

German Alumni Forestry Network (GAForN)

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

**Multipurpose Forestry: Managing and Enhancing
Ecosystem Services and Production Functions of
Forests, Woodlands and Trees Outside the Forests**

9th to 13th November 2009

Forest Research Institute, Dehradun, India

ABSTRACTS



DAAD

Forest Research Institute
(Indian Council of Forestry Research & Education)
P.O. New Forest, Dehradun

Forests contribute in many ways to human well-being, and many of these contributions can be enhanced by intelligently managing the forest resource. International networking and sharing of experiences is among the most crucial sources of spreading and advancing sustainable forest management. The German Alumni Forest Network has the objective to foster this type of networking, which is also the background for this symposium.



Published by:
Director
Forest Research Institute, Dehradun

Printed at:
Saraswati Press,
2 Green Park, Niranjapur, Dehradun
Ph. 0135-2726694



Forest Research Institute
P.O. New Forest, Dehradun, India

German Forestry
Alumni Network

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

MULTI-PURPOSE FORESTRY

Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2009



DAAD

INTRODUCTION

This booklet in your hand includes abstracts of the papers submitted by participants of the German Alumni Forestry Network (GAForN) International Symposium on "Multi-Purpose Forestry: Managing and Enhancing Ecosystem Services and Production Functions of Forests, Woodlands and Trees Outside the Forests" organised at Forest Research Institute, Dehradun, India from Nov 9 to 13, 2009.

The themes of symposium are:

- Multi-purpose forestry
- Ecosystem services
- Non-wood forest products (NWFP)
- Trees outside forests (TOF)

Special thanks are to the authors for their contributions to the scientific programme of this symposium. Full papers are slated to be published after the Symposium.

We extend you a warm welcome; enjoy your stay at Dehradun

Prof. Dr. Christoph Kleinn

Director, Centre for Tropical and Subtropical Agriculture and Forestry (CeTSAF), Professor of Forest Inventory and Remote Sensing, Georg-August Universität Göttingen, Germany

Dr. S.S. Negi

Director, Forest Research Institute, Dehradun, India

Dr. Dinesh Kumar

Organising Secretary, Forest Research Institute, Dehradun, India

Note: The abstracts have been published as received from authors with minimal editorial inputs. Authors have the sole responsibility for their contents.

CONTENTS

Abs. no.	Title and author(s)	Page
1.	Community Agreement as Strategy for Managing Forest Products in the Vicinity of Lore Lindu National Park in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia — <i>Marhawati Mappatoba</i>	1
2.	Multi-Purpose Forestry in Natural Park Resource Management: The Case of Biak-na-Bato National Park, San Miguel, Bulacan, Luzon Philippines — <i>Cristina C. VJuan</i>	2
3.	Forest Design in a Changing World — <i>K. v. Gadow, V. P. Tewari and J. Corral Rivas</i>	4
4.	Driving Forces of Resource Governance in the Forestry Sector of the Philippines — <i>Herminia C. Tanguilig</i>	5
5.	Trend of Forest Cover Change in Sundarban Reserved Forest – An Application of Satellite Remote Sensing — <i>Mariam Akhter and Elmar Csaplovics</i>	6
6.	Functional Species Group Composition and Biodiversity Conservation in Managed Forests — <i>Hubertus Pohris</i>	7
7.	Line Enrichment Planting in Rehabilitation of Logged-over Dipterocarps Forests: A Review of Resource Sustainability — <i>Prijanto Pamoengkas</i>	8
8.	Reforestation with Chinese Yews – Source of Valuable Non-Timber Forest Products — <i>Zhang Deshun and Li Xiufen</i>	10
9.	Ecosystem Services from Smallholder Tree Farms in Leyte Island, Philippines: CO ₂ Equivalent, Opportunities and Challenges — <i>Arturo E. Pasa and M.B. Sudaria</i>	11

Abs. no.	Title and author(s)	Page
10.	Tool to Decide Between Compliance and Voluntary Offset Standards for Forestry Carbon Projects — <i>Debojyoti Chakraborty and J.C. Kala</i>	12
11.	Litter Decomposition of <i>Rhizophora stylosa</i> , in Sabang-Weh Island, Aceh, Indonesia: Evidence from Mass Loss, and Nutrients — <i>Irma Dewiyanti</i>	14
12.	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) in Developing Countries and Forest Conservation for Climate Change Mitigation: The Indian Approach <i>V.R.S. Rawat</i>	15
13.	Ethnobotanical Survey of Non-Wood Forest Products in Northern Philippines — <i>Emilia Boadilla Abalos</i>	17
14.	Challenges and Potentials for Non-Wood Forest Products: Rattan and Bamboo Products in Vietnam — <i>Bui Nguyen Huan</i>	18
15.	Status and Trade Pattern of Non-Timber Forest Products in Community Forests — <i>Binita Shahi</i>	20
16.	Sustainable Management of High Altitude Medicinal and Aromatic Plants in Nepal: Linking with Biodiversity Conservation — <i>Netra Bhandari and Bharat Budhthapa</i>	21
17.	Status of Survey on Non-Timber Forest Products: <i>Aquilaria crassna</i> Pierre ex Situation in Ha Tinh Province, Vietnam — <i>Nguyen The Chien</i>	23
18.	Evaluating the Importance of Non-Wood Forest Products in Integrated Forestry Planning — <i>Phyu Phyu San</i>	24
19.	Eco-friendly Technologies for Sustainable Utilisation of NWFPs — <i>Vineet Kumar</i>	25
20.	Policy Options to the Effective Implementation of Community Forestry in Indonesia — <i>Dodik Ridho Nurrochmat</i>	26

POLICY OPTIONS TO THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY FORESTRY IN INDONESIA¹

Dodik Ridho Nurrochmat

Institute of Forest Policy, Department of Forest Management, Faculty of Forestry,
Bogor Agricultural University (IPB), Indonesia

Email: dnrochmat@yahoo.com, dmurrochmat@ipb.ac.id

German Forestry
Alumni Network

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY

Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2009



DAAD

Abstract

One of the most important results of the Indonesian political reform 1998 was the strengthened demand for democratization of natural resource management. The paradigm of Indonesian forest management shifted from state-based forest management to community-based-multipurpose forest management or community forestry. Besides supporting the Community-Owned Forests (*Hutan Rakyat*) located in the private lands, Indonesian government also introducing three schemes to implement community forestry in the state forestlands, namely: HTI Plasma (Partnership Forest Plantation), HKm (Community Forests), and HTR (People Forest Plantation). There are two main objectives of the development of those schemes that are: first, to increase sense of belonging of the rural community towards forest resources in order to minimizing illegal logging and forestland encroachment; and second, to alleviate poverty of the rural community by giving them more access and opportunity to utilize forest resources sustainably. However, many evidences showed that the implementation of those schemes has not been as effective as expected. They have not performed convincingly in reducing deforestation, neither poverty reduction. The number of forestland has been given for community forestry tends to increase from year to year, but simultaneously illegal logging spiraled upward. As results, more than million hectares of Indonesian forest deforested every year. At the same time, the community forestry schemes gave only very low impact in improving social welfare, since millions of people within and surrounding forests are still living under poverty situation. Those ironical situations clearly appointed for the ineffective implementation of community forestry in Indonesia. This paper focused on identifying constraints of community forestry practices and discussed the policy options to ensure that those three schemes of community forestry would be implemented effectively.

Key words: community forestry, constraints, Indonesia, policy options

¹ Paper presented at the International Symposium Multi-Purpose Forestry: Managing and enhancing ecosystem services and production functions of forests, woodlands and trees outside the forests. 9 – 13 November 2009, Dehradun, India

1 INTRODUCTION

Socio-economic and political situations influenced significantly the implementation of forestry practices. In Indonesia, shifting political system towards decentralization, for instance, were resulting a massive policy of maximizing natural resource extraction in the most regions. There were indubitable evidences that during the political transition period, illegal logging spiraled upward and the deforestation rate sharply increased. One of the most important results of political reform in Indonesian forestry sector is shifting paradigm from state-based forest management to community-based forest management, mostly in the production forests.

Since a last recent decade the government of Indonesia paid more attention to address the social side of forestry and therefore supported development of the Community Forests, both in the private lands and state-forestlands. However, the implementation of these efforts has not been as effective as expected. They have not performed convincingly in improving and perfecting forest management, neither have they contributed to poverty reduction. Ministry of Forestry (2008) reported that the deforestation rate was still high - about 1.08 million hectares per year on average. Some reports also showed that poverty within and around forests is still high. Seventy-six percent of Indonesians living below the poverty line in 1999 occupied rural areas (Pradhan *et al.*, 2000). The most recent data show that the Human Development Index has a negative association with forest cover, particularly in Java and the southern part of Sumatera (Murdiyarto *et al.*, 2006). There is ongoing debate about the ways to address the constraints of Community Forestry and to ensure whether the implementation of Community Forestry can alleviate poverty and enhance forest management practices simultaneously.

This paper addressed such issues through a desk study and literature review on conducting Community Forestry in Indonesia. Based on the findings, this paper recommends several policy options for the improvement of future Community Forestry, both in private-lands, namely Community-owned forest (*Hutan Rakyat*) and in state-forestlands, i. e. Community Forestry Programs initiated by the government.

German Forestry
Alumni Network

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY
Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2009



DAAD



2 COMMUNITY-OWNED FOREST

Community-owned forest or people forest, namely in Indonesian as *Hutan Rakyat*, is a piece of forest that belong to community. According to the rule given by the Ministry of Forestry, a Community-owned forest shall have a minimum size of 0.25 ha. It shall have also canopy of woody trees or other plants with more than 50% tree's crown cover or other plant which planted at the first year minimum density of 500 trees per hectare (Ministry of Forestry, 2008).

In Indonesia, community-owned forest management is implemented through the development of various management units. A unit consists of several farmer groups with total area of at least 900 ha. Community-owned forest management can be developed on lands with ownership right (private lands) or other rights outside the forest area, e.g. communal lands, that meets the requirement for community-owned forest development (Ministry of Forestry, 2008).

3 GOVERNMENT'S INITIATED COMMUNITY FORESTRY PROGRAMS

The government's initiated Community Forestry Programs cover all activities related to and located in or around community forests. According to the legal definition given by the Ministry of Forestry, community forest is defined as a certain area of State forest, allocated and assigned by the Ministry of Forestry, as an area to be managed by a forest-dependent community or a community close to the forest in the context of poverty alleviation and sustainable forest management.

The government's initiated Community Forestry program was based on the Ministerial Decree No. 622/1998 as amended by No. 677/1998 on Community Forestry. In the same year Ministerial Decree No. 699/1998 was issued to allow a more devolved approach to Community Forestry management. It administered under the Directorate of Community Forestry, within the Directorate General of Land Rehabilitation and Social Forestry, Ministry of Forestry which has been established since 1990s. This directorate was assigned to improve the economies of forest-dependent communities and to accelerate

forest rehabilitation in the direction of sustainable forest management (Ministry of Forestry 2003).

The government's initiated Community Forestry programs were initially established in Java, Bali, Nusa Tenggara and Sumatera. The aim of these programs was mainly to encourage rehabilitation in those areas. These leaseholds were referred to as *Hutan Kemasyarakatan* (HKm - community forests). However, the legislation underpinning this program was replaced in 1999 with the passing of the new Forestry Act and Local Government Act, which devolved these decisions to districts.

German Forestry
Alumni Network

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

A revised decree, No. 31/2001, allows district regents (*bupati*) to issue communities with usufruct leases to manage State forest lands, unencumbered by any other rights or concessions for periods of up to 25 years (although shorter leases are often given in practice). These leases, which are subject to the elaboration of management plans that satisfy the district level forestry bureau, can be awarded if the community is incorporated as a cooperative, in accordance with the Cooperatives Act.

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY
Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2009

The whole government's Community Forestry program was again placed in doubt with the passing of GR 34/2004 in June 2002 which revoked the authority of district-level administrators and *bupati* to allocate timber cutting rights. Ministerial Decree No 31/2004 was issued to ensure community empowerment in the framework of social forestry. In September 2007, the Ministry of Forestry issued a new decree (No 37/2007) on social forestry that included the revised procedures for the allocation of Community Forestry permits (Ridwansyah *et al.*, 2009)



DAAD

4 COMMUNITY-OWNED FOREST AND GOVERNMENT'S INITIATED COMMUNITY FORESTRY: A COMPARISON

It is interesting to compare the Community-Owned Forest and the government's initiated Community Forestry in Indonesian context, because those terms are likely the same and closely related to the general term of Community Forestry. There seems to be general agreement among Community



Forestry, both Community-Owned Forest and government's initiated Community Forestry, about their goal: to alleviate poverty and to manage forest sustainably, but there is less agreement about their role. Though they are closely linked, goals and roles, like texts and contexts, are not the same. Among the differences, goals define what is to be accomplished and roles define who will do what, where, and when to accomplish them (Nurrochmat, 2003). The role of Community-Owned Forest needs at least one more role to exist, and the one most often mentioned is the role of government, i.e. forestry officials. On the other hand, the role of the government's initiated Community Forestry needs also people to participate in the programs. Those programs of the Community-Owned Forest and the government's initiated Community Forestry have different role and goals to achieve several specific objectives. A comparison of those programs is presented in **Table 1**.

Table 1: Comparison between Community Owned Forest and Government's Initiated Community Forestry Programs

Aspects	Community Owned Forest (<i>Hutan Rakyat</i>)	Government's Community Forestry Programs		
		<i>HTI-Plasma</i>	<i>HKm</i>	<i>HTR</i>
Role(s)	Land rehabilitation & community empowerment	Company-community Partnership	Community empowerment	Forestland rehabilitation
Goal	Poverty alleviation	Timber industry supply	Forestland rehabilitation	Timber production
Land Status	Private	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inti (core) = State ▪ Plasma = private 	State	State
Actors	Person/family/ community group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Private company ▪ Community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government ▪ Community Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government ▪ Community (group or individual)
Sources of Funding Management Model	Person/family/ community group Community Based Forest Management	Government, Private Company Collaborative Forest Management	Community, Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Based Forest Management (CBFM) ▪ Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) 	Village/Community Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State Forest Management ▪ Community Based Forest Management (<i>Hutan Desa</i>)
Rights Status	Ownership	Management (core), Ownership (plasma)	Management	Management

Source: adopted partly from Ridwanjyah et al. (2009)



4.1 *Hutan Rakyat*

Hutan Rakyat or Community-Owned Forest has important role to maintain ecosystem balance as well as to protect land from erosion and degradation in the private lands within and around rural area. *Hutan rakyat* plays also a pivotal role to empower village economy and used as one of the most important saving for households. Therefore, it is expected as one of the ways to alleviate poverty in the rural area (Nurrochmat *et al.*, 2007).

Hutan rakyat is an important timber sources to the small scale timber industries in Indonesia, especially in Java. *Hutan Rakyat* is usually dominated by several kind of tree species such as acacia (*Acacia mangium*), teak (*Tectona grandis*), mahogani (*Swietenia sp.*), pine (*Pinus sp.*), sengon (*Paraserianthes falcataria*), sonokeling (*Dalbergia latifolia*), and sungkai (*Peronema canescens*).

Teak is the most favorite tree species planted in the *Hutan Rakyat*. About three millions households in Indonesia planted 80 millions of teak's trees or in average each household has 26 trees of teak. The other popular trees of *Hutan Rakyat* are Sengon (60 million trees), Mahogani (45 million trees), and Acacia (30 million trees), while Pine, Sonokeling, and Sungkai are less popular tree species (less than 10 million trees per species). Although Sungkai's trees are not so popular in Java, however, they were planted by more than 20 thousands households, mostly in the outer Java (BPS, 2003).

4.2 *Hutan Tanaman Industri (HTI)-Plasma*

HTI-Plasma is a program under the government's initiated Community Forest which promote partnership between community and company to build forest plantations. The objective of the program is to increase the capacity of raw material supply (relative to sustainable supply) of timber-based industries, particularly pulp and paper factories. Land allocation is centrally planned by the Ministry of Forestry in the vicinity of existing pulp and paper processing plants. Household allocation of land is made according to labor availability, which is determined by the number of community members. The choice of species is limited, with strong preference for monocultures. "Superior" germplasm and

intensive technical specifications (including pest management regimes to guard against monoculture failure) are to be used and “extended” to all interested households. Production targets are to be realized from even-aged and fast-growing monoculture plantations, managed by private or state-own companies (van Noordwijk *et al.*, 2007).

Ridwansyah *et al.* (2009) reported that the core areas of plantation are in State forest areas, and the buffer areas of plantation are in private lands called plasma. As the plasma plantations are in private lands, the community has the right to manage the plantations. In managing these plantations, the community obtains fund from micro finance schemes provided by the Government. The community sells the yield of the plasma plantation to the pulp and paper factories through a local (monopolistic) mechanism.

The main advantage of this scheme is the cheap supply of wood for factories. However, the main concern is high Government expenditure, public subsidies to downstream factories, and the weak position (lack of decision-making power) of the farmers - the primary biomass producers (van Noordwijk *et al.*, 2007).

4.3 *Hutan Kemasyarakatan* (HKm)

HKm is one of the most important schemes of the government’s initiated Community Forestry. As defined in the Ministerial Decree No. 31/2001, HKm is state forest managed by local community for the purpose of economic empowerment and improvement without undermining its forest function. The management should be conducted under the principle of sustainability forest management. Principally, HKm program may be implemented throughout Indonesian forest, where there is available state forest can be determined as such.

HKm is mostly addressed to the degraded area located inside State forest area. Multi Purpose Trees Species, fruit trees, fuel woods are mainly planted in this area. The objectives of this scheme are to facilitate economic improvement, sustainable forest production for the community while improving soil fertility

German Forestry
Alumni Network

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY
Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2009



DAAD

and environmental condition or forestlands rehabilitation.

The main concern of this program is poverty alleviation through increasing the capacity of and empowering the local community in the context of sustainable forest management. This program was also designed to create jobs for local communities. It is carried out in State forest areas especially in production and protected forests.

The activities allowed in the production forest include the plantation and utilization of wood, non-wood forest products (NWFPs), and environmental services. While the activities allowed in the protected forest are limited to utilization of NWFPs and environmental services. In some places, local communities initiate the program. The resources for plantation could come from both the community and the Government (Ridwansyah *et al.*, 2009).

4.4 *Hutan Tanaman Rakyat (HTR)*

The Government Regulation No. 6/2007 introduced a new scheme for increasing the potency of production forest through collaboration with communities. The primary policy concern is to increase forests' contribution towards economic growth and to reduce unemployment and poverty (pro-growth, pro-job, pro-poor). This program has been implemented on State production-forestlands, in particular logged over areas and degraded forest lands. About 5.4 million hectares of land has been and will be allocated by the Government to this program, with local government consultation, in particular concerning the legitimacy of the State forestlands ("clean and clear"). The land allocated for people's plantations is shown in **Table 2**.

German Forestry
Alumni Network

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY
Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2009



DAAD

Table 2: Areas allocated for the people's plantation forest program

Year	Area (ha)	Number of Households
2007	1,400,000	93,333
2008	1,400,000	93,333
2009	1,400,000	93,333
2010	1,200,000	80,000
Total	5,400,000	360,000

Source: MoF (2006) in Ridwansyah *et al.* (2009)

Through this program, the Government will provide local communities with wider access to credit and markets. Each household will receive approximately 15 hectares of land to manage, not to own, for a maximum period of 100 years, and US\$ 800 per hectare in the form of a soft loan for this purposes. The 15 hectare per household figure has been calculated by the Government to be sufficient for households to make a decent living. Households should form a group in order to join the program (van Noordwijk *et al.*, 2007).

Ridwansyah *et al.* (2009) reported that there are three schemes of HTR:

- **Self-financing scheme.** By this self financing scheme namely HTR *Pola Mandiri*, the local community forms groups and the Government allocates area and issues a decree (SK IUPHHK-HTR) for every individual in the group. Each group leader is responsible for HTR implementation, credit proposals, marketing, and stewardship from the Government
- **Partnership scheme.** In this scheme, the local community develop forest plantation together with their partners, i.e. State-/private-owned companies. The local community forms groups proposed by the *Bupati* (district leader) to the Minister of Forestry. The MoF issues a decree (SK IUPHHK-HTR) to individual and assigned partners. Partners are responsible for stewardship, modal input, training, and marketing
- **Developer scheme.** By this scheme, state-/private-owned companies develop the HTR and then the Government will give the HTR to the

German Forestry
Alumni Network

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY
Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2009



DAAD

community as the IUPHHK-HTR holder. The cost of the HTR developer will be counted as the loan for the IUPHHK-HTR holder and the credit will be repaid periodically based on the contract.

German Forestry
Alumni Network

5 PROBLEMS CONCERNING COMMUNITY FORESTRY IN INDONESIA

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

After the issuance of the Ministerial decree on Community Forestry, in December 2007 the Ministry of Forestry launched a program to target 400,000 ha of community forest by 2009. However, up to August 2008, only 8,600 hectares had been dedicated to the Community Forest program in HKm scheme. This is not surprising because the trend for HKm has been highly variable over time and has tended to decline since it started. The slow progress of Community Forestry development indicates the lack of support for its development in many ways (The Jakarta Post 2008). The Directorate admits that this leasehold system is only a first step towards the devolution of forest management to communities but argues that it is a process that requires support.

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY
Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2008



DAAD

In general, the Directorate notes that the Ministry of Forestry still questions the existence of customary rights and is unsure whether traditional systems of forest management are strong or rigorous enough to deal with the current pressures on forests from the market and competing interests. It notes that the Ministry of Forestry currently does not have a system for recognizing customary rights, nor has it passed any regulations to make this possible. In this situation, local governments and non-government organizations (NGOs) can play more significant roles in facilitating communities to request Community Forestry programs in their areas. However, it is also possible that social forestry is not becoming priority issue for them (Ridwansyah *et al.* 2009).

Furthermore, Ridwansyah *et al.* (2009) reported that a thorough analysis of the existing information enabled us to identify two categories of problem that are affecting Community Forestry implementation and making it difficult to improve and perfect forest management and alleviate poverty, that are:

- a. Technical Problems
- b. Institutional Problems

German Forestry
Alumni Network

5.1 Technical Problems

Technically, the growth rate in any programs of community forestry is relatively low. It could be understood since community forest is usually intended to rehabilitate the degraded land inside forest area or watershed to improve their ecological and hydrological functions. Degraded land refers to a piece of land severely damaged due to its lost of vegetation cover hence its functions as water retention, erosion control, nutrient cycling, micro climate regulator and carbon retention is completely depleted.

German Forestry
Alumni Network

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

The degraded lands which are targeted to rehabilitate, mostly lied on remote area with very poor accessibility. A combination of a very poor site quality and bad accessibility lead for low achievement of any reforestation and rehabilitation programs included community forestry. Although, Indonesian government, communities, and other concerned parties have been and are continuing to make all efforts in order to rehabilitate degraded forestlands, however, the progress of rehabilitation, particularly through community forestry, is running slowly compared to the high rate of deforestation and degradation.

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY
Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2009



DAAD

5.2 Institutional Problems

Besides the technical constraints, there are also some institutional constraints which affecting the difficulties to conduct as well as to ensure the successful results of the community forestry. The most important constraint among those, are:



a. Inconsistency in Policies

Some substantial incompatibilities and in some extent conflicts between national and local governments, the government and communities, between private companies and communities, and among communities with regard to community forestry has lingered and affected the regulation and effectiveness of Community Forestry implementation. The basic problem is lack of synchronization of laws and regulations at national and regional levels. This problem can be explained by sectoral overlapping, such as forest conversion into other usage, due to pressure from large plantation estates and the creation of million hectares of palm oil plantation. Most of the problems originate from conflict in government sectors that ignore the needs of others. Even among Ministry of Forestry officials, policy synchronization continues to be weak, especially with regard to coordination in policy substance (Ridwansyah et al, 2009).

b. Competition for Land Allocation

Competition for land allocation is also characterized by unending pressure from agricultural and mining practices; threats to community forestry programs. Besides competition for land allocation with other sectors, some areas designated for community forestry program are not meeting community expectations, because the program in some cases will “take” or reduce their farmlands. This situation has triggered activities that jeopardize community forestry program because people are trying to fulfill their needs. This hampers the willingness of the community to participate actively in community forestry programs.

c. Incomplete Organizational Arrangement of FMUs

The Forest Management Unit (FMU) is still at the level of unit management, whereas the establishment of the FMU institution as mandated by Government Regulation No. 44 of 2004, article 32, has not been realized yet. There is still an internal problem in the Ministry of Forestry related to FMU establishment. In addition, the code of conduct for institutions involved in FMU management is

still not clearly defined. Unclear regulations on FMUs will cause uncertainty in community forestry area arrangements and with regard to the authority of the Government at various levels, responsible for the community forestry program. Therefore, to ensure long-term management of community forestry area, defining a regulation for FMUs is a high priority.

d. Low Human Resource Capacity

The low capacity of both Government officers and communities has created ineffective implementation of community forestry programs in Indonesia. Ineffective Government officers for facilitating community forestry programs has resulted in suboptimum results of community forestry that is less concerned with the process and goal achievement as well as the objective of the program. Ineffective implementation of community forestry programs could be caused also by weaker communities in terms of low skills and education, poor information access, and insufficient innovations. Furthermore, the community forestry programs are not integrated and have tended to deviate from the expected path, leading to wider gaps between the program's objectives and real achievement (Ridwansyah *et al.*, 2009).

e. Negative Perception Towards Community Forestry Programs

In some places, local communities have negative perception towards community forestry programs. In their perception, community forestry program is a way of government to convert their own or occupied lands to convert into forests. They will not loss their own or occupied farmland, so they are reluctance in participating community forestry programs. Negative perception and weak participation in a community leads to ineffective implementation of community forestry programs because of the presence of many free riders and unclear common objectives in conducting the programs. Weaknesses in community participation can also be observed in less mutual trust among communities in sharing experiences on managing community forestry programs.



6 POLICY OPTIONS TO MAKE COMMUNITY FORESTRY WORKS

The development of Community Forestry in Indonesia can be conducted in effective way, if the problems mentioned can be addressed properly. Ridwansyah *et al.* (2009) suggested a set of policy options to make community forestry works:

a. Improving Government Policy on Community Forestry

Government policy on community forestry shall be improved through several ways, i.e. developing public consultation mechanisms in policy preparation, accelerate fund disbursement for implementing Community Forestry schemes, acknowledge and respect various management patterns rather than introduce single pattern for community forestry, provision of market information for Community Forestry production, and developing participatory monitoring and evaluation.

b. Strengthening institutional capacities

Institutional capacities could be strengthened through the following actions: improve Government organization in Community Forestry; improve human resource capacity; and strengthen social capital.

To Improve Government organization in Community Forestry, some actions shall be taken, i.e. accelerate a definitive regulation on Forest Management Unit (FMU), develop institutional collaborative mechanisms, which can accommodate all parties' interests, and improve organization and mechanisms at the management level and decision-makers' level.

Human resource capacity could be improved by improving the skills and knowledge of forestry officials on Community Forestry schemes through training on various aspects of Community Forestry, i.e. social, technical, and economic aspects as well as strengthening the capacity of Community Forestry group members through stewardship, intership, and training.

To strengthen social capital, there are two strategic efforts shall be conducted, that are: First, improving mutual understanding among Community Forestry

German Forestry
Alumni Network

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY
Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, INDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2009



DAAD



stakeholders by involving all parties working in partnership Community Forestry programs, including Government agencies, NGOs, universities, research institutions, as well as local communities. Second, strengthening mutual trust among communities through regular meetings among Community Forestry group members as well as developing internal common agreement among group members on Community Forestry management.

c. Regulate fixed-forestland allocation for Community Forestry

It is a pivotal policy option to regulate fixed-forestland allocation for community forestry. Therefore, a policy shall be produced by the government for the allocation of a forest area as a community-managed area, which can be accessed and utilized by the community, through: first, establishing more realistic allocation of forest areas into the context of workable and implementable policy; and second, identifying community-managed areas supported by regulations such as *peraturan daerah* (local authority regulation) more clearly. It is important to note that more than a silvicultural or technical system, any strategy of community forestry development shall be seen as a policy matter. As a policy matter, it needs to be supported and could be achieved among other by a comprehensive regulations, better coordination, and strong commitment of central government, regional governments, communities, and all other parties.

REFERENCES

- BPS. 2003. Sensus Pertanian 2003. Badan Pusat Statistik, Jakarta.
- Jakarta Post, 2008. Forests suffer from lack support, 22 August 2008. The Jakarta Post, Jakarta.
- Ministry of Forestry. 2003. The policy of the Ministry of Forestry on Community Forestry. A paper presented at the International Conference on Rural Livelihood, Forest and Biodiversity. Bonn, Germany.
- Ministry of Forestry. 2008. Statistik Kehutanan Indonesia. Badan Planologi Kehutanan, Departemen Kehutanan, Jakarta.
- Murdiyarmo, D., Puntodewo, A., Widayati, A. and van Noordwijk, M. 2006. Determination of Eligible Lands for A/R CDM Project Activities and of

Priority Districts for Project Development Support in Indonesia. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor. 39 p.

German Forestry
Alumni Network

Nurrochmat, D.R. 2003. Comparative Policy Analysis in Development Studies: Theoretical Approaches and Learning from Cases. In: Birner, R., Nurrochmat, D.R., and Rosyadi, S. (Eds). Sustainable Forest Management: Socio-Economic and Environmental Problems. Focused on Indonesian Cases. Cuvillier Verlag, Goettingen. Pp. 100-106.

Nurrochmat, D.R., Sudradjat, A., Ramdan, H., Haryadi, D and Irawanto, D.S. (Ed.). 2007. Reposisi Kehutanan Indonesia. Departemen Kehutanan, Jakarta.

INTERNATIONAL
SYMPOSIUM

Pradhan, M., Suryahadi, A., Sumarto, S. and Pritchett, L. 2000. Measurements of Poverty in Indonesia: 1996, 1999, and Beyond. Social Monitoring and Early Response Unit. Working Paper, June 2000.

Ridwansyah, M., Susanti, A., Nurrochmat, D.R., Budiono, P and Indrajaya, Y. 2009. Constraints to the Effective Implementation of Community Forestry in Indonesia. Policy Report. SEANAFE-RECOFTC, Bangkok.

MULTI-PURPOSE
FORESTRY

Forest Research Institute,
Dehradun, NDIA
Nov 9th - 13th, 2005

van Noordwijk, M., Suyanto, S., Budidarsono, S., Sakuntaladewi, N., Roshetko, J.M., Tata, L.H., Galudra, G., and Fay, C. 2007. Is Hutan Tanaman Rakyat a New Paradigm in Community Based Tree Planting in Indonesia? ICRAF Working Paper # 45.



DAAD