

Challenges of community-based forest management considering local institutional differences between South Korea and Indonesia

by Eko Priyo Purnomo

Submission date: 03-Mar-2020 10:42AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1268163704

File name: Developmen_in_Practice-halaman-dihapus.pdf (254.92K)

Word count: 7503

Character count: 41682

Challenging of the Community-based Forest Management with Local Institution Differences between South Korea and Indonesia

1
Eko Priyo Purnomo

Department of Government Affairs and Administrations, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia
eko@umy.ac.id (corresponding author)

7
Rijal Ramdani

Departemen of Government Affairs and Administrations, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Lubna Salsabila

Departemen of Government Affairs and Administrations, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Jin-Wook Choi

Institute of Governmental Studies, Korea University, Korea

ABSTRACT

This is a descriptive and exploratory study that compares the **1** implementation of **Community Based Forest Management (CBFM)** practice between South Korea and Indonesia and discusses the political and legal basis of land and natural resources of the two countries. A triangulation method was used for data collection and analysis. As a result, this study developed a theory about successful community institution development on forest management and recommends policy for local and national government levels. Hence, the Indonesian Government can learn from the success of the Korean Government on the implementation of CBFM sustainability and articulate local institutions' strategies.

Keywords: *Community-based forest Management, Implementation and Complexity. Indonesia, Korea.*

Introduction

The aims of the paper are to portray the implementation of community-based forest management (CBFM) in Korea and Indonesia and then to suggest a comprehensive lesson learnt on it. There is no doubt that there is massive deforestation in the globe. FAO points out that the gross reduction in forest land use was 2.7 million ha per year from 1990 to 2000, 6.3 million ha per year from 2000 to 2005 (FAO and JRC 2012). Significant forest conversion to other land uses occurred in South America and Africa. Additionally, in Africa, there were statistically net annual forest area losses of 1.1 million ha from 1990 to 2000 and 2.7 million ha from 2000 to 2005 (FAO and JRC 2012). Moreover, Europe, including the Russian Federation, had a significant net annual loss of forest area of 0.4 million ha from 1990 to 2000 and then 0.6 million ha from 2000 to 2005 (FAO and JRC 2012).

In the Asian context, FAO confirmed that the increasing forest area of about 2.5 million ha per year for total 49.7 million ha from 1990 to 2010 in China because the country's planted forest initiative that started in the 1950s and continues today (FAO and JRC 2012). In South Korea the wars that occurred during the first half of the 20th century severely depleted and degraded forest areas (Hanson et al. 2015). The Japanese occupation from 1919 to 1945 and World War from 1939 to 1945 caused excessive harvesting of wood for timber and fuel from the forest (Hanson et al. 2015). From 1950 to 1953, Korean war occurred and caused more forest loss and degradation (Hanson et al. 2015). According to Lee (2014), the nation's forest growing stocks were less than 50 percent of the pre-war levels.

During the period after World War II, the accessibility of timbers from forests with high species diversity increased rapidly due to FAO technical assistance, new extraction and processing technologies (Vandergeest, Lanes, and Peluso 2006). For example, demand for cheap construction timber for the reconstruction of Japan was a significant factor at this time, first from the Philippines, then, in the 1960s, from Kalimantan-Indonesia scholars claim that Java and Northern Thailand both had forests with concentrated teak stands (Vandergeest, Lanes, and Peluso 2006). Overall, the importation of non-timber forest products of Sarawak and Dutch Borneo, currently Malaysia and Indonesia respectively Indonesia and Malaysia belong, became more significant than local distribution (Vandergeest, Lanes, and Peluso 2006).

It is a fact that deforestation has become a global problem. A yearly loss of 1.08 million hectares of forest area has been recorded from 1999 to 2005 (Rahman and Fuadi 2004, FAO 2009). However, in the middle of 1950s, South Korea has restored their forest area (Hanson et al. 2015). An approximate 3.5 million hectares of the nation's forest area increased to 6.4 million hectares in 2007 (Hanson et al. 2015). According to Kim (2005), the forest grew from 35 percent to 64 percent of the country's total area.

In Indonesian context, the government is still struggling to deal with the problems due to the mismanagement of natural resources (Moeliono, Wollenberg, and Limberg 2009). In 1995, the Indonesian government, through the Ministry of Forestry (MF), announced ministerial decree number 622/1995 titled Community-Based Forest Management - CBFM (referred as *Hutan Kemasyarakatan* in the Indonesian national language) (Safitri 2010) (Forestry, 1995). The main goal of this decree is to mobilise local communities to rehabilitate destroyed forest.

This descriptive and exploratory study aims to compare the implementation of Community Based Forest Management (CBFM) between South Korea and Indonesia and discusses the political and legal basis of land and natural resources of the two countries mentioned. This paper argued that a shifting policy that is caused by the unclear vision of the policy maker and a sub-optimal numbers of participants that is less than it needs are two things that Indonesia needs to learn from South Korea. A clear policy with strong leadership can increase the number of the participants in CBFM, resulting in more successful rehabilitation programs across Indonesia.

Literature Review

Land Tenure and Forest Resources Management

In South Korea, the percentage of the privately-owned forest is larger than the area belonging to the government—68 percent is privately owned, 24 percent belongs to the nation, and 8 percent to the local government (Park and Lee 2014). South Korea's forest plans were achieved starting from 1973 to 1987 on its legal framework on land and natural resources, while the scale of forestation since 1987 decreased. Whereas, the priority of the State shifted into the management of rehabilitated forest resources (Kim 2005). After experienced foreign exchange crisis and employment rate increase, South Korea government accomplished public work project and invested 32 percent of the project budget into forest management to raise the economy (Kim and Kim 2005). The project made 437,000 ha of forest area and succeeded in making the people understand the importance of forest management it-self (Park and Lee 2014).

The demand for public benefit from forest increased, which is attracted attention in improving the management of the forest (Kim 2005). Timber harvesting becomes the primary income of mountain villages until the early 1970's. In the 1990's the tourism income was added to income sources of mountain villages owing to the government policy that used natural resources for tourism in mountain villages (Kim and Kim 2005). According to Kim (2005), South Korea forestation is a functional prototype of

combining environmental rehabilitation and economic development since Korea accomplished economic growth by rehabilitating natural environment.^[u2]

On the other hand, in Indonesian context, article 33 of the 1945 National Constitution declares that the State has the absolute right to own and control land, water, airspace, and all other resources exist therein. Several community's engagement actions were taken in the end of New Order era in which the political shift has made a new catalyst to the social forestry formulation (De Royer 2018). Citing Safitri and Purnomo mentioned that the state holds, manages, and occupied around 60 percent of the forest. Indonesia is a unitary State whereby the central government actively directs the provincial and district governments that makes the positioning and policy of the Ministry of Forestry (MF). As the State's representative, they need to be understood clearly (Safitri 2010, Purnomo 2014). This situation differs from than that in South Korea in which the percentage of the privately-owned forest is larger than the area belonging to the government.

About 120 million hectares of Indonesia's—61 percent—is “forest land”, which should be owned and managed by the forestry department (Alliance 2008). Historically, the idea that State should own, control, and manage the land, water, air, and all others embraced therein was supported by the first President and Vice President of Indonesia, Soekarno and Hatta (Purnomo 2014). It was taken as a way to against the imperialism that manifested in the market mechanisms being unfair and relies on the colonialism (Mubyarto 2004). Mubyarto explained that Hatta was very strong in criticising the open market policy and suggesting that foreign capital and foreign investment can come to Indonesia, but there shall be a control (Mubyarto 2004).

The Idea of Community Based Forest Management

⁵ Forests cover 30 percent of the earth's land area, totalling nearly four billion hectares (FAO 2009), however, today represent about two-thirds of their historical expanse (Myers 1999).

Table 1. Global Forest Cover

Region	Total area (million ha)	Forest area (million ha)³	% of land area forested	% of land area forested
Africa	3031.0	635.4	21.4	16.1
Asia	3177.0	517.6	18.5	14.5
Europe ^b	2298.0	1001.4	44.3	25.3

North and Central America	2273.0	705.8	32.9	17.9
Oceania	856.0	206.3	24.3	5.2
South America	1784.0	831.5	47.7	21.0
Global total	13,419.0	3952.0	30.3	-

Source: FAO 2009

From the year 2000 to 2005, an annual forest net loss of 7.3 million hectares was recorded, 5.8 million hectares (79.5 percent) of which was because of forest conversion into agriculture while Africa and South America experienced the most significant net losses (Chamley and Poe 2007).

Table 2. Annual Changes in Forest Area, 1990 -2005

Region	Net Change 1990 – 2000 (thousand ha)	% change 1990 - 2000	Net change 200 – 2005 (thousand ha)	% change 2000 - 2005
Africa	-4375	-0.64	-4040	-0.62
Asia	-792	-0.14	1003	0.18
Europe	877	0.09	661	0.07
North and Central America	328	-0.05	-333	-0.05
Oceania	-448	-0.21	-356	-0.17
South America	-3802	-0.44	-4251	-0.50
Global total	-8868	-0.22	-7317	-0.28

Source: FAO, 2009

Various studies have already been conducted focusing on the CBFM implementation in Indonesia. One of which is the research of Safitri (2010) that focuses on legislation and licensing processes in CBFM implementation, dealing with the tenure security and its relation with Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) program. Other researchers also attempted to deal with economic issues and national growth towards the CBFM's implementation (Dewi, Belcher, and Puntodewo 2005). Suwarno and Nawir found that participatory modelling improves partnership schemes, while Purnomo attempted developing scenarios on multi-stakeholder forest management (Suwarno et al. 2009, Purnomo et al. 2005). In addition, scholars argued that CBFM is a model of collaborative partnership between government, NGOs, and local communities on forest management while Wulandari emphasized a critical process of social learning between local communities and the external actors (Ramdani, 2016; Wulandari & Inoue, 2018).

Other scientists also looked into forest structure and different types of the forest structure that lead to different types of community forestry (Dietz et al. 2007). However, there is a scarcity of research on how local institutions deal with the shifting dynamics of CBFM's policies and then how to strengthen local institutions to face that context.

For instance, Dietz's research only emphasises the communities' diversity of protected areas only, and Moeliono looks solely at the decentralisation process in industrial forest areas (Moeliono, Wollenberg, and Limberg 2009).

In other words, the research is expected to contribute and to encourage policymakers to devise policies that can help to minimise poverty, reduce deforestation, and raise ecological awareness according to the community's institutional approaches, particularly, on how to strengthen local institutions and how the institutions work on CBFM policy (Quinn et al. 2007). Therefore, understanding the other scholars that focused on REDD and global contexts is important but this research would highlight to strengthen local communities in dealing with national and local policies dynamics.

In this present study, institutions can consider the inclusion of formal and customary laws (North 1991, Quinn 2007, Smajgl and Larson 2007). Institutions mean the direction that people use to organise all forms of repetitive and structured interactions, including those within families, neighbourhoods, private organisations and government (Ostrom 2005). North (1991) proposed a critical difference between organisation and institutions as follows; organization is a group of people that want to achieve the same goals, bounded by common purposes, while institutions are mainly the rules of the game, or code of conduct that define social practices and interactions among the stakeholders.

In Indonesia, the CBFM policy emphasises the role of the local community in managing and monitoring the State forest areas within a specific period and license (Forestry 1995). This policy has a goal that relies on understanding the process of policymaking regarding natural resources management, which requires balancing between the aims of providing equitable access and sustainability. For instance, the existing policies allow or put the control of natural resources in the hands of few people, especially those who are close to the political leaders of the State. As a result, industries such as the timber industry and palm industry accessed and occupied nearly 63 million hectares of forest in 1995, which rose to 69 million hectares in 2000 (Forestry 2002). Also, Indonesia annually loses forest revenue of nearly two billion USD in unpaid taxes, more than 50 percent of this being as a result of illegal activities.

Therefore, extensive logging in Indonesia is a crucial issue of concern because it is losing an approximate size of 40 football fields of forest every day. Whereas, Indonesia is supplying 20 percent of the total log needed in Asian, which further resulted in more deforestation in the said country (Alliance 2008). The involvement of the logging industry into corruption and tax evasion are some of the reasons behind the loss of revenue of the country (HNW.org 2010). Furthermore, the weak law enforcement and lack of transparency resulted in the lack of accountability of loggers.

With regards to the issues as mentioned earlier, Indonesian forest policies appear to be industry oriented and less sensitive to the needs of local communities (Safitri 2010, FAO and JRC 2012). For instance, the income per capita of the people living in the communities within and near forest areas is less than 1 USD a day (FAO and JRC 2012). Furthermore, even where there have been policies with community-based forest management, those policies have not been successfully implemented because of the lack of community involvement. Therefore, the involvement of many stakeholders in the natural resource management by the participation of communities is a solution to forest resources management in Indonesia, but this must be controlled and negotiated, especially by the community; otherwise, it will only create new problems.

Analysis

Community Based Forest Management in South Korea

In 1910, the Korean government managed pine forests; however, the number of destroyed forest near villages continued to rise (Charnley and Poe 2007). Moreover, during Japanese colonisation (1910-1945), several deforestations occurred such as Virgin forest exploitation for construction and cutting down of in-land pine in Uljin and Bongwa. The initiative of the government to replant trees did not succeed (Charnley and Poe 2007). Whereas, massive deforestation continued to happen during the Korean War from 1950 to 1953.

Table 3. The change in Devastated Forest Area (unit in hectares)

Year	1946	1953	1960	1965	1970	1975	1980	1985	1987
Area	412.0	607.0	524.4	120.8	89.9	70.0	34.0	5.3	1.2

Source: Service, 2017

According to Korea Forest Service (2017), the forest area is approximately 6,408,069 ha or about 63.7 percent of the total land area of South Korea (Services 2017). Twenty four percent of forest area belongs to the government, 8 percent belongs to the local government, and 68 percent belongs to private corporations or individuals (Services 2017). According to Ministry of Forest Service (2009), forest sequester greenhouse gases provide essential goods and service to humanity and wildlife inhabitants, reduces greenhouse gas. In the 1970s, the Korea government implemented a series of forest rehabilitation projects which covered 6.4 million ha and 634 million m³ volume stocks with approximately 8,000 plant and 500 animal species (Service 2009). Accordingly, South Korea together with Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Russian Federation, and United States of America (USA) worked on a scientific framework for sustainable forest management using the Montreal Process and a set of national-level indicators (Service 2009).

Songgye is a traditional social institution in Korea for forest management practiced by the local residents, a type of public participation in forest management initiated during the Joseon Dynasty (Chung, Lee, and Lee 2011). As a resource management organisation, *Songgye* was to provide three important types of public infrastructure; (1) provide appropriation rules, (2) to tackle challenges of infrastructure provided by the communities, and (3) monitoring of rule compliance and sanctioning of unlawful activities (Chung, Lee, and Lee 2011). Roshetko et al. (2008) argue that smallholder tree-based systems play remarkable roles in the local communities'

subsistence, both in wood and non-wood products and contribute for the public good (Roshetko 2008).

In 1987, the Republic of Korea established Korea Forest Service with the core function of administering and managing state-owned forests (Service 2009). Following with the Montreal Process that endorsed 7 criteria in 1995, these are: (1) Conservation of biological diversity; (2) Maintenance of productive capacity of forest ecosystems; (3) Maintenance of forest ecosystem health and vitality; (4) Conservation and maintenance of soil and water resources; (5) Maintenance of forest contribution of long-term multiple socio-economic benefits to meet the need of societies; (6) Maintenance and enhancement of long-term multiple socio-economic benefit to meet the needs of the societies; and (7) Legal, institutional and policy framework for forest conservation and sustainable management (Service 2009). The government of South Korea initiated a large-scale reforestation program and set up the national forest plan for every ten years from 1973 to present in order to rehabilitate destroyed forests (Service 2009).

South Korea launched its first national forest plan in 1973 entitled Forest Rehabilitation (Lee 2015). This initiative resulted in the remarkable progress of about 1,080,000 ha reforestation by the end of 1982 (Park and Lee 2014, Services 2017). The second national forest plan took place in 1979 and was devised to establish large-scale commercial forest in which the government of South Korea initiated various forest policies regarding improvement of national rehabilitation project and forest protection, promotion of forest development fund to support private forest management, grouping and expansion of national forest, and implementation of forest conservation project in improving common benefits. As a result, about 970,000 ha were reforested, and the development of 80 large-scale commercial forests over 320,000 ha (Service 2009). The third national forest plan took place in 1988 with the goal of enhancing the economic capacity of forest and improving common benefits of the forest, and to promote the effectiveness of forest management practices as its objectives. In 1998, the initiation of a plan that focused on establishing a foundation for sustainable forest management as its primary objective (Service 2009). In the current, the Korean government included another national forest plan consisting of five strategies in its 25 action plans that promote sustainable forest management in order to optimise multiple functions of the forest based on the legal and policy framework (Service 2009, Services 2017). Hence, policy evolved to match the economic growth of the said country, and as a result, deforestation was eradicated (Kim and Kim 2005).

Table 1. The strategies and action plans of the Fifth National Forest Plan (2008-2017)

Five Strategies	Twenty-five Action Plans
Integrated management and development of multi-functional forest resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement sustainable forest management at the national and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local level • Expand carbon sinks in response to climate change • Strengthen support system to enhance common benefits of forest • Develop sustainable forest resources • Strengthen infrastructure for the development and management of forest resources
<p>Development of forest industry for the use of renewable forest resources, and promotion of industry competitiveness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop environment-friendly wood industry • Strengthen competitiveness of forest resources for short-term returns and establish local-based industry cluster • Increase growth potential of new industries, such as BT and ET • Promote competitiveness of private forest land and establish infrastructure for stable income in the forestry sector • Increase export of food from the forest and active response to forest products trade
<p>Systematic conservation and management of forest as national terrestrial resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish forest land management system in accordance with well-balanced land development • Conserve biological diversity of forest and enhance forest health and vitality • Conserve ecological axis of national territory in the Korean Peninsula, such as the Baekdu mountain range

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent and response to forest disaster with scientific knowledge • Conserve and promote scenic view of forest
<p>Development of green space and environmental services in order to improve the quality of people's life</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop green space in urban area • Increase recreational, cultural and hiking services corresponding to public demand • Create amenities available for hiking and other sports activities in the mountain • Enhance social function of the forest and increase employment opportunities in the forestry sector • Strengthen public service functions of national forest • Promote the value of mountain villages in terms of multifunctional living space
<p>Reinforcement of international Cooperation for resources development and global forest conservation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen cooperation initiatives for resource development and broaden overseas plantation • Strengthen and engage in international collaborative networks, such as the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) • Strengthen multi-national cooperation • Strengthen inter-Korea forest cooperation by stages, such as forest rehabilitation in North Korea

Source: [Services 2017](#)

From 1972 to 1997, 68 percent of the total forest area in South Korea was privatised (Lee 2015). The KFS provided not only seedlings and fertilisers but also technology transfer and tax benefits for forestland owners aiming to encourage them in restoring their respective forestland (Service 2009). KFS focused in Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) principle towards harmony between the environment, economy, and society (Lee 2015). Moreover, in the year 1998 to 2017, forest management through public participation was proposed to ease the conflict between forest conservation and urban development (Services 2017). The Korean civil society criticised the development plans made by the government and private enterprises by executing a campaign, demonstration, petition filing, and demanding demand-centric policy approach instead of supply-centric approach (Lee 2015).

Table 2. Forestation Areas (Unit: 1,000 hectares)

Classification	The First Plan (1973-1978)		The Second Plan (1979-1987)		The Third Plan (1988-1997)	
	Goal	Achievement	Goal	Achievement	Goal	Achievement
Fruit Trees	300	154	50	28	13	15
Rapid-growing species	300	360	750	442	42	33
Long-Growing species	195	358	700	496	247	254
Others	205	208		109	15	19
Total	1000	1080	1500	1075	317	321

Source: [Services 2017](#)

The Republic of Korea successfully Implemented the National Reforestation Program by restoring the forest ecosystem during the implementation of the First and Second Plans with 77 percent un-stocked area decreased, 9 percent of forest area increased, and a total of growing stock increased 270 percent (Junghan Bae, 2012). President Park Chung-hee (1963-1979), was the first leader to make reforestation a national priority and was champion of restoration during his tenure and also emphasised in his public addresses that planting trees is an act of patriotism that would make the nation strong. According to Buckingham and Hanson (2015), several factors lead

South Korea into its success; these are (1) Leadership, (2) Policy and Institutional Condition, (3) Participation and (4) Awareness.

The Community Movement started in 1971 along with President Park that transferred Forestry Administration from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry to the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) for the connection of forestation and New Community Movement in 1973 (Hanson et al. 2015). President Park himself led the planning, implementation, and coordination of the program by transferred the KFS to the MOHA for more effective implementation, and coordinated national finance and administrative power to fully support the Program (Kim et al. 2018). In this case, in order to a developing country with a low-income level to solve the problem requires strong and committed leadership along with the efforts Program (Kim et al. 2018).

The Community Movement started in 1971 upon the transfer of Forestry Administration from Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry to Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) (Hanson et al. 2015). President Park led the planning, implementation, and coordination of the said transfer to ensure the efficacy of the said program. Hence a strong and committed leadership is needed to address critical issues such as deforestation (Kim et al. 2018).

Additionally, clear policy objectives and continuous promotion are needed to bring out the capacity of the citizen. Furthermore, the government initiated a nationwide campaign to educate the citizens about the benefits restoration to gain commitment from the public, which shall be helpful in the implementation of the program (Hanson et al. 2015). Along with this method, the government did the promotion of reforestation by appealing to patriotism and invoking a sense of duty among the public and present clear policy goals and use a systematic publicity strategy (Forestry, 2013). Ministry of the MOHA played a vital role in the implementation of the first reforestation plan by concentrating on encouraging rural people to participate in the said program and advocating conservation (Park and Lee 2014). Hence, public participation was crucial to the success of ROK. According to Park and Lee (2014)(2016), participatory activities by private actors in managing forest depended on three environmental rights; (1) access to the information, (2) public participation in decision making, and (3) standing in court (Park and Lee 2014). They also added four dimensions of public participation, such as information sharing, consultation, collaborative decision-making, and implementation (Park and Lee 2014) (Lee, 2016).

Table 3. ² Result of Forest Management Public Work Project

Classification		Total	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Budget (100 million won)	Government Public Work Project (A)	18,383	2,083	7,000	5,300	2,500	1,500
	Forest Mangement Public Work Project (B)	5,804	549	1,766	1,589	1,200	700
	² % (B/A)	32	26	25	30	48	47
Forestry field employment (1,000 persons)		15,544	1,486	4,833	4,299	3,22	1,706
² Managed Forest Area (1,000 hectare)		437	43	130	117	95	52

Source: [FAO, 2009](#)

Community Based Forest Management in Indonesia

The policy and their implementation significantly influence the development of the sustainable CBFM in Indonesia. If the policy is enabling the stakeholders to utilise the forest resources properly, it is likely that the forest resources management will be preserved and sustained (Kaskoyo, Mohammed, and Inoue 2017). In this case, the policy is a rather broad term and refers to the various rules, regulations, ownership mechanisms, and financial incentives that have been formed by the Indonesian Government concerning CBFM. In the middle 1990s, the Minister of Forest of Indonesia (MF) committed to create a new forest management regime that is based on empowering the local community (Safitri 2010). The first decree that was enacted by the MF is decree no 622/KPTS/1995. This decree gave a chance to communities to gain access to the state forest (Safitri 2010). However, the MF already ratified several regulations on the CBFM project. From 1995 to 2009, the MF revised the decree on the CBFM five times. On the other hand, the local governments at both the provincial and district level also amend some regulations (Kaskoyo, Mohammed, and Inoue 2017). As a result, the changing of CBFM policies and synchronisation of its policies between the Central and local governments is important to understand (Sieniawski 2011, Schulte and Sah 2000).

Forest destruction started due to the forest degradation during the colonialism period (Purnomo, 2011). In the late 18th century, the process of forest degradation began in Java Island, which is mainly on account of extreme teak harvesting carried out by the East India Company (*Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie*, VOC) and Javanese

enterprise (Safitri 2010). In 1840, Java and Madura area was 9.6 percent teak forest and 38.7 percent forest of other timber species (Safitri 2010). As a result of VOC central control, there was a lack of consideration and marginalization of local people.

The concept of benefit sharing was not implemented appropriately. Which means the forest should give profit not only to a privileged few but also to society as a whole. Many regions that have natural resources and contribute to the national income only get small benefits (Moeliono, Wollenberg, and Limberg 2009). Besides, the existing forest management policy works with limited transparency and accountability. Unjust processes lead to many conflicts, not only between central and local government but also between government and communities.

Forest resources policy of Indonesia relies on the centralised approach but demands on a decentralised approach. Forest resources management was implemented to produce profits for the Indonesian government during the New Order regime, Suharto era (Safitri 2010). However, this policy produced problems such as deforestation, poor community, and unsustainable forest. In effect, a decentralised approach was introduced as a solution called the Reformation Order Era. The shifting of CBFM policy implementation is explained on two levels: central government policy and local government policy (Safitri 2010).

CBFM Policy was initiated as a national project in 1995 by Mr. Djamaludin Suryo hadikusumo. Latter enacted the Ministerial Decree no.622/KPTS-II/1995 which states that the community has limited rights on using and accessing the forest (Pumomo 2014). Even if they have a licence, it is limited in degraded forest areas, and they cannot harvest the timber. The central government claimed that this policy is a model of development of community-based forest management and can rehabilitate the degraded forest. The community acted as forest security officer and the revenue previously received by the government from forestry decreased. Because of the lack of profit from the forests, the government gave the forests to the community. In this case, the community must use its local resources to be able to meet the needs in managing a forest without an appropriate community capacity building. It seems that re-allocate of the resources from the state or industries to local communities is not possible (Suwarno et al. 2009).

After the fall of Soeharto's regime, the political contexts and structure changed drastically (Safitri 2010). The resources' policy altered from the state-based to the community-based. Soeharto reigned after more than 32 years, and his term is labelled the new-order period. In 1998, the Minister of Forestry introduced a new decree, which is the ministerial decree no. 677/1999 (Safitri 2010, Sandker, Campbell, and Suwamo 2008). They said decree stipulates that the community has a right to use, occupy and gain access to the forest for 35 years. Despite being one of the principal actors in forest management, the community remains subject to the rules. Whereas, the community can

get a license to occupy a small-scale forest area and can access the said area only as a group.

By Ministerial Decree No 622/1995, the Ministry of Forestry initiated the CBFM programme. Furthermore, in 1999 the Enactment of Law No. 41/1999 on Forestry and No. 22/1999 on Local Government were introduced by the central government (Purnomo 2014). These laws led the Ministry of Forestry to generate a new policy on CBFM, which is the Ministerial Decree No. 677/1999.^[u7] However, in 2001, Dr Nur Mahmudi Ismail, the Minister of Forestry, revised Ministerial Decree No. 677/1999 and made a fresh Ministerial Decree, No. 31/2001. Decree No. 31/2001 also responded to the Enactment Law No. 22/1999 on Regional Government. According to the Enactment Law no. 22/1999, the central government should distribute their authority to the local government (Safitri 2010, Purnomo 2014). Therefore, based on the Decree No. 31/2001, the local government is the main actor of this implementation of CBFM, where the district leader can give the right to the local community to use the forest resources. However, this policy did not last long. Ministry of Forestry enacted the Decree No. 37/2007 and then the Decree No. 18/2009. **These regulation shifts implies the inconsistency and the uncertainty of CBFM policy in Indonesia.**

Table 4. Shifting Policy in Indonesia Forest Managements

No	Policy	Details
1.	The Minister of Forestry Decree no 622/1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Gives the local community access to the state forest area. The community can participate and be involved in the project although not actively involved. b. An alternative action to conserving and rehabilitating the forest, at the same time it can distribute the forest resources
2.	The Minister of Forestry Decree no. 677/1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The CBFM areas are allocated not only in production forest areas, but also in protected forest areas and certain areas within conservation zone. b. The community get a licence to use the forest areas for 35 years. c. Communities should create a CBFM master Plan that guides on forest management and commercial utilisation to forest.

-
- d. Any participation is not on an individual basis or any other groups, but it relies on the local community.
 - e. CBFM licence holder is no different to a small or medium logging enterprise.
 - f. Communities have been persuaded to develop their forest as tourism destinations.
-
3. The Minister of Forestry
Decree no. 31/2001
- a. Local government have the authority to implement the CBFM Program.
 - b. The allocated state forest for CBFM is only production and protection forest areas.
 - c. The community is granted a licence after the MF has stipulated the CBFM areas, based on an inventory by the Regency Government
 - d. The duration of the licence is decreased from 35 to 25 and the community should prepare their master plan before definitely obtaining their full licence.
-
4. The Minister of Forestry
Regulation no. 37/2007 and
19/2009
- Regulation no 37/2007:
- a. The licence can obtain 35 years and it can be extended
- Regulation no. 18/2009:
- a. The submission procedure of CBFM.
 - b. The licence holder's right.
-
5. **Local Government Policy**
The Minister of Forestry
Regulation no. 252/2002
- a. The forest areas is used and managed by local communities.
 - b. The communities can get a benefit from the forest by both direct revenue (woods & non timber) and indirect revenue air and water)
 - c. The forest area is claimed by the local communities.
 - d. Local communities have already proposed to get a business licence for utilization of CBFM permits.
-

-
- e. Those forests are obliged to raise any ecological, social and political problems, such as illegal logging, fire forest, and conflict of interest.
-

Source: Purnomo 2014

From 2001 to 2012, there were several government policies created to accommodate the political interests of the central government, local government, and the needs of the local community. However, CBFM lacked proper implementation. Hence, the frequent decree amendments in the central government caused local community difficulties in establishing local policies. In this case, only a few local communities obtained a licence from the district leader (Safitri 2010, Sepsiaji and Fuadi 2004). On the other hand, the district leader also could not risk breaking the national rules even though local communities had already been managing the state forest areas. Therefore, it appears that the community is “illegally” using the forest area. Communities who have spent time and resources but do not receive benefits, the possibility of illegal logging is high. Therefore, this confusion about the status of communities is dangerous, not only for the sustainability of the forest but also for good practice of the communities’ forest management.

In conclusion, the forest operations in Indonesia do not only marginalise the local community but also eliminate local initiatives to utilise the forest resources sustainability (Nevins and Peluso 2008). In the last decade, the Indonesian government policies have supported only the corporate (Nevins and Peluso 2008). These circumstances need an urgent response to solve that situation. The response could not only save the forest but could also reallocate and redistribute the forest resources from state or market-based orientation to community-based orientation. Therefore, CBFM is suggested to resolve mismanagement on forest resources.

Conclusion

¹ The basic idea of CBFM is a synergy between local people and their environment, and it is the changing of policy-based from a state to community-based. The community forest is a ecosystem managed by multiple users on a sustainable way to be aware of local needs. Moreover, CBFM policy supports the idea of decentralisation of power and authority.

In Indonesia context, Forest resources policy depends on the centralised approach, but it demands on a redistributed approach. On the other words, the forest operations in Indonesia do not only marginalise the local community but

also eliminate local initiatives to utilise the forest resources sustainability. As a result, the government established the program called community-based forest management in 1995. In addition, there were several government policies created to accommodate the political interests of the central government, local government, and the needs of the local community from 2001-2012.

The sifting policies make several consequences. For example, Indonesia has weak farmers compared to other nations. The changing of policy is a significant obstacle to the local communities and other stakeholders. The implementing customary laws, such as codes of conduct, customs, local knowledge, and social expectations are quite promising. The crucial problem in local institutions is participating in decision-making processes. To improve and strengthen formal institutions such as the capacity building, bottom-up approach and can be done to individual and communal level should be implemented. The State is the leading actor in both Countries, and they are not a homogenous actor, each level of government apparatus has its own interest.

Lesson learned for Korea can be look at as the Korean way on reforestation on sustainable policy. Korea succeeded in reforestation in the brief period due to economic growth, strict rule, and the use of forests as tourism village or production of medicinal plants. The success of Korea did not replicate in Indonesia for several reasons. Hence, Indonesia is a big country with different communities and cultures and decentralisation creates a conflict between local and central government. Now therefore, this study suggests ways on how to encourage the local community to optimise their institutions and develop institutions properly and why the State should take the lead on CBFM by creating a robust rule. Indonesian government can learn from the Korean government by establishing a strict rule, developing incentive and disincentive program, and encouraging local.

Acknowledgment

We would also like to show our gratitude to the blind reviewers and the editor for giving us very constructive comments and suggestions. We would also thank to Prof Klaus Huback from the University of Maryland and Prof P.B Anand from University of Bradford who provided insight and expertise that greatly assisted the research. In addition, the authors are thankful to the Korean Foundation for Advanced Studies (KFAS) and Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY) for their generous support on this research process and outcome.

References

- Alliance, Indonesian Forest Climate. 2008. *Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in Indonesia : IFCA consolidation report*. Jakarta: Forestry Research and Development Agency, Ministry of Forestry of Republic of Indonesia.
- Charnley, Susan, and Melissa R. Poe. 2007. "Community Forestry in Theory and Practice: Where Are We Now?" *Annual Review of Anthropology* no. 36 (1):301-336. doi: [10.1146/annurev.anthro.35.081705.123143](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.35.081705.123143).
- Chung, JW, ME Lee, and HD Lee. 2011. "Characteristics of Environmental Pollution Related with Public Complaints in an industrial Shipbuilding Complex, Korea. Journal." *Environmental Monitoring Assessment* no. 177. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-010-1619-9>.
- De Royer, S., Van Noordwijk, M., & Roshetko, J. M. 2018. "Does community-based forest management in Indonesia devolve social justice or social costs?" *International Forestry Review* no. 20(2) (2018):167-180. doi: 146554818823767609.
- Dewi, S., B. Belcher, and A. Puntodewo. 2005. "Village economic opportunity, forest dependence, and rural livelihoods in East Kalimantan, Indonesia." *World Development* no. 33 (9):1419-1434. doi: DOI 10.1016/j.worlddev.2004.10.006.
- Dietz, J., D. Holscher, C. Leuschner, A. Malik, and M. A. Amir. 2007. "Forest structure as influenced by different types of community forestry in a lower montane rainforest of Central Sulawesi, Indonesia." *Stability of Tropical Rainforest Margins: Linking Ecological, Economic and Social Constraints of Land Use and Conservation*:133-148.
- FAO. 2009. *State of the World's Forests*. Rome, Italy: (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations)
- FAO, and JRC. 2012. *Global forest land-use change 1990-2005*. In *FAO Forestry Paper No. 169. Food and Agriculture* edited by R. D'Annunzio E.J. Lindquist, A. Gerrand, K. MacDicken, F. Achard, R. Beuchle, A. Brink, H.D. Eva, P. Mayaux, J. San-Miguel-Ayanz & H-J. Stibig. Rome, FAO.: Organization of the United Nations and European Commission Joint Research Centre.
- Tentang Pedoman Hutan Kemasyarakatan. Hutan Kemasyarakatan.*
- Hanson, C., K Buckingham, S Dewitt, and L Lastadius. 2015. *The Restoration Diagnostic: A Method for Developing Forest Landscape Restoration Strategies by Rapidly Assessing the Status of Key Success Factors*. World Resources Institute.
- HNW.org. 2010. *Indonesia: Kerugian Akibat Korupsi Sektor Perikanan* 2010 [cited 25 February 2010]. Available from <http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2009/11/30/indonesia-kerugian-akibat-korupsi-sektor-perikanan>.
- Kaskoyo, Hari, AbrarJuhar Mohammed, and Makoto Inoue. 2017. "Impact of community forest program in protection forest on livelihood outcomes: A case study of Lampung Province, Indonesia." *Journal of Sustainable Forestry* no. 36 (3):250-263. doi: 10.1080/10549811.2017.1296774.
- Kim, Eui-gyeong, and Dong-jun Kim. 2005. "Historical changes and characteristics of rehabilitation, management and utilization of forest resources in South Korea." *Journal of Mountain Science* no. 2 (2):164-172. doi: 10.1007/bf02918332.
- Kim, Ji Soo, Young Man Kwoun, Yowhan Son, and Sue Kyoung Lee. 2018. *The history of deforestation and forest rehabilitation in Korea*. edited by Korea University Division of Environmental Science and Ecological Engineering. Korea.
- Kim, S. J. W. 2005. *Syngman Rhee and The Seoul Washington Alliance 1953-1960*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.

- Lee, Kyung-Joon. 2015 *Successful Reforestation in South Korea : Strong Leadership of Ex-President Park Chung-Hee*. United States Publisher Createspace Independent Publishing Platform
- Moeliono, Moira M. M., Eva Wollenberg, and Godwin Limberg. 2009. *The decentralization of forest governance : politics, economics and the fight for control of forests in Indonesian Borneo*. London ; Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- Mubyarto. 2004. *Teknokrat dan ekonomi Pancasila*. Ed. 1., cet. 1. ed. Yogyakarta: Pusat Studi Ekonomi Pancasila, Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Myers, N. 1999. "Our forests, our future: World Commission on Forests and Sustainable Development." *Nature* no. 400 (6741):231-232.
- Nevins, Joseph, and Nancy Lee Peluso. 2008. *Taking Southeast Asia to market : commodities, nature, and people in the neoliberal age, Cornell paperbacks*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- North, D. C. 1991. "Towards a Theory of Institutional Change." *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business* no. 31 (4):3-11.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 2005. *Understanding institutional diversity, Princeton paperbacks*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Park, Mi, and Hyowon Lee. 2014. "Forest Policy and Law for Sustainability within the Korean Peninsula." *Sustainability* no. 6 (8):5162.
- Purnomo, Eko Priyo. 2014. *Strengthening local institutions in the context of shifting policies*, University of Bradford, Bradford.
- Purnomo, H., G. A. Mendoza, R. Prabhu, and Y. Yasmi. 2005. "Developing multi-stakeholder forest management scenarios: a multi-agent system simulation approach applied in Indonesia." *Forest Policy and Economics* no. 7 (4):475-491. doi: DOI 10.1016/j.forpol.2003.08.004.
- Quinn, Anthony. 2007. *Ceramic design course*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, NY: Barrons Educational Series, Inc.
- Quinn, C. H., M. Huby, H. Kiwasila, and J. C. Lovett. 2007. "Design principles and common pool resource management: An institutional approach to evaluating community management in semi-arid Tanzania." *Journal of Environmental Management* no. 84 (1):100-113. doi: DOI 10.1016/j.jenvman.2006.05.008.
- Rahman, Zain Noor., and Firman. Fuadi. 2004. *Desentralisasi dan Deforestasi*. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana.
- Roshetko, J. M., Snelder, D. J., Lasco, R. D., & Van Noordwijk, M. 2008. "Future challenge: a paradigm shift in the forestry sector " *In Smallholder tree growing for rural development and environmental services* (Springer, Dordrecht):453-485.
- Safitri, Myrna. 2010. "Forest tenure in Indonesia : the socio-legal challenges of securing communities'rights."
- Sandker, M., B. Campbell, and A. Suwarno. 2008. "What Are Participatory Scoping Models? Response to Dudley et al. 2008. "Simulating Oil Palm Expansion Requires Credible Approaches that Address Real Issues"." *Ecology and Society* no. 13 (1):- . doi: Artn R2.
- Schulte, A., and S. Sah. 2000. "Historic shift towards silviculture by people in Asia - A review and country case studies on community based forest management from Nepal, the Philippines and Indonesia." *Bodecultuur* no. 51 (4):291-299.
- Sepsiaji, Dhonawan. , and Firman Fuadi. 2004. *Pergulatan Hutan Kemasyarakatan di Gunung Kidul*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: KPHKM Gunung kidul.
- Service, Korea Forest. 2009. National Report on Sustainable Forest Management in Korea. Korea Forest Service. Korea.
- Services, Korean Forest. 2017. Forest Policy.

- Sieniawski, W. 2011. "Forest utilization in Indonesia." *Sylvan* no. 155 (4):279-288.
- Smajgl, Alex, and Silva Larson. 2007. *Sustainable resource use : institutional dynamics and economics*. London ; Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- Suwarno, A., A. A. Nawir, Julmansyah, and Kurniawan. 2009. "Participatory modelling to improve partnership schemes for future Community-Based Forest Management in Sumbawa District, Indonesia." *Environmental Modelling & Software* no. 24 (12):1402-1410. doi: DOI 10.1016/j.envsoft.2009.07.001.
- Vandergest, Peter, York Lanes, and Nancy Lee Peluso. 2006. "Empires of Forestry: Professional Forestry and State Power in Southeast Asia." *Environment and History* no. 12.

Challenges of community-based forest management considering local institutional differences between South Korea and Indonesia

ORIGINALITY REPORT

11%	%	11%	%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

- 1** Eko Priyo Purnomo, P.B. Anand, Jin-Wook Choi. "The complexity and consequences of the policy implementation dealing with sustainable ideas", Journal of Sustainable Forestry, 2017
Publication 4%
- 2** Eui-gyeong Kim, Dong-jun Kim. "Historical changes and characteristics of rehabilitation, management and utilization of forest resources in South Korea", Journal of Mountain Science, 2005
Publication 2%
- 3** Mi Park, Hyowon Lee. "Legal Opportunities for Public Participation in Forest Management in the Republic of Korea", Sustainability, 2016
Publication 1%
- 4** "National Forest Inventories", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2016
Publication 1%
- 5** "Community Forestry in Theory and Practice: 1%

Where Are We Now?*", Annual Review of Anthropology, 10/2007

Publication

6

Cubbage, F.W.. "Forest policy reformed: A United States perspective", Forest Policy and Economics, 20061201

Publication

1%

7

Eko Priyo Purnomo, Rijal Ramdani, Agustiyara, Queenie Pearl V. Tomaro, Gatot Supangkat Samidjo. "Land ownership transformation before and after forest fires in Indonesian palm oil plantation areas", Journal of Land Use Science, 2019

Publication

1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 1%

Exclude bibliography Off