

INCREASED COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN FOREST MANAGEMENT THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL FORESTRY PROGRAMMES IN INDONESIA

Sri Suharti

ABSTRACT

In the last few years there has been a tendency to adopt a new forest management system in which people's participation is the focus of attention. This concept has several different names, such as community forest based management, collaborative forest management, joint forest management and social forestry. Three main principles are applied in this new forest management system i.e. 1) Local people need to be involved in forest management activities; 2) Local people have legal rights and obligations to participate in forest management activities; 3) There is a need to actively involve local people in deciding on which activities to develop in order to guarantee a forest management system which is economically feasible, socially adaptable and ecologically sound.

To anticipate the tendency, the Indonesian Ministry of Forestry and Estates (MOFEC) has developed several programmes the main purpose of which is to rationalise and empower the life of local people living near and around the forest area and to increase their participation in forest management activities. There are various forms of social forestry programme in Indonesia i.e. PMDH (Forest Village Development Programme), Community Forestry, Mixed Farming Timber Estate, Transmigration Timber Estate, Small Scale Private Forest, etc.

Social forestry programme development shows a dynamic from time to time. Since the programme was first introduced there has been a change of heart on the part of professional foresters, who in the past mostly thought they knew more and had a greater right over forest resources. Now they realise that local people also have the right to be involved in forest management activities. Furthermore, the active participation of the people in forest management activities has an important role in determining the success of sustainable forest management. The top-down approach as the only method applied in programme establishment is now being gradually abandoned. The newly introduced method of PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal) is starting to be used widely in designing alternatives in social forestry programmes.

This paper tries to elaborate the establishment of these programmes and to describe how far and in what activities local people could participate in forest management activities in some areas of Indonesia. Some case studies presented in the paper focus on what the local people receive and how they react after the establishment of these programmes. The information presented here has been gathered from several research studies and literature.

I. INTRODUCTION

Forestry in Indonesia has followed two different management approaches. One approach is the management of the surrounding forest land by forest dwelling communities and individuals. The other one is the management of state forest by the government. There are some differences between these two management approaches, resulting from different cultural presuppositions about resource management and control. This situation gave rise to some conflicts between forest village people and the government over forest land use (Poffenberger, 1990). During the past two decades, the occurrence of social conflicts between these two parties has become more frequent, especially after the government of Indonesia decided to give concession rights to concessionaires. These concessionaires (who were most likely newcomers) assumed that they had greater power and rights to exploit the forest, as they had a formal licence from the government. Local people, who have been living in the area since time immemorial, are considered to be outsiders who will disturb and endanger the concessionaires' activities. Moreover, local people wonder why after these newcomers come into the area, they are no longer allowed to work or take anything from the forest.

Learning from the situation the government of Indonesia (GOI) realised that this had been an inappropriate approach to forest management. Local people, who had been living in the area long before the concessionaires came, should be involved in forest management activities, as otherwise there would be constant conflict between the two and this situation in turn would endanger forest resources.

Furthermore, there has been a change in the last few years in many parts of the world towards a new forest management system based on participation of the local people. This concept has various names, such as community forest based management, collaborative forest management, joint forest management and social forestry. Three main principles are applied in this new forest management system *i.e.* 1) Local people need to be involved in forest management activities; 2) Local people have legal rights and obligations to participate in forest management activities; 3) There is a need to actively involve local people in deciding which activities to develop in order to achieve a forest management system which is economically feasible, socially adaptable and ecologically sound (Lembaga Alam Tropika Indonesia/LATIN, 1998).

In order to anticipate the change towards a new forest management system and also to reduce the occurrence of social conflicts, the Ministry of Forestry and Estates (MOFE) has developed several programmes with the main purpose of rationalising and empowering the lives of local people living in and around the forest area and of increasing their active participation in forest management activities. There are various forms of social forestry programme in Indonesia *i.e.* PMDH (forest village community development programme), community forestry, transmigration timber estate, mixed farming timber estate, small-scale private forest, etc.

This paper tries to give an overview of the establishment of some of these programmes and to describe how far and in what activities local people can participate in forest management activities. Some case studies presented in the paper focus on what the people receive and how they react after the establishment of these programmes. The information given here has been gathered from several research studies and literature.

II. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SOCIAL FORESTRY PROGRAMMES IN INDONESIA

Social forestry is defined as the practice of using trees and/or tree planting specifically to pursue social objectives, usually betterment of the poor, through the delivery of benefits (of tree and/or tree planting) to the local people; it is sometimes described as “tree growing by the people, for the people” (Nair, 1993)

Another author has noted that the meaning of social forestry cannot be gathered from descriptions of the range of activities carried out under the projects. As Noronha and Spears, in Sutrisno (1990), have indicated, the novel element of social forestry projects is that these serve local needs through the active participation of the beneficiaries in the design and implementation of the reforestation efforts and the sharing of products. This would imply that the success of social forestry programmes depends on the responses of persons living in the forest based communities, made up of “individuals who have a lot in common and yet unique differences”.

People’s participation in social forestry programmes must be preceded by the creation of a participatory environment. This leads to two basic questions *i.e.* what kind of programme and how far are people expected to participate in it, and how does the Forestry Department propose to create a participatory environment in the implementation of the programme. Depending on how we define the word “participation”. Sen and Das, in Sutrisno (1994), suggested two possible alternatives to increase people’s participation in social forestry programmes. The first alternative is to look at the major operating tasks in social forestry and consider at what stage people could participate. The operating tasks are; 1) nursery raising; 2) land preparation (digging of pits); 3) watering; 4) weeding; 5) fertiliser application; 6) protection from pests and diseases and 7) exploitation. This kind of participation is considered to be the lowest level of participation, as the people become involved in forest management only as wage labour and the Forestry Department continues to decide and determine all forest management activities (P3AE-Universitas Indonesia, 1998).

The second alternative is to involve people in all the major management functions of forest management activities, starting from the planning stage right up to product marketing. These activities include: 1) land selection; 2) species selection; 3) organising planting operations; 4) plantation management (maintenance and protection); 5) exploitation and marketing. These functions have to be carried out by the people themselves with the Forest Department contributing technical assistance.

In the past, the implementation of social forestry tended to apply the first alternative. Under this “top-down” approach the people act merely as an object and have no right to make any suggestion about forest management activities. All the decisions are made by what we call “professional foresters”. Only in the last few years has the GOI begun to realise that the approach used in the programmes should be changed in order to give greater opportunities for the people to play a role in forest management activities.

III. HISTORICAL REVIEW OF SOCIAL FORESTRY PROGRAMMES

Long before the term “social forestry” became popular and encouraged many people to learn more about it, Perum Perhutani (State Forest Enterprise) was the local people taking into consideration and involving them in forest management activities. This effort aimed at the attainment of sustainable forest management and at improving the social welfare of the people living around the forest as well.

In the early 1970s Perum Perhutani introduced what was called the prosperity approach programme in Java. It was followed in 1974 by MA-LU and in 1982 by the PMDH programme (Forest Village Community Development Programme). MA-LU stands for Mantri and Lurah, meaning forest ranger and village chief. This programme addresses, in particular, the importance of cooperation between forest ranger and village chief in the implementation of the prosperity approach programme, in particular, in greening activities on village land and in forest protection (Perum Perhutani, 1982). In 1982, the programme was further developed more and became the Forest Village Community Development Programme (PMDH). This programme, which was actually an extension of the prosperity approach programme aimed to promote employment, increase villagers’ income and distribute it more equally, enhance the growth of the village economy, promote a balanced standard of living between rural and urban communities, encourage sustainable forest management and forest use and enhance the capabilities of villagers in general (Perum Perhutani, 1982).

The application of the “prosperity approach” programme, using extension methods can be categorised as “top-down”. This management approach was improved in the MA-LU programme, although the extension methods were still “top-down”, with the implementation being carried out jointly by Perum Perhutani field personnel and local government officials. All the efforts and initiatives (including funding) for the programme came from the top management of Perum Perhutani.

The social forestry programme on forest land was initiated in 1984 by the Directorate General of Forest Utilization and Perum Perhutani of the Ministry of Forestry, and supported the by Ford Foundation. From October 1984 to early 1986 diagnostic research was carried out in Java with Perum Perhutani (State Forest Enterprise) as the implementing agency. This research was followed by pilot projects in Java. The organisation and execution of the programme seem to have been better than those of the previously mentioned programmes, with more involvement of various groups and calling on the expertise in society. An important aspect of this programme is the effort to organise and educate forest farmers with the objective of creating an partnership between Perum Perhutani and the villages participating in the programme. This goal is to be achieved by the establishment of forest farmers groups, which are expected to become a medium for a two way communication between foresters and farmers using both the “top-down and bottom-up” approaches (Kartasubrata, 1990).

In 1986 the first phase of the “Outer Islands Social Forestry Programme” was initiated. This programme is coordinated by the Directorate General of Forest Utilization in cooperation with the respective regional government and forestry offices. Local universities and voluntary organisations collaborate in the implementation of the programme (Nasendi, 1990).

From time to time, modifications, adaptations and changes are made to the implementation of social forestry programmes. Since 1990, the GOI has been urging concessionaires to become more actively involved in social forestry programmes. The implementation of a social forestry programme is then integrated with timber estate establishment (TE). Under Ministry of Forestry decree No. 20/II/1983, all concessionaires have to establish timber estate plantations. As a reforestation activity, the objective is to increase the capacity of the forest and thus guarantee the sustainability of industrial timber supplies. The development of the timber estate is carried out by the concession holder with funding from the Reforestation Fund (DR). The establishment of the programme in an area should allow some direct or indirect input from the people living in and around it. The community is therefore expected to receive some benefit from the establishment of the plantation. Timber estate establishment often involves people (usually shifting cultivators) who live around the site as well as transmigrants in the area. The degree of involvement of these people in the plantation varies depending on the policy of the company. Some of them participate very minimally in company work as general labourers, while others are more involved in the plantation. Learning from this situation, timber estate development companies have started trying to increase active participation by adopting modified models of TE such as mixed farming TE and transmigration TE. Nowadays, companies in charge of developing TE are beginning to balance wood production and the social welfare of the people involved in the programme. Hence, these people not only receive wages, but also other benefits such as improvements in marketing and health facilities, infrastructure and other forms of subsidy (Gintings and Suharti, 1998).

In order to ensure that concessionaires paid more attention to local people living in and around the concession area, the GOI, through Minister of Forestry (MOF) decree No. 691/Kpts-II/1991, subsequently instructed all concessionaires to become actively involved in empowering local people and this is now obligatory. A programme called HPH-PMDH (Pembinaan Masyarakat Desa Hutan) for increasing people's participation was established in 1991. All concessionaires have to develop and supervise at least 2 (two) villages under the HPH-PMDH programme, which addresses the problem of poverty, especially for those living in and around their concession area. If they do not apply the programme, they are penalised by MOF, *i.e.* refusal to approve the annual cutting plan.

IV. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL FORESTRY PROGRAMMES

The concept of community participation is not fully satisfied by "just" receiving people's contributions in the form of labour, kind or cash. Participation must contain elements of initiative and decision, emanating from the community itself. When community contributions do not comprise such bottom-up elements, the concept changes from participation to mobilisation (Nasikun, 1990). As has already been mentioned, there is a wide range in the degree of people's participation in forest management activities. The extent to which companies seriously support community participation depends on how far they are aware of and understand its importance and on how far they are willing to transfer some of the profits gained during their operations in the area and to the local people living around their concession. The participation of people in mixed-farming TE, transmigration TE (TTE) and HPH-PMDH programmes is presented in detail below.

a) Participation in Mixed-farming Timber Estates

Some concession holders have already applied the mixed farming technique in the establishment of plantation forests. This approach is much better for both parties (the company and the labourers). By working on the plantation, people earn some wages and also have a chance to grow food crops between the rows of trees. However, the permit to grow food crops is only for 1–2 years, that is before the tree canopy becomes so wide that crops no longer grow well. After 1–2 years they have two possibilities, *i.e.* to look for another job or to extend the contract if the company wants to establish TE in another area. Nevertheless, this programme has so far already provided a chance for the people to receive a regular monthly wage and an opportunity to grow crops for their own consumption (Suharti, 1993).

The company actually loses nothing from the application of mixed-farming TE, in fact, some studies reveal that growing food crops among the trees has positive effects on the growth of the tree. Kijhar, in Sukandi (1990), reported that the growth of trees when grown together with food crops tends to be better than those grown without food crops. Similarly, Mile (1992) found that (4) four species of trees in mixed-farming TE in HPH. PT. Erna Djuliawati, *i.e.* *Acacia mangium*, *Paraserianthes falcataria*, *Eucalyptus deglupta* and *Gmelina arborea*, showed better growth than those grown without it. Besides, monthly wages, this pattern could also contribute to households' income from rice and other food crop production. Meanwhile, PT. Inhutani V in Bengkulu and Lampung, which also applied this programme, reported that farmers are allowed to grow rice, corn and other food crops for (3) three years. In this case, these crops are grown under rubber trees and, on average, each hectare could produce 3.5 tones of unhulled dry rice/year.

This type of interaction is not yet universal, but at least some concessionaires have already paid some attention to local people living round the concession area and tried to give them a chance to earn additional income from TE activities. Some modifications are indeed needed to increase the self-reliance of the people, so that they do not fully depend on the company and are able to create their own jobs to guarantee their livelihoods in the future. The concessionaires could give them some subsidy or other form of assistance, such as food crop seeds, fertiliser, extension, training, etc. as they usually also own some land which they cultivate themselves. This would help them to work more effectively in managing their land and finally be able satisfy their basic daily needs. The responsibility of deciding what kind of subsidies and how they should be given is not only in the hands of the concessionaires, but should be coordinated with the Ministry of Forestry and Estates, Ministry of Agriculture, local government and other institutions in order to increase the self-reliance of the people and achieve top quality TE plantations (Gintings and Suharti, 1998).

b) Participation in Transmigration Timber Estates (TTE)

Indonesia's forest policy is closely linked with other pioneering efforts such as the transmigration programme. In TTE, settlers are given permanent employment at the Eimber Estate on Indonesia's outer islands. Eventually, every forest concession will have its own TTE project. Providing a job for each family head involved will, over the years, save many hectares of forest which they might otherwise destroy to obtain land to grow food crops.

In 1991, Transmigration Timber Estates (TTE) started to recruit people, mostly slash and burn migrant cultivators. Now more than 111 TTE units are being established throughout the country (Manan, 1995).

The establishment of TTE could be done by using 2 (two) kinds of model *i.e.* Integrated TTE, and TTE using the NES (Nuclear Estate Smallholder) pattern.

1. Integrated TTE

The development of TTE is designed together with the development of a transmigration settlement, either inside or outside TE unit; most of the transmigrants' income comes from forest plantations. Transmigrants work in the TTE during the year and obtain an adequate income, while the company has permanent labourers to cultivate the plantation continuously. The regulation of contractual arrangements between the two parties should be mutual.

In integrated TTE, people also receive additional benefits to their daily wage *i.e.* an opportunity to cultivate the land for food crops, as long as it does not disturb tree growth on TE (similar to mixed-farming TE) and an opportunity to develop plantations of seedlings under the village unit cooperative (KUD) guides, so that later they will be able to supply seedlings to the company.

2. Transmigration timber estates using the NES pattern

The development of the plantation in this pattern is also related to the transmigration programme. The plantation unit is considered to be nuclear, while the transmigrants in the settlement areas are considered to be smallholders. An example of this pattern can be found in North Sumatra in HPH. PT. Indorayon. This type of TE imitates the NES-Trans programme, which was developed earlier by the Ministry of Agriculture. Forest areas converted to smallholder areas cover at least 4 (four) ha (a share certificate is issued for each smallholder). Besides this, each transmigrant receives a 36 m² house and 0.50 ha of home garden. But some further considerations have to be taken into account, *i.e.* transmigrants are allowed to keep the trees well until harvesting time (8 years for pulp species and 18 years for construction timber). There is also the possibility that, after the trees are cut, the transmigrants will not be willing to grow trees any more and so the area of production forest will decrease.

c) Participation in HPH-PMDH programmes

The HPH-PMDH programme could be defined as the social activity of the concession holder (HPH) in managing shifting cultivation living within and around concession area towards sedentary farmers and other productive activities based on conservation principles (Dit. Penyuluhan, RRL, 1991).

The activities developed in HPH-PMDH programmes are adapted to the physical condition of the area, the socio-economic and cultural situation of the people and the needs and desires of the people. Alternative activities developed in PMDH programmes include:

1. Permanent/sedentary farming
(rice field cultivation, dry field cultivation, provision of production factors, extension, dams/building irrigation facilities).
2. Increase in income generation
(labour recruitment, home industries, credit for livestock raising, etc)
3. Infrastructure provision
(houses, road, bridge, school buildings, health facilities, etc).
4. Socio-cultural development
(training and education, sport, fellowship, religion, art etc).

5. Conservation forest and natural resources
(reforestation, terracing, small scale private forest, extension)

Community participation in HPH-PMDH programmes in some provinces in Indonesia is elaborated below:

a. HPH-PMDH in Riau Province

The development of HPH-PMDH in Riau province is relatively small scale (in terms both of number of participants and area of coverage). To take the example of HPH PT. Sejati Riau I, on average in one year, they involve only 10 households. This also applies to HPH PT. Triomas FDI, where only 30 households participate in the programme each year. Activities developed in the programme vary from providing some form of subsidies, up to the provision of houses for each household (in Triomas). However, most of the activities developed are only for one year and, after that, HPH moves to another group or another area. The reason why HPH do it is because establishing the programme is compulsory for them. Moreover, each concession has to develop at least 2 (two) villages every year and, within 20 years, or after their concession terminates, all the villages in their concession area must have been involved in the programme. This situation makes them try to achieve the target of developing villages and not concerning themselves with the continuation and the appropriateness of the programme to its participants. Failure to continue programme development means that efforts to involve local people in forest conservation activities fail. To take an example, the people may be given some instruction in nursery activity but they are told nothing about cultivation and maintenance techniques. Again in Sejati Riau I, people are encouraged to grow pineapples on their land, as the area is suitable for pineapples, but unfortunately HPH does not provide the people with techniques to conserve the product. As a result, when the amount of the product is abundant during the harvesting period, the price becomes very low and, since pineapples are perishable, they have to be marketed quickly at any price. If HPH told them about conservation techniques, they would not need to sell them quickly, as they could keep them and market them later at a better price (Suharti *et al.*, 1995).

In the area, groups of farmers who should be empowered do not reach their full potential. The guidance and extension are given more individually. This is of course ineffective because, if there is problem (technical or non technical), they have to go to the extension officer individually. Moreover, there is another problem for product marketing, since marketing the product individually means the farmer has no power to determine the price. If they worked and marketed their product as a group, they could negotiate together and decide on a selling price (Suharti *et al.*, 1995).

Professional extension officers are not available in these two concessions. Field experience has shown that extension officers, who should understand not only the technical problems, but also the socio-economic-cultural situation of the people, are not doing their job well. Many of them are even outsiders who have not originated from the area, and so they do not understand the socio-cultural situation of the people (Suharti *et al.*, 1995).

The method used in deciding which alternatives to develop is based on a “top-down” approach. Everything is decided by the concessionaires and the people passively accept everything given to them. In gauging the success of the programme, we found that the people felt unsatisfied about it

and, since the activities offered by the programme do not consume most of their time and labour, some of participants still continue to practise shifting cultivation.

b. HPH-PMDH in South Kalimantan province

Not all the 11 forest concessions operating in South Kalimantan province have developed a HPH-PMDH programme regularly each year. In 1998/1999 there were only (4) four forest concessions who implemented the programme (Kanwil kehutanan Propinsi Kalimantan Selatan, 1999). The scale of programme development is relatively bigger than in Riau. For example, HPH. PT. Yayang involved 200 households, while HPH.PT. Hutan Kintap involved 180 households and HPH. PT. Kodeco 100 households. The concession allocates between 0.5 – 1 Ha of forest land to each participant to cultivate. All the participants in these three HPH are divided into farmer groups of 20–30 people. Farmer groups are already functioning well and helping to facilitate the development process. Before the programme is executed, the concessionaires carry out “a diagnostic study”, to investigate the potential of the area (biophysical, socio-cultural situation). Intensive dialogues and discussions about alternative activities are conducted. In these dialogues and discussions people are asked about their expectations and needs (Suharti, 1993).

Although people are already involved in designing the programme, so far they are still in an inferiority position. It is the concessionaires who analyse, define and determine alternative solutions to their problems. Alternative activities developed in the programme already covers all 5 (five) of the possible activities suggested, but unfortunately not all the activities were done well. Dam building in HPH. PT. Hutan Kintap, for instance, could not function properly as the dam was poorly built. It seems that the concessionaires only try to achieve the programme target and give less thought to the technical feasibility of the area. This also happened in HPH. PT. Yayang, where social conflicts arose after the concessionaires suggested that people should grow sungkai (*Peronema canescens*) on their land, while people were reluctant to do so. They were unwilling to grow because they prefer to grow other species (fruit trees and estate crops). The people consider it would be more advantages to grow these species than sungkai, as fruit trees and estate crops would be able to contribute some of their basic necessities, while if they grow sungkai, the concessionaires who would derive the benefit. In addition, the people consider that sungkai is still available in the forest, so why should they grow it? (Suharti, 1993).

Here it can be seen that concession holders seem have not taken into account the needs and desires of the people. The purpose of the programme establishment to improve the social welfare and self-reliance of the people is not being met. The people are considered only as a means to achieving their goal of getting the timber product. Although developing the programme is compulsory, with a risk of penalty for all concessionaires, they are still not aware of the importance of the active participation of the people, and this results in the failure of the programme establishment. The situation is sometimes worse when the extension worker, who should be the mediator between the two parties, failed in his task and even complicated the conflict.

c. PH-PMDH in West Kalimantan province

Of the 45 forest concessions operating in West Kalimantan, only 33 have developed HPH-PMDH activities. In this province, the scale of programme activities varies from relatively small (HPH. PT. Halisa) to relatively big (HPH.PT.Erna Djuliawati). In Halisa, the programme involves only 20 households in each village (there are two villages in the HPH-PMDH programme). The activities

include provision of production input (seeds, fertiliser, equipment), plot demonstration of annual and perennial crops, provision of health and education facilities, bridges and roads (Suharti *et al.*, 1999).

By contrast, in Erna, the programme already involves a relatively large number of households (150 households involved). The activities include guidance on rice field farming and the promotion of rubber tree growing in their former shifting cultivation area. Other activities are the provision of credit for livestock raising and transport facilities to surrounding villages (Suharti *et al.*, 1999).

Both in Halisa and Erna, before alternative activities were selected, there was already communication between the people and HPH. In order to encourage the people to be more participatory, both HPH already applied the PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal) method, so that it is the people themselves who evaluate, identify and diagnose their problems and select alternative solutions which they consider to be the most appropriate. HPH personnel were also present during the process, but they acted more as facilitators and offered help only when there were difficulties or confusion in selecting activities.

Looking at the process of HPH-PMDH establishment, it can be seen that much progress has been made in the social forestry programmes. The “top-down” approach, which was considered to be the most suitable method of programme implementation, has slowly been replaced by a combination of the “top-down” and “bottom-up” approaches. Companies’ awareness participation seems to be increasing. However, the situation needs intensive monitoring and evaluation by the Ministry of Forestry (*c.q.* regional Forest Service). Because otherwise the companies might again consider the development of the programmes only as another burden for them and therefore useless. If possible, training about the importance of community participation and how to promote it should also be given to the personnel of HPH.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It can be seen from the above that from time to time there is a dynamic in social forestry development. Beginning from when social forestry was first introduced, it showed there has been a change of attitude among professional foresters, who mostly thought they know more in the past and had more rights over the forest. They started to realise that local people also have the right to be involved in forest management, and that community participation also has an important role in determining the success of sustainable forest management. Local people’s feelings and knowledge which were often neglected before, began to receive some attention after it was realised that indigenous knowledge is also useful and valuable in certain circumstances.

The top-down approach that was previously the only method applied in programme establishment is now combined with the bottom-up approach. The newly introduced PRA method (which is actually a combination of the top-down and bottom-up approaches) has begun to be used widely in designing alternative activities in social forestry programmes.

However, although the PRA method is already being applied, the people still depend on other people (concessionaires). An increase in social welfare and environmental awareness might be

achieved, but what about people's self-reliance should the concession holders lose their concession rights. There should be other institutions which would be responsible for continuing the programmes. For instance, after HPH-PMDH finishes (HPH no longer guides and supervises), it should be handed to another institution (local government) for the continuation and monitoring of the activities. Otherwise, there is possibility that the people will continue their former activities, and the objective of increasing the social welfare and self-reliance of the people will end in failure. There should therefore be a clear and proper coordination between all parties involved in programme establishment (Forestry Department, concessionaires, local government and other institutions). In addition, intensive extension and training should also be given to the concession holders who develop the programmes, so that they really understand the purpose of programme establishment (both technical and non- technical) before implementing the programme.

Finally, regular monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of various forms of social forestry programme has to be done to anticipate any problems and divergences during execution.

REFERENCES

- Direktorat Penyuluhan Reboisasi dan Rehabilitasi Lahan. (1991). *HPH Bina Desa Hutan Sebagai Upaya Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat dan Pelestarian Lingkungan*. Proceedings of Seminar Peranan Hutan dalam Mendukung Tersedianya Pangan dan Kelestarian Lingkungan. Peringatan Hari Pangan Sedunia XI, Jakarta.
- Gintings A. Ng. and Suharti, S. (1998). *Social Factors, Local Impacts and Community Interactions in Timber Estate Establishment in Nambiar, E.K.S., Gintings A. NG, Ruhayat, D., Natadiwirya, M., Harwood, C.E. and Booth, T.H (eds)*. Sustained Productivity of Short and Medium Rotation Plantation Forests for Commercial and Community Benefit in Indonesia. CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products, Australia.
- Kantor Wilayah kehutanan Propinsi Kalimantan Selatan. (1999). Laporan Kegiatan Pelaksanaan Program HPH-PMDH bulan Februari 1999. Kanwil kehutanan Propinsi Kalimantan Selatan, Banjarbaru.
- Kartasubrata, J. (1990). 'Review of Community Forestry programs in Selected *Proceeding Seminar on Research Policy for Community Forestry*. RECOFTC, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Lembaga Alam Tropika Indonesia (LATIN). (1998). *Proposal Program Mendukung Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pengelolaan Hutan di Indonesia*. LATIN, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Manan, S. (1995). *Establishment of Transmigration Timber Estate Program to Save Forest Resources in Indonesia*. Paper presented on International Seminar on Population Resettlement for Poverty, Alleviation, Department Transmigrasi dan Pemukiman Perambah Hutan.
- Mile, Y. (1992). *Penelitian HTI Agroforestry dan HPH Bina Desa*. Makalah disajikan pada Seminar Hasil-hasil Penelitian HTI, TPTI dan Agroforestry. Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Hutan, Bogor.
- Nair, P.K.R. (1993). *An Introduction to agroforestry*. Kluwer Academic Publishers in cooperation with ICRAF, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Nasendi, B.D. (1990). *Social Forestry Development (Outer Java)*. Workshop Report on Social Forestry Indonesia. FAO-APAN. FAO Regional Wood Energy Development Program in Asia, Bangkok, Thailand.

- Nasikum. (1990). *Percikan pemikiran FISIPOL UGM tentang Pembangunan*. FISIFOL UGM, Yogyakarta.
- Perum Perhutani. (1982). *Proceeding Lokakarya Pembangunan Masyarakat Desa Sekitar Hutan*. Perum Perhutani, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Poffenberger, M. (1990). *Keepers of the Forest. Land Management Alternatives in Southeast Asia*. Kumarian Press, Connecticut, USA.
- Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Antropologi Ekologi – Universitas Indonesia. (1998). *Laporan Diskusi Perumusan Konsep Partisipasi Masyarakat Desa Hutan Dalam Pengelolaan Hutan di Indonesia*. Program Pasca Sarjana Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Soetrisno, L. (1990). *Social Forestry Development; Two Words. Social Forestry in Indonesia* “FAO-APAN. FAO Regional Wood Energy Development Program in Asia, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Soetrisno, L. (1994). ‘Basic Social and Political Requirement for Sustainable Social Forestry Hartadi, S. Sambas, Sumardi and I. Heru (eds.), *Social Forestry and Sustainable Forest Management*.
- Suharti, S. (1993). *Socio-Economic Aspects of Shifting Cultivation in South Kalimantan, Indonesia*. A case study in two forest concessions (HPH PT. Yayang and HPH PT. Hutan Kintap). MSc-thesis. Wageningen Agricultural University, the Netherlands.
- Suharti, S., Asmanah, W., and Murniati. (1995). *Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat di Sekitar Hutan Melalui Program HPH Bina Desa*. Prosiding Seminar dan Pameran Ilmiah Peranan MIPA dalam menunjang Pengembangan Industri dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan. Fakultas Matematika dan Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam Universitas Pakuan, Bogor, 6 Desember 1995.
- Suharti, S., Asmanah W. and Lincah A. (1999) *Peningkatan Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Kegiatan Pengelolaan Hutan Melalui Pelaksanaan Program HPH-PMDH*. Makalah disampaikan dalam Ekspose Hasil-hasil Penelitian “Penerapan Teknik Konservasi Tanah dan Peningkatan Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Kegiatan Pengusahaan Hutan. Bogor, 11 Februari 1999.
- Sukandi, T. (1990). *Pembangunan Hutan Tanaman Industri dengan Sistem Agroforestry*. Prosiding Diskusi Hutan Tanaman Industri. Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kehutanan, Jakarta.