambi – where the national park located - was a Sultanate area. During those days, there was a different mechanism

---

<sup>7</sup> Author: Irene Koesoetjahjo



in spatial and land management from what is implemented today. Another system was also implemented during the Dutch colonial time. Under the new authority, what mechanism will be used? What if the influence of former mechanism makes the situation worse?

The living space of *orang rimba* is only an example of land tenure case in Indonesia. Instead of relieving, the government side to the people seems to invite more confusion for related stakeholders. Layers of land tenure have existed there and the situation will be more complicated with the implementation of Social Forestry through PIAPS.

PIAPS is the initiation of the Directorate General of social Forestry and Environmental Partnership (DG SFEP), the Ministry of Environment and Forestry to have a reference in distributing the 12.7 million ha committed land. The map has been formulated with data support from Customary Areas Registration Agency (BRWA)/the Alliance of Indigenous People (AMAN), Participatory Mapping Working Network (JKPP) and Consortium for Community Forestry (KpSHK). Version 22 October 2015 of the map accumulated 12,739,224 ha of prospective areas consists of free permit state production forest 4,545,797 ha, proposed customary forest area as registered by BRWA/AMAN 3,921,841 ha, prospective areas suggested by JKPP 595,659 ha, proposed areas registered by KpSHK 1,607,877 ha, excluded land allocated for Agrarian Reform/TORA in South Kalimantan, West Nusa Tenggara, Lampung and Bali provinces (197,310) and added by the ongoing permit process areas facilitated by BPDAS 1,870,740 ha.

However, with the basic data taken from various sources, it is realized that the map still lack in accuracy. It also gives no clue on land use status, land cover (still forested or not), terrain condition of whether the area is located on top of hill or in valley, the slope steepness of the area, and so on. All those criteria will be important to determine on suitability and workability of local and indigenous community to manage the SF areas. The SF State Program consists of HKm (community forestry), HTR (community plantation), HD (village forest), HK (social forestry) and HA (customary forest).

As a reference, ideally the map also completed with the present conflict, source of conflict and land tenure to make sure on clean and clear area. In many cases, there are forest areas which is de jure still hold encumbered permit but the license holder are inactive. Those areas are potential to become SF area after the land tenure was cleared. On the other hand, there are non-encumbered permit areas but de facto have been acquired and managed by local community as agriculture or plantation area. Guidance information on conflict or source of conflict as well as land tenure will be helpful for conflict resolution. So, at least, PIAPS should be differentiated in two types: first, free licensed area which has big potential to be directly defined as SF areas, second, the existing encumbered permit area, whether the license holders still inactive or not, where conflict resolution assistances will be needed.

PIAPS needs also to consider the spatial distribution of poor villages inside and outside state forest area to achieve the right target. Verification with local data should be conducted to avoid problems due to legal permit. Besides enrichment to PIAPS with any relevant information, it must be synergized with maps produced by Working

Group on Land Inventarization, Tenure, Ownership, Use and Utilization (P2SPK) led by the Agrarian Ministry.

And no less important is the coordination with FMU/KPH, the forest management unit that is planned to be 600 units by 2020. As the “new” manager in field, the KPH will be the government’s vocal agencies in facilitating relevant management model implemented in the regions. Sometimes, even he KPH jumps into conflict with the community, such as in West Nusa Tenggara where a competition takes place over land use, therefore coordination with KPH becomes very important to avoid such situation.

Complaint protocol, administration proposal, etc. should be clear to help common people getting their needs. So far, the Ministry of Forestry will only deliver complaints they received to DKN – the National Forestry Council which will set up an ad-hoc committee, but clear conclusion and resolution still unfound. Conflict will remain conflict without clear steps for resolution.

### *The Living Legacy of the Past<sup>7</sup>*

*Orang Rimba is a special community who has inhabited the forested area of Bukit Dua Belas National Park, which is the representative of lowland tropical rain forest in Jambi province, since long time ago. While the northern part of the forest remains pristine, the rest is secondary forest due to past logging activities. The population of Orang Rimba is now predicted only around 200.000 people. They called themselves Orang Rimba because they live in “rimba” which means forest. They refused to accept any influence of modern life and remain living in the traditional way inherited from their predecessor. Sometimes people also called them Suku Kubu (Kubu Tribe) or Suku Anak Dalam (Anak Dalam Tribe).*

*Orang Rimba and the forest are inseparable. They will never be out of the forest, even for trading they use a system of silent trading where they put the stuff they want to “sell” at the edge of the forest to be bartered with something else. The buyer (usually the outsider/the local people) will take the stuff and replace it with other things. Only in recent times certain members of Orang Rimba trade to some villages in nearby forest area and get some money that will be used to buy certain things they need.*

*Orang Rimba do not keep livestock and just eat what they got from hunting in the forest such as deer or partridge. They appreciate forest and environment and will not harm the forest by using any chemical stuff such as fertilizer; they will not allow the use of soap while taking a bath at the river. They drink water from the river using wooden jug. Destroying forest for them means destroying their own living and they have a very rigid rule upon this issue. Any violation to customary law will receive punishment and the culprit will be cursed by their ancestors in the form of seloko/mantra that will be read in an adat ceremony.*

*Orang Rimba becomes more popular after Butet Manurung, an activist and a staff of WARSI, established Sokola Rimba (School of Rimba) in an effort to combat illiteracy from the children of Orang Rimba. Butet and her school as well as her teaching method receive a lot of publications from various media and it was like an opening to the reality of the existence of “another realm” to Indonesians that even in the high-tech era, there is still a group of people, a desolate community, who still lives in the dark of illiteracy deep inside the forest primitively. Butet expedition to combat illiteracy for desolate group of people/community has now developed to reach other remote areas all over Indonesia and even reach Asmat, the indigenous tribe living in secluded forest area of Papua.*

\*\*\*

<sup>8</sup> <http://melayuonline.com/ind/culture/dig/2593/leluhur-orang-rimba-provinsi-jambi>



# CSOs: From Challenges to Consolidation<sup>9</sup>

*Various challenges faced by CSOs including how to set up an exit strategy upon completion of their projects*

**W**hen the program initiated by CSOs completed, facilitation done, and the CSOs have to leave the site, will it be possible for the activity to remain continue? Does the local group have the capacity to continue the activity? It is quite often that many programs initiated by CSOs cannot be continued after program completion. So, how to make sure that the program will remain continue? The question came up during the workshop. Certainly there should be an exit strategy! Having the exit strategy is the real challenge for CSOs.

The government capacity to achieve the so called “ambitious” target – the distribution of 12.7 million ha forest land certainly makes CSOs’ support significant. CSOs have several roles which can be helpful in supporting the government’s work. The CSOs can work hand in hand with the government, and also with private sectors and other related stakeholders in the regions to finally achieve the real target: people’s welfare and prosperity.

Excerpted from discussions during the workshop, a summary on the roles of CSOs can be categorized into six important roles:

the thinker: various changes in policies will be enacted in the future such as government regulation (PP) No.44 about forestry area or PP No.6 year 2007 about forest governance and that will need input from CSOs.

the lobbyist: synchronization especially in “new” working culture of the ministry of environment and forestry needs to be understood. Several CSOs have done the lobby but not yet systemized and planned.

the facilitator: facilitation should also be done from inside the ministry of environment and forestry. In the past, for instance, there was a working group in empowerment either in policy changes or policy implementation.

---

<sup>9</sup> Author: Irene Koesoetjahjo

the pressure agent: there should be a pressure from CSOs to the government in the SF program because there is an assumption that the good will of the government to distribute 12.7 million ha land is only a false promise. Before input data given by NGOs (JKPP, AMAN, FFI, etc.), the government was unsure on the location of the 12.7 million ha area.

the connector: CSOs should be the bridge between the government and the local institution. Any changes should be adapted between policy and implementation.

the public communicator. It is often the weakness that the program cannot be communicated clearly to the public. Public communication should be strengthened to clearly influence the target audience.

To carry out those roles, the workshop floor suggested that first strategy is the consolidation between forums of CSOs either at national or local level. Second strategy is to reactivate the existing forums of CSOs in field and update with the new platform of SF.

Consolidation amongst CSOs especially those in the regions is a must with so many donors such as PS, MCA, TAF, MFP. Every CSO might have own specialty that can compliment one to another in achieving the goal while delivering their programs. CSOs should also prepare the exit strategy within the program's framework. When the program completed, the champions regenerated can tackle all the initiated activities. Otherwise, the farmer group, for instance, will no longer have someone to bridge their connections with supra village or district government. The role of intermediary, however, can still behold by the CSOs although they do not stay at the village anymore.

Real challenges may include establish network for related stakeholders such as associations of farmers/farmers' network to establish connection with investors, develop community's product so as to be accepted by the market, etc. Establishment of association is important to strengthen networking that will strengthen CSOs to continue the stronghold to stand, exchange information, update new implemented regulation, and provide support when the facilitated group faces any problems or obstacles especially in the production. Village groups should have a network at supra village levels such as sub-district or even province to have bigger networking.

However, preparation for this strong standing support cannot be set up in one day but a gradual process. The association ideally becomes an active forum with regular activities and network development, not just a passive or dormant institution. It is better if an association of CSOs set up at not only at provincial or district level but also at national level. Communication intensity at national level can give impact on CSOs at regional/local level. Under the umbrella of an association the CSOs could set up a similar goal to be a solid group which will empower people better. The problem is about to manage members of the association to meet the same theme, otherwise the consolidation will not work.

At the time being, it is said that the government actually has adequate fund allocated for villages. The village fund is estimated to hit billions of rupiah. However, the village needs assistancy in using the fund, and the program initiated by the CSOs can be

an alternative to use the fund. Continuation of the program is also part of the local government interest in the sense that any capacity improvement program for the district/province communities can be secured to continue using the fund. Director General of Social Forestry and Forest Partnership, MoEF, Wiratno Inung said, the Social Forestry program needs to be included in Region Middle Term Development Plan (RPJMD) and receives funding support from district or provincial budget so that access distribution to the right target such as poor community, landless farmer, etc can be accelerated.

An example of CSOs working with the involvement of local government is the project carried out by the Consortium for the Support of Community Forest Systems (KpSHK) in facilitating rattan producers in several provinces of Indonesia. KpSHK facilitated the development of rattan network involving multi-stakeholders: the local government, the furniture company, and the rattan farmers. It also facilitated rattan distribution channel dan rattan certification in the provinces of East Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, South East Sulawesi and South Sulawesi.

Indeed, identified problems faced by local group/facilitated community are usually limited capacity for business development, lack of support from local government, and inexistence of local funding to continue initiated activities. But with consolidation of CSOs, active forum of multi-stakeholders and intensive facilitation focused on accelerating target achievement and empowering beneficiaries of the program, the goal to develop forest based resources which are innovative and effective especially in economic gain will not be far away.



## Appendix B.

# Terms of Reference

- Background

The administration of President Joko Widodo has targeted the achievement of Social Forestry (SF) program to distribute 12.7 million hectares of land (Mid-term development plan 2015-2019), where it is hoped to achieve 2.5 million hectares in 2016. On the other hand, it has also determined to redistribute 9 million hectares of land (Land Allocated for Agrarian Reform/TORA) of which 4.1 million hectares will be derived from state forest area. The achievement of the target is certainly uneasy, considering the complicated problems of land tenure and limited capacity of the government in preparing “clean and clear” state forest areas and facilitating conflict resolution at the grassroots level.

Not less important to be anticipated from now on are efforts to capacitate the targeted beneficiaries of the SF program, so as to the community will be able to manage their land and improve their prosperity, while the output of the program could mitigate climate changes, especially the reduction of carbon emission to 29% against business as usual (BAU) until 2030.

To achieve the goal, the SF beneficiaries need to be empowered by government, Civil Service Organizations/CSOs and private sector.

The government and SF supporters can no longer rely on community’s local wisdom in natural resource management. The big pressure of the opportunist groups to grab the land, materialism life-style and the weakness of community institutions will potentially speed up the transfer of land from powerless to powerful groups. To prevent this, the capacity of targeted SF beneficiaries to build innovative forest-based livelihoods need to be strengthened.

Learning the success of smallholder’s oil palm plantation development, SF implementation should be designed by considering the following factors:

- a. Economic scale of land management for individual or community group;

- b. Key commodities to guarantee sustainable income sources in short, middle and long term periods;
- c. Market assurance, it would be good if partnership can be set up with the private sector;
- d. The availability of yield processing industry;
- e. Fair and rational price determined by tripartite, i.e. community, businessman and government.

Given the above issues, it is the time for CSOs and private sector to support government in the spirits of togetherness (*gotong-royong*) to accelerate SF achievement in sustainable manner.

For this purpose the Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environment Partnership, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (DG SFEP, MoEF) has set up an intensive collaboration with many CSOs to conduct preparation activities, among others are drafting of geospatial data to define Indicative Area for Social Forestry (IASF). The topic has become a major discussion in the National Workshop "Strategic Planning to Achieve 12.7 Million Hectares of Social Forestry" in Horison Hotel, Bogor, 28 -29 September 2015 organized by DG SFEP, MoEF in collaboration with Consortium for Community Forestry (KpSHK) and United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

Apart from IASF drafting, the following issues are not less important to be addressed from now on:

First, considering the slow achievement of SF program in the past, efforts are needed to identify the actual problems within and beyond MoEF and its acceleration strategies.

Second, concerning the rampant land conflict, efforts are needed to capacitate local community for conflict resolution in harmony with other stakeholders.

Third, concerning that SF is expected to reduce land tenure disparity, enhance prosperity and to mitigate climate change, facilitation and technical assistance of the government, private sector and CSOs are needed to develop sustainable livelihoods.

To response the above problems, Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership, MoEF in collaboration with Tropenbos International (TBI) Indonesia Programme will organize a national workshop entitled "Strengthening Social Forestry Strategies and CSOs Roles"

The workshop will be conducted in two days, the first day is aimed to identify and formulate problem solving strategies, whereas the second day is aimed to map the strengths and roles of CSOs to support SF program.

Theme: Identifying problems and formulate strategies on social forestry program in Indonesia and its implication to the roles of CSO.



## Workshop objectives (day 1)

- a. To identify policy constraints on SF establishment and formulate acceleration strategies at national, province and district level.
- b. To identify problems and formulate strategies to strengthen community institutions and conflict resolution.
- c. To identify problems and formulate strategies to develop SF's sustainable livelihood.

## Workshop objectives (day 2)

- a. To map the strengths of CSOs to support SF program in Indonesia.
- b. To formulate roles of CSOs and strategies to address problems as defined in the day 1 workshop.
- c. To identify training and capacity building needs for CSOs.
- d. To formulate follow-up actions to support SF program.

## Workshop design:

Day 1 workshop will be attended by the government, CSOs, donor agencies, researchers and private sector, aimed to:

- a. Identify policy constraints and opportunities of SF establishment at national, province and district levels and formulate the acceleration strategy.
  - Identify obstacles and opportunities as consequence the enactment of Law No.23/2014 on regional governance and steps required to solve the problems.
  - Identify obstacles in budgeting.
  - Identify obstacles related to the past and current (government) working culture.
  - Identify obstacles to conduct coordination/integration within MoEF.
  - Identify obstacles to establish synergy with other development agents beyond MoEF.
  - Formulate strategy and accelerated efforts.
- b. Identify problems and formulate strategies to strengthen community institutions and conflict resolution.
  - Identify policy constraints to capacitate community institutions
  - Identify obstacles in budgeting.
  - Identify obstacles related to the past and current working culture.
  - Identify obstacles to conduct coordination/integration within MoEF.
  - Identify obstacles to establish a synergy with other development agents beyond MoEF (Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Cooperatives, Ministry of Village, etc.)
  - Formulate strategy and facilitation actions.
- c. Identify problems in facilitating community to develop sustainable livelihood and formulate strategy of implementation in a synergy with other stakeholders.

- Identify policy constraints to develop sustainable livelihoods.
- Identify obstacles in budgeting
- Identify obstacles related to the past and current working culture.
- Identify obstacles to conduct coordination/integration within MoEF.
- Identify obstacles to establish synergy with other development agents beyond MoEF (Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Cooperatives, Ministry of Village, etc.)
- Formulate strategy and facilitation actions.

The workshop will be started with the key-note speeches of three resource persons from the Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership, MoEF: (a) Director of Social Forestry Area Preparation; (b) Director of Conflict Resolution, and (c) Director of SF's Sustainable Livelihoods Development.

The presentations are followed by a plenary discussion to clarify some burning questions from the audience. The session is intended to refresh the workshop participants on status and development of SF within Directorate General SFEP as key issues to be addressed in the following group discussion sessions.

In the subsequence session, the workshop's participants are divided into three group discussions (GDs) based on participants' background, working areas, experience and interests; each group will be facilitated by a facilitator:

- a. Topic in GD 1: Identify policy constraints and opportunities of SF establishment at national, province and district levels and formulate the acceleration strategy.
- b. Topic in GD 2: Identify problems in strengthening community institutions and conflict resolution and formulate the implementation strategy.
- c. Topic in GD 3: Identify problems in facilitating community to develop sustainable livelihood and formulate the implementation strategy.

Day 2 workshop is mainly attended by CSOs and aimed to:

- a. Map of the strengths of CSOs capacity to support SF program in Indonesia
- b. Formulate the roles of CSOs and strategy to help resolving various problems as formulated in the first day workshop.
- c. Identify training needs and capacity building for CSOs.
- d. Formulate follow-up action to succeed SF program.

- First day agenda, Thursday, October 22, 2015

Time	Activities	Resource person	Moderator/ Facilitator
08.00 – 09.00	Registration of participants		
09.00 – 09.45	Introduction	Edi Purwanto (PD TBI-Indonesia Programme) Rene Boot (Director TBI) Wiratno (Director of SF Preparation Area)	MC
09.45 – 10.00	Morning break		
10.00 – 12.30	Group discussion (GD) part 1		
Group Topic 1: Identify PS development policy constraints at the central, provincial and district levels as well as the formulation of strengthening strategies  Topic of Group 2: Identifying problems of community institutional strengthening and handling of land conflicts and formulating strategies for handling them.  Group Topic 3: Identify community facilitation issues for sustainable livelihood development and formulation of implementation strategies.		Group 1 Facilitator: Arif Aliadi  Group 2 Facilitator: Hery Santoso  Group 3 Facilitator: Jusupta Tarigan	
12.30 – 13.30	ISHOMA		
13.30 – 14.30	Presentation and Plenary Discussion: Problems and Strategies of the Social Forestry Program	Hadi Daryanto	Edi Purwanto
14.30 – 15.15	GD Part 2 (advanced)		
15.15 – 15.30	Afternoon break		
15.30 – 17.30	Presentations and Plenary Discussions: The three groups present the results and receive feedback	Representatives of each group	Wiratno
17.30 – 17.45	Conclusion	Hadi Daryanto	

- Second day agenda, Friday, Oktober 23, 2015

Time	Activities	Resource person	Moderator/ Facilitator
09.00 – 09.45	Plenary Presentation and Discussion: Mapping the Strength of CSOs in different regions	Hery Santoso	Wiratno
09.45 – 10.00	Morning break		
10.00 – 12.30	Plenary Discussion 1: Identify the role of CSOs in addressing the issues and strategies that have been formulated at the First Day Workshop.		Muayat Ali Muhshi
12.30 – 14.00	ISHOMA/Sholat Jumat		
14.00 – 15.15	Plenary Discussion 2: Identify the various needs for CSO strengthening, including the various training required.		Muayat Ali Muhshi
15.15 – 15.30	Afternoon break		
15.30 – 17.30	Plenary Discussion 3: Follow-up Plan Agreement		Hery Santoso
17.30 – 17.45	Conclusion		Hery Santoso Muayat Ali Muhshi



## Appendix C.

### List of Participants

No.	Name	Institution	Email Address
1	Adiryati	WBH	aadjhios@yahoo.com
2	Andika	WRI	aputraditama@wri.org
3	Amirah Yumn	CIFOR	a.yumn@cgiar.org
4	Afifi Rahmadetiasari	KEHATI	afifi@tfcasumatera.org
5	Agus Mulyana	CIFOR	a.mulyana@cgiar.org
6	Agustian Natarino	GARSI	nattarieno@gmail.com
7	Ani A. Nawir	CIFOR	a.nawir@cgiar.org
8	Arif Aliadi	LATIN	aaliadi@yahoo.com
9	Aziz Khan	WB	a.jazz44@yahoo.com.au
10	Ach. Rozani	WALHI	achrozani@gmail.com
11	Adiosyafri	WBH/Haki Sumsel	adjhios@yahoo.com
12	Betty Tio Minar	BRWA	b.nababan@gmail.com
13	Bukhari	OWT	b_khari@yahoo.com
14	Cecilia Srihadi	TFT	cecilia.srihadi@yahoo.com
15	Deni Rahardian	JKPP	denyrahardian@gmail.com
16	Dedek Hendri	AKAR	dedek_hendra79@hotmail.com
17	Dedi Permana	WBH	deddypermana@gmail.com
18	Dolly Priatna	APP	dolly_priatna@app.co.id
19	Edi Endra	Pundi Sumatera	tumbuh_sejajar@yahoo.co.id
20	Eri Indrawan	Dit. BUPSITA	agaiza@yahoo.com
21	Eko Manjela	TBI	eko@tropenbos-indonesia.org
22	Fauzi Masud	Seknas KPH	afmsd15@yahoo.com
23	Faridh Almuayat	MAP Institute	faridh@mapinstitute.org
24	Feni Nur	AMAN	feri.nur@aman.or.id
25	Firmansyah	Majalah Tropis	firmanhutasuhut@yahoo.co.id
26	Gladi Hardiyatmo	Kemitraan	gladi.hardiyatmo@kemitraan.or.id
27	Hasbi Hasbillah	TFF	hasbie@tff-indonesia.org
28	Hartjahjo A	RER GCN RAPP	hartjahjo-ariawan@aprilasia.com
29	Helmi Ayuradi M	FKKM	helmy.radhit@gmail.com
30	Herbert	YMI Riau	bert@mitrainsani.or.id
31	Hery Santoso	Javlec	

No.	Name	Institution	Email Address
32	Hasan Toha As	FKKM	hasantoha@gmail.com
33	Imam H	JKPP	havink@gmail.com
34	I.B.W Putra	Alas Kusuma	putraibw@yahoo.co.id
35	Indra Mahyudin	Smart.Tbk	indra.mahyudin@sinarmas_agri.com
36	Ismatul Hakim	Puslitsosekjakpi	ismatulhakim@yahoo.com
37	Iwan W	TNC	
38	Jeri Imansyah	KEHATI	jeri@tfcasumatera.org
39	Jusupta tarigan	NTFP-EP	jtarigan@gmail.com
40	Kresno Dwi S	TBI	k_santoso68@yahoo.co.id
41	Lampor	FWI	lampor@fwi.or.id
42	La Ode Ifrisal	FKKM	
43	Lili Hasanudin	TAF	lili.hasanuddin@asiafoundation.org
44	Ludiro P	OWT	prajoko.ludiro@yah
45	Maryo	Sawit Watch	maryo@sawitch.or.id
46	Mardhatilla	RMI	tilla@rmibogor.or.id
47	Mirza Indra	AMAN	mirza-indra@aman.or.id
48	Moh. Djauhari	KpSHk	tjongpaniti@kpskh.org
49	Muh. Yusuf	KpSHK	moch.yusuf@gmail.com
50	Muayat Ali M		malimuhshi@gmail.com
51	Naubbie	APP	naubbie@app.co.id
52	Ngaloken Ginting	Litbang	akusginting@yahoo.co.id
53	Nila Silvana	UNDP	nila.silvana@undp.org
54	Reny Juita	ICRAF	r.juita@cgiar.org
55	Rizal bukhari	TNC	rbukhari@tnc.org
56	Riko Kurniawan	WALHI Riau	rikokurniawan@gmail.com
57	Rudi Syaf	WARSI	rudisyaf2004@yahoo.com
58	Sintong Frenz S	Ulayat	sintong@ulayat.or.id
59	Sugeng Rahardjo	FFI-Ind	sraharjo@gmail.com
60	Suwito	Kemitraan	suwito@kemitraan.or.id
61	Telly Kurniasari	Wetland International	telly.kurnisari@wetlands.or.id
62	Tony Djogo	USAID	adjogo@usaid.gov
63	Tri Wahyudiati	P3SEKPI	triwahyu@cbn.net.id
64	Timotius	PSKL	timotiusgi@gmail.com
65	Ujang S Irawan	OWT	ujangsi@yahoo.com
66	Wiratno	Dit. PKPS	
67	Wahyudi	PSKL	wahyudianto@yahoo.com
68	YulQari	KKI-WARSI	yulqari@yahoo.co.id
69	Yekti Wahyuni	PUTER	yektiwahyuni@gmail.com
70	Tri Roswajdi	CI	trooswiadji@conservation.org



## Appendix D. Photo Documentation



Participants take a picture together at the end of the workshop





## About Tropenbos Indonesia

**T**rack record on activities of Tropenbos International (TBI) Indonesia was started in 1986 in line with stronger concern on the high rate of tropical forest damage in Indonesia. Through MoF Tropenbos Kalimantan Programme, TBI Indonesia conducted various conservation researches in East Kalimantan.

In 1993, TBI International Indonesia formally signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the government of Indonesia, represented by the Ministry of Forestry (now the Ministry of Environment and Forestry). This MoU extended in 2007 marked with expansion of coverage activities from Kalimantan to the whole regions of Indonesia. Mof Tropenbos Kalimantan Programme was then changed into TBI Indonesia Programme.

Later on, TBI Indonesia activities were extended to not only cover silviculture, the development of herbarium in the Wana Riset Samboja and research of wildlife, but expanded to various aspects of forest management. In 2004 – 2008 TBI Indonesia together with CIFOR and WWF implemented Asia Forest Partnership Programme in Paser District, Kapuas Hulu District and Malinau District. Between 2008 and 2016 TBI Indonesia focused on mainstreaming High Conservation Value (HCV) with several partners, starting from the formulation process until the publication of HCV Identification Guideline (2008), continued with HCV training and technical assistance in HCV identification for forest concessionaires (HPH), industrial plantation forest (HTI), and oil palm plantation as well as mainstreaming HCV to the government.

Since 30 December 2016, TBI International Indonesia has been officially incorporated Indonesian law (Tropenbos Indonesia). With the tagline “Making knowledge work for forests and people” and bring about a vision to “Bridging the gaps between knowledge and practices on better forested landscape governance”, since 2017, Tropenbos Indonesia (TBI Indonesia) has worked in Ketapang District in collaboration with the government, private sectors, local community and NGOs to facilitate the development of ecological corridor connecting Sungai Putri Forest complex with Gunung Palung National Park and Gunung Tarak Protection Forest.



**P**resident Joko Widodo's policy to allocate 12.7 million ha of land for the Social Forestry Program (SF) until 2019 has spurred the excitement of CSOs working in SF. Tropenbos International Indonesia Programme (now Tropenbos Indonesia), tried to present and document this momentum by organizing a workshop titled "Strategy for Strengthening Social Forestry and the Roles of CSOs" at The Sahira Hotel, Bogor on 22 and 23 October 2015.

The target can be said to be very big (compared to the previous achievement) and raises new questions to answer. Can these slow-moving "vehicles" be forced to speed up to reach the new target? Which spare-parts should be repaired or replaced? Is the provided fuel enough? What is the capacity of the drivers and their assistants?

On the other hand, the commitment of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) to simplify license which previously long, complicated and difficult to undertake by community groups has resulted in a new enabling condition to pave the way of SF vehicle to achieve the target area and number of beneficiaries.

The workshop attempts to answer questions and hot issues that have implications for policy restructuring, a simpler and quicker land preparation procedure and, more importantly, how development strategy of sustainable livelihood for community groups who hold permits to not transfer their rights to free riders group. Furthermore, how the role and readiness of CSOs are as the key government partners in anticipating sharp soaring target area.

Apart from presenting the key conclusions of the workshop, the proceeding also includes interviews with SF activists as well as interview with WARSI as an experienced institution working in SF and has succeeded in developing best practices. While other issues rising from the discussion groups were excerpted in several separate articles, context of the workshop results and the latest issues have been knitted by Pak Wiratno in Foreword.

Tropenbos Indonesia dedicates this proceeding as part of its efforts to bridge the gaps in knowledge and practices on forested landscape governance in Indonesia.



National Committee  
of The Netherlands



ISBN 978-602-61993-0-0

9 786026 199300