

DAFTAR ISI

Gerakan Sosial (Baru) Pasca "Orde Baru"

1. PKBI: Aktor *Intermediary* dan Gerakan Sosial Baru
Haryanto, Siti Mauliana Hairini, Abu Bakar 187-199
2. Gerakan Buruh Pasca Soeharto:
Politik Jalanan di Tengah Himpitan Pasar Kerja Fleksibel
Muhtar Habibi 200-216
3. Gerakan Aktif Tanpa Kekerasan:
Sebuah Transformasi Perjuangan Masyarakat
(Kasus Masyarakat Moro-Moro Register 45 Mesuji Lampung)
Oki Hajiansyah Wahab 217-233
4. Reforma Agraria dan Aliansi Kelas Pekerja di Indonesia
Emilianus Yakob Sese Tolo 234-249
5. Optimising Community-Based Forest Management Policy In
Indonesia:
A Critical Review
Lucas Rumboko, Digby Race, Allan Curtis 250-272
6. Berlindung dalam Hak Asasi Manusia:
Strategi Pekerja Seks di Eropa untuk Mentransformasi Kebijakan
Prostitusi
Rima Nusantriani Banurea 273-292

Optimising Community-Based Forest Management Policy in Indonesia: A Critical Review

Lucas Rumboko •
Digby Race •
Allan Curtis •

Abstract

Community-based forest management (CBFM) is a popular concept in many countries, covering over 400 million hectares worldwide. In Indonesia, CBFM is viewed as an important component of the forestry sector with the government's goal to establish 5.6 million hectares of CBFM by 2011 (twice the area of industrial plantation forests). The Indonesian government is pursuing CBFM as a strategy to reduce deforestation of tropical forests, to alleviate poverty in rural communities, and to contribute timber supplies to the processing industry.

There has been a belief that CBFM can lead to a physical and socio-economic transformation at the local level. However, in practice, especially in Indonesia, this claim appears problematic because in over 35 years since it has been officially introduced it does not appear to have contributed significantly to address the problems of deforestation and rural poverty.

Despite the government's ambitious goal for CBFM, there are several challenges, for instance the entrenched poverty of many rural communities and inconsistent and unsupportive policies of CBFM at the national, provincial, and local government. This paper is intended to explore, discusses, and criticize the implementation of CBFM policies in various countries and in particular in Indonesia. This paper also aims to explore its challenges in the future development in Indonesia.

Keywords:

community-based forest management; poverty; participation; forest policy

Abstrak

Pengelolaan hutan berbasis masyarakat (CBFM) merupakan konsep yang populer di banyak negara, meliputi lebih dari 400 juta hektar di dunia. Di Indonesia, CBFM dipandang sebagai komponen penting di sektor kehutanan, dengan tujuan pemerintah membangun 5,6 juta hektar pada tahun 2011 (dua kali lipat dari hutan tanaman industri). Pemerintah Indonesia mengembangkan CBFM sebagai strategi untuk mengurangi deforestasi, kemiskinan, dan meningkatkan suplai kayu ke industri pengolahan.

Ada keyakinan bahwa CBFM akan membawa transformasi secara fisik dan sosial ekonomi di tingkat lokal. Akan tetapi dalam praktiknya, khususnya di Indonesia, tesis ini terlihat problematis karena lebih dari 35 tahun sejak CBFM dikenalkan dan dikembangkan,

-
- Junior Research Scientist at Center for Climate Change and Forest Policy Research and Development (FORDA) Bogor
e-mail: lukas_19672000@yahoo.com
 - Senior Scientist at Charles Sturt University Australia
 - Prof Integrated Environmental Management at Charles Sturt University

tampaknya tidak berkontribusi secara signifikan untuk mengatasi deforestasi dan kemiskinan pedesaan.

Selain ambisi besar dari pemerintah untuk mengembangkan CBFM, ada beberapa tantangan seperti kemiskinan masyarakat desa dan kebijakan yang tidak selalu konsisten dan mendukung, baik di tingkat nasional, provinsi, dan lokal. Paper ini juga bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi tantangan dalam pengembangan kebijakan CBFM di Indonesia kedepannya.

Kata kunci:

CBFM; kemiskinan, partisipasi; kebijakan kehutanan

International Experience of Community-Based Forest Management

Many countries around the world have introduced community-based forest management (CBFM) over the past two decades, particularly throughout South-east Asia (Poffenberger, 2006). A useful definition of CBFM is that it is “locally based management of forest and tree resources” (Nebel, Jacobsen, Quevedo, & Helles, 2003, p. 3). CBFM is a people-centred development approach, which involves local people in decisions that influence their well-being (Duinker, Matakala, & Zhang, 1991). It is seen as a “vehicle” and a “panacea” for enhancing community livelihoods, preserving forest resources, and ensuring long-term sustainability (Nebel, et al., 2003).

One of the significant driving forces for the emergence of CBFM in a large number of countries is deforestation, since for instance in Indonesia, the CBFM policy was believed to be one of important policy options to curb deforestation (Hindra, 2005; Lindayati, 2003). In tropical countries deforestation is occurring at an alarming rate (Gilmour, Malla, & Nurse, 2004), for instance, in the Philippines only 22 percent of the forest remained in 1987 (Nurjaya, 2005). Between 1973 and 1985, in Thailand forest cover lost 26 percent, Cambodia lost 24 percent, Vietnam lost 19 percent, Laos 10 percent and Myanmar lost 8 percent (Sen, Wang, & Wang, 2004). By the 1980's, growing concern over deforestation in the region resulted in many policy-makers and development

agency experts reviewing the role of industrial forestry and the capacity of state agencies to protect forest resources and support rural development, especially for poor people and other marginalised groups (Nurjaya, 2005)

Donor agencies and other organisations started introducing and promoting community-based forest management as a new model of development (Nurjaya, 2005). The main objectives of the CBFM policy in the early stages (e.g. 1960's-1970's) focused on curbing deforestation (Awang, 2004; Hindra, 2005; Hobley, 2007b), and enhancing a sense of ‘ownership’ for local communities in forest resource management (Duinker, et al., 1991). Today efforts are more focused on enhancing the livelihoods of rural communities (Charnley & Poe, 2007; Hobley, 2007b).

Another significant driving force for CBFM is poverty, as some policy analysts argued that CBFM policy can be an instrument for transforming the lives of the poor living in and surrounding forests into a better off community (Awang, 2003; Hindra, 2005; Nugroho, 2002; Peluso, 2006). Poverty is a complex problem which often includes insufficient food, income, and other inputs to maintain an adequate standard of living. Poverty relates to vulnerability to shocks to the livelihood systems, and an inability to cope with and recover from them (Bhumibhamon, 2005). Livelihood system shocks may be the result of deforestation or other natural disasters (World Bank, 2010a). Poverty is also linked with a lack of power,

security and voice, not just a limited amount of money (Roe, 2010).

Very large numbers of rural households in developing countries are living on, or under, subsistence levels on a daily basis (Arnold, 2001). For instance recent estimations based on the US\$1 a day poverty threshold shows that nearly 625 million people in Asia can be classified as poor (Fernando, 2008). These people are largely dependent on forests and tree products for their survival (Arnold, 2001). The scale of poverty also shows to some extent the failure of forest policies in countries such as Indonesia and Nepal to contribute in a substantial way to poverty elimination (Babili & Wiersum, 2010; Duinker, et al., 1991; Lindayati, 2003; Safitri, 2006).

Given the short comings forest policy in some countries, there has been a search for policy alternatives to address poverty in rural areas. They have put forward CBFM as an appropriate strategy (Mahanty, Gronow, Nurse, & Malla, 2006) and a mechanism for poverty alleviation (Gilmour, et al., 2004; Mahanty, et al., 2006; Mansuri & Rao, 2004; Nebel, et al., 2003). In Asia, CBFM is acknowledged to be a key ingredient (Mahanty & Guernier, 2008), and an innovative practice (Mazur & Stakhanov, 2008) for improving the welfare of the estimated 450 million impoverished people living in and around forests (Mahanty & Guernier, 2008).

Issues Arising from Implementation

Despite its potential to curb deforestation and to alleviate poverty in rural areas, the implementation of CBFM development has been slow to progress. For instance, during the first 10-15 years of implementing CBFM in pioneering countries such as India, Nepal and the Philippines, the focus was on developing, testing, and institutionalising effective approaches for encouraging community participation in the protection and management of forests. The main goal was

to protect and rehabilitate the degraded forests (Gilmour, et al., 2004). In other countries, including Butan, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Vietnam, CBFM is a much more recent government initiative and is still largely in its formation stages (Gilmour, et al., 2004).

Policy problems are significant contributors to the slow progress of the CBFM development. There are two particularly problematic areas at policy level; the policy-making process or policy development, and policy implementation. *Firstly*, at a policy development level, the problems relate to ineffective public participation, poor policy communication, and inadequate tenure policy, related to control of and access to forest resources by the local people. *Secondly*, at policy implementation level, the problems relate to economic and political inequity, and inadequate institutional development, especially at the local level.

Within the policy making process, public participation is one of the components for assuring the accountability and responsibility of decision making agencies (Renn, Webler, Rakel, Dienel, & Johnsom, 1993; Sunito, 2005). In reality, policy-making is often impeded by the limited participation of local people (Harrison & Suh, 2004). It is crucial that all related actors are represented (Renn, et al., 1993) and essentially representation is related to the legitimacy and fairness of the people selected to be involved in the policy-making process (Abelson et al., 2003). Full participation needs to embrace representation of poor and disadvantaged groups, not only at central level but also in local committees and other bodies (Pandit, Albano, & Kumar, 2009). It needs people's involvement not just as individuals but as a collective, such as a village community (Agrawal, 2001c). The most diverse group possible makes it more likely that all viewpoints will be heard and considered in the policy-making process (Carson & Hart, 2005).

Policy communication is another significant problem for CBFM. Essentially public participation is increasingly designed to improve consultation and communication (Hjortsø, 2004), and enhance information flow in forest resource management (Wollenberg & Kartodihardjo, 2002). However, the fragmented nature of rural populations is a real obstacle to rapid and regular communication (Garver, 1962). This problem is exacerbated by limited available information about the issues related to CBFM (Janse, 2007), especially about the dynamics of local needs and aspirations. As a result, public participation and policy communication generally have not been effective, in a situation where policy-makers ideally respond to local people's aspirations and needs quickly (Sutaryo, 2006).

The other problem is tenure policy concerning community property rights (Colchester, 2002; Contreras, Hermosilla & Fay, 2005). Tenure policy concerning state forest management has tended to limit access to forest resources for local people (Safitri, 2006; Salomo & Matose, 2007; Wulan, Yasmi, Purba, & Wollenberg, 2004), especially during periods of nondemocratic rule, for example during the Suharto regime in Indonesia (Colchester, 2002). This policy hampered the local people in gaining control of forest and woodland resources (Salomo & Matose, 2007). It has been estimated that the global forest estate covers nearly 3.9 billion hectares, of which governments control nearly 77 percent (White & Martin, 2002), and even other scientists estimated central government's own by far the greater proportion, approximately 86 percent, of the 5.4 billion hectares of the world's forests and wooded areas (Agrawal, Chhatre, & Hardin, 2008, p. 4). At least 11 percent of the world's forest is designated local communities and individuals or companies control nearly 12 percent (White & Martin, 2002).

In 2004, it was expected that the 378 million hectares of community owned and managed land would have increased to 740 million by 2015, representing 45 percent of the world's forest estate (Bull & White, 2002). However, research conducted in Kumaon, India, noted that the state still has a dominant role in determining how forest resources can be used (Agrawal, 2001c). It seems that the state retains a dominant role in deciding who is allowed and empowered to manage this resource (Agrawal, 2001c; Awang, 2003; Lindayati, 2003; Safitri, 2006; Sunito, 2005), which means that devolution of real power, especially in the most valuable forests, has not occurred. Typically, power has been retained by the state and large corporations (Awang, 2003; Barr, 2003; Campbell, 2003; Mahanty, Fox, McLees, Nurse, & Stephen, 2002; Safitri, 2006; Wollenberg & Kartodihardjo, 2002).

At policy implementation level, there is a lack of economic and political equity (Agrawal, 2001b; Agrawal & Ostrom, 2001b; Mahanty, et al., 2002). Equity is defined as the distribution and allocation of socio-economic benefits and resources (Kellert, Mehta, Ebbin, & Lichtenfeld, 2000, p. 707). Lack of economic equity means a lack of benefit sharing arrangements and weak government finances and capacity in support of the system, such as is reported to be happening in Cambodia (Sunderlin, 2004). As a result of economic inequity, community forests hardly ever contribute to the needs of the most marginalised members of the communities (Fonseca, 2004). In Nepal, for example, wealthier households tend to have a dominant role in forest user groups (FUG) (Malla, Neupane, & Branney, 2003). Political inequity means that the policies have applied tight control over the commercial use of community managed forests. In this situation the local people must gain additional permits and licenses to harvest, transport, and sell the timber, in comparison to large scale commercial

logging operations (Mahanty & Guernier, 2008). Furthermore, some elite people are able to take new opportunities, by virtue of their assets or skills, which put them in a privileged position, thereby creating further political inequities (Angelsen & Wunder, 2003).

Another problem relating to the ineffective implementation of CBFM is poor institutional development, especially at a local level (Djogo, Sunaryo, Suharjito, & Sirait, 2003). This is characterised, for example, by a low awareness level of the poorest groups of the FUG (Malla, et al., 2003). The challenge is therefore how to strengthen the legitimacy of forest governance at the local level, including customary forestry, company-community partnerships, and enhancing community participation in the management of forests. This means improving the local institutional capacities, improving transparency, creating checks and balances that enhance the security of communities' rights over forest management, and better channelling the benefits to them. Local forest management (e.g. customary forestry management) is often not democratic, equitable, or transparent (Wollenberg & Kartodihardjo, 2002). Thus, it is not possible for government sectors to be able to facilitate and anticipate the socio-economic dynamics of local people if the institutional setting is not enhanced (Sutaryo, 2006).

As evidenced above, many studies have been conducted exploring policy problems; both in policy-making processes and policy implementation. However, there are still many factors that need to be investigated further to deepen our collective understanding of the conceptual framework of CBFM and to optimise the outcomes. Optimising CBFM policy so that it can be a transformative instrument for enhancing community livelihoods, support community development, and contribute to rural economies, while ensuring the long-term sustainability of forest resources, requires research to bet-

ter understand to the significant gaps in CBFM policy development and subsequent implementation. In the following pages, we briefly identify and discuss the research gaps, particularly as they relate to CBFM in Indonesia, which are the subject of this research.

The Context for CBFM in Indonesia: Policy Stages and the Emergence of Government Initiatives

Essentially, community-based forest management (CBFM) has been practiced by local communities or indigenous people for more than 400 years (Adi et al., 2004; Peluso, 1992a; Subarudi, Idris, Achmad, Iman, & 2003), with different forms practiced at different times (Wardojo, 2003). These include *Lembo* in East Kalimantan, *Tembawang* in West Kalimantan, *Kebun Talon* in West Java; and *Repong* in West Lampung (Safitri, 2006). These models could broadly be described as forms of community-based agro-forestry (Peluso, 1993). Some sources of information indicate CBFM occurred before the Dutch colonisation in 1602 (Safitri, 2006). These models are termed 'traditional' models of community forestry; systems of local level forest management that were created spontaneously by a community (Sunderlin, 2004) without any encouragement or guidance by people or institutions from outside the local community (Sunderlin & Thu Ba, 2005).

In the post colonial state (1945 until in early New Order), CBFM had little attention from the state. When the Indonesian government issued the Basic Forestry Law (No. 5/1967), followed by the Government Regulation (No. 21/1970) concerning forest concession, the central government, through the Ministry of Forestry (MoF), started applying a timber-based paradigm, which focused on timber extraction through the provision of licenses to large-scale industries (Awang, 2004; Barr, 2003; Safitri, 2006; Wardojo, 2003). The policy has contributed some negative impacts on the livelihoods of the local

people as a result of the ecological destruction from widespread forest harvesting (Hidayat, 1996). Consequently, Indonesia has been trying to resolve social and environmental tragedies, such as forest fires, illegal logging, forest encroachment and flooding, which are taking place in more than 120 million hectares of its state forest land (Safitri, 2006; Wardojo, 2003).

The International Forestry Congress, held in Jakarta in 1978 with the theme “*Forest for People*”, encouraged the advanced development of CBFM (Subarudi, et al., 2003). With its numerous variations (Safitri, 2006; Sunito, 2005), such as community development with forest concessions, CBFM was supported by Ministry Regulations (Decrees No. 691/1991 and No. 69/1995). Under this policy, forest concession holders were obligated to support activities which contributed to the socio-economic development of communities living in and surrounding their concessions. Then in the early 1980’s, the Ministry of Forestry introduced a social forestry program in a State Forest Corporation (*Perhutani*), called the *taungya* system (*tumpang Sari*) (Awang, 2004; Peluso, 1993; Wardojo & Masripatin, 2002). This model was adopted from the Dutch colonial period (Adi, et al., 2004; Colchester, 2002; Peluso, 1992b, 1993, 2006).

The Community Forestry policy (*Hutan Kemasyarakatan/HKm*) was issued in 1995 under another Ministry of Forestry Regulation (No. 622/Kpts-II/1995). This gave local people rights in the management of forest resources, including access to use Non-Timber Forest Products (Hindra, 2005). At that time, CBFM was believed to be a panacea to concerns about widespread rural poverty, illegal logging, and address questions about the legitimacy of the state in managing forests (Safitri, 2006). This policy was subsequently amended (No. 677/Kpts-II/1997) to provide greater access for local people; granting a license to manage and use timber and

nontimber forest products (*Hak Pengelolaan Hutan Kemasyarakatan/HPHKM*) to the local people and improve implementation at the field level. However, the outcome was little improvement in the well-being of the local people (Colchester, 2002).


Since the fall of the Suharto regime in May 1998, the state has paid more attention to CBFM (Kusumanto & Sirait, 2002), as the political system and government system is more democratic, with strong demands for public participation in policy-making and a more decentralised governance system (Lindayati, 2003; Safitri, 2006). There was a need for improvement, with the Ministry of Forestry then issuing a new regulation (No. 31/Kpts-II/2001), which enabled the local people to be more active in forest management. However, this policy has not been implemented since the new regulations do not accommodate the right to manage the forest and only allow for licensing the use of forest resources (Hindra, 2005).

Subsequently, the Ministry of Forestry passed the Social Forestry Program. To support this policy the Ministry of Forestry issued a further regulation (No. 1/Menhut-II/2004), which sought to empower people living within and surrounding the forest through the implementation of social forestry. In this regulation, social forestry is described as a forest resources management system for state forest areas and/or private forests, which the aim to provide the local people with an opportunity to become the main actors and/or partners in a simultaneous effort to increase local welfare and preserve the forest (Hindra, 2005). Again, the implementation of the social forestry program was widely thought to have failed. In 2007, one of the government’s regulation (No. 34/2002) concerning empowering communities living within and surrounding forests was revised with another regulation (No. 6/2007) which mandated empowering of communities.

Prior to the period 1970's-1990's, especially in the post colonial period, community-based forest management systems were excluded from the mainstream legal policy discourse (Lindayati, 2000; Nugroho, 2002 cited in Awang, 2003), as they were viewed as a threat to forest sustainability (Lindayati, 2000). The period during the 1970's to the 1990's was a formative step, as this period experienced a gradual change from negation to the introduction era of community-based forest management (Lindayati, 2000, 2003). This change was an important learning phase for Indonesia, especially for the government officers learning to deal with collaborative management with the local people and other related stakeholders, such as NGOs. This stage, especially in the mid-1980's to the early-1990's, was recognised as the period of exploration and experimentation in regard to community forestry (Hindra, 2005; Lindayati, 2000). It was marked by the testing of various pilot projects in different areas and institutionalising, developing and reviewing these models (e.g. community forestry/ *Hutan Kemasyarakatan*) (Safitri, 2006), an evolutionary process of CBFM in Indonesia (Hindra, 2005).

During the period 1970's-1990's community-based forest management did not generally improve the well-being of local people, and did not provide sufficient legal space for local people to promote their own interests (Moniaga, 1997). Thus, the CBFM policies generally did not answer the real needs and aspirations of the local people, such as long-term management rights and poverty alleviation (Safitri, 2006). Wardoyo (2003) classified the period from 2001 as the initiation stage under the new political system. Then the period of 2002-2003 was considered the installation period, followed by the period of 2004-2006 as the consolidation stage, and then 2007 onwards as the stabilisation period (refer to Figure 1.1). Under the new political system, the Ministry of Forestry has set up new approach which focused on three different institutional arrangements through better local institutional management, better forest area management, and better timber business management.

Figure 1.1 Community-Based Forestry Management Stages in Indonesia



Community-Based Forest Management: The Evolutionary Policy Process

As a result of the many early failures of CBFM in Indonesia, activists and policy-makers continued to develop new concepts and strategies focusing on the engagement of local communities in managing forest resources (Sunito, 2005), through providing legal and better access with longterm management rights to the local people. For instance, in 2007 the Ministry of Forestry began developing the new policy in forestry development, termed the Peoples' Plantation Forest or community participation on industrial forest plantation (HTR) program. The HTR program includes a forest plantation planted as a production forest by communities, both individually and as groups of communities. The aim of these activities is to improve the potency and quality of production forest and improve the well-being of the local people (BPK, 2007; Emila & Suwito, 2007). Then in 2008, the Ministry of Forestry passed village forest regulations to enable a village to manage state forest through a village institution. Under CBFM policy, multi-interest parties at both the central and regional levels have undertaken field action. The objectives of the policy are to increase the welfare of local people, speed up the achievements of sustainable forest management goals, embrace policy as practice and improve implementation (Wardojo, 2003).

Making CBFM Policy Work for The Poor

Policy is a significant instrument of governments for transforming communities and enhancing the environment towards better conditions (O'Laughlin, 2001; Winarno, 2008). In developing countries, the connection between the people and the forests is more intense due to higher dependence of the population on forests for meeting their daily needs (Katwa, 2005). The crucial contribution of forest to improving rural liveli-

hoods, especially for the poor is well acknowledged (Gilmour *et al.*, 2004). Very large numbers of rural households in developing countries are living under subsistence levels on a daily basis, and they are very dependent on tree products (Arnold 2001). For more than two decades it has been understood that biological diversity provides goods and services for rural people, but these goods and services are frequently taken for granted, underpriced, overexploited (Leisher *et al.*, 2010; Shougong *et al.*, 2005), and degraded (Katwa, 2005). The thematic and well-known motto "save the forest" has recently changed to "save the forest people" or "save the forest for the forest people" (Levang *et al.*, 2005).

Recently there has been a growing interest in the potential of community based forest management (CBFM) to be a significant vehicle for poverty alleviation (Mahanty *et al.*, 2006). In Asia, CBFM is seen as a key ingredient (Mahanty & Guernier, 2008) and an innovative practice (Mazur & Stakhanov, 2008) for improving the welfare of the estimated 450 million impoverished people living in and around forests (Mahanty & Guernier, 2008). In the Phillipines, CBFM interventions are viewed by the government and the funding institutions as an important strategy in alleviating upland poverty (Pulhin, 20000).

Poverty alleviation, in both theory and practice, is not simple. Constraints often emerge around the process of poverty alleviation. Little access to the market (Tshering, 2005; Byerlee *et al.*, 2005; Wollenberg *et al.*, 2004), and market infrastructure such as roads and transport, post-harvest facilities, communications and business services (Pandit *et al.*, 2008), and lack of employment opportunities especially during the off-season are significant constraints (Tshering, 2005). Other constraints are lack of both financial and human capital to start and manage a business (Pandit *et al.*, 2008), including insufficient funding for the implementa-

tion of pilot projects and inadequate education of extension agents. There is also competition among local inhabitants for access to forest resource benefits, the constraints of an inadequate resource base for supporting livelihoods, and drought or other natural disasters (Sunderlin, 2004).

It is crucial, however, to understand the role of elites and their connections both with poor people and with others who control the flow of access to forest resources. Understanding the links of the local elites with national and in some instances with transnational elites is of central importance (Hobley, 2007). In practice, the poor are often prohibited from using timber forest products, while private sectors and other outsiders are able to utilise the same resources, either legitimately or illegally. Elites in a society often drive and control the way natural resources are managed (Mahanty *et al.*,

2006). Distributional manipulation sees most of the benefits flowing to local elites with, in some cases, the poor people becoming even worse off (Gilmour *et al.*, 2004). For example in the case of CBFM in Nepal, about 36 percent of the income from community forests was expended by the Forest User Groups on community development activities such as building schools, roads, and drinking water facilities, but only around 3 percent was targeted towards specific pro-poor activities (Kanel & Niraula, 2004). In addition, the application of political patronage often benefits the elite group while the ordinary members become subordination to these privileged elite. Poor communities remain in a worse position than powerful interests, since the elite and rich people rarely share the interest of members in redistributing their power (Larson & Ribot, 2007).

Table 1
Evidence on Dependence on Natural Resources for Income

Source	Region	Evidence	Resource type
Bahuguna 2000	South Asia	48.7% of household income	Forests: fuel, fodder, employment
Bene <i>et al.</i> 2009	West Africa	Varies from 90% (poorest)—29.7% (richest)	Fish
Cavendish 2000	Southern Africa	35.4% of household income in 1993-94; 36.9% in 1996-97	Wild foods, wood, grasses and other environmental resources
Coomes <i>et al.</i> 2004	Latin America	20% of household income	Fish, palm products, timber, hunting
de Merode <i>et al.</i> 2004	West Africa	24% of cash sales	Wild foods

Source	Region	Evidence	Resource type
Fisher 2004	Southern Africa	30% of household income	Forests
Fu et al. 2009	Asia	1.7% of household income in Site 1, 12.2% in Site 2	NTFPs
Jodha 1990	South Asia	14-23% of total household income	Common pool resources
Kamanga <i>et al.</i> 2009	Southern Africa	15% of total household income	Forests
Levang <i>et al.</i> 2005	South-east Asia	30% of total household income	Forests
Mamo <i>et al.</i> 2007	East Africa	39% of total household income	Forests
Narain <i>et al.</i> 2008a	South Asia	Quartile1: 9%, Quartile2: 7.2%; Quartile 3: 7.9%; Quartile 4: 8% of permanent income	Fuelwood, dung for fuel, manure, fodder, construction wood
Shaanker <i>et al.</i> 2004	South Asia	Site 1: 16%, Site 2: 24%, Site 3: 59% of household income	NTFPs
Viet Quang and Anh 2006	South-east Asia	For 30% of households, over 50% of total income; further 15%, 25-50% of total income	NTFP

Source: Vira & Kontoleon (2010)

The Table above demonstrates the linkages between the forest and rural people. Especially for rural people, across countries and sites, natural resources provide considerable variation in household incomes.

As the CBFM model was not designed specifically to be pro-poor, its capacity to provide benefit to the poor is little (Mahanty *et al.*, 2006). An example is found in the case of the South African partnership model which

put community partner only as a complementary rather than as the main target for lifting out from poverty (Vermeulen *et al.*, 2008). As result, the partnership only contributed up to 45 percent out of the total figure needed to poverty alleviation (Vermeulen *et al.*, 2003).

Policies are deliberately intended to resolve problems faced by governments and/or its citizens (O'Laughlin, 2001; Winarno,

2008). Recent studies on CBFM policy have mostly tried to reveal why and how policies have not worked particularly well for enhancing the well being of rural people and ensuring the longterm sustainability of forest resources. As highlighted by some scientists, the failures of CBFM policies in Indonesia have fundamentally been due to a state centric paradigm which has given the central government greater control over natural resources at the expense of local people (Awang, 2003; Colchester, 2002; Kusumanto & Sirait, 2002; Safitri, 2006; Sunito, 2005). Additionally, forest management has been strongly informed by conventional scientific knowledge (often focused on maximising timber production) at the expense of local knowledge (e.g. Moniaga, 1997; Peluso, 1992b, 2006). This has combined with a lack of understanding by frontline government officers of participatory forest management (e.g. Kubo, 2010), and little change in government-community relations (e.g. Safitri, 2006). Many government officers doubt that local communities have the capacity or knowledge to successfully manage forest resources (Sardjono, 2006). Problems of patronage, class and gender inequities (e.g. Li, 2002) have also been identified. However, there are several limitations of the previous research, including:

1. Even though recent studies have highlighted participation as a significant ingredient in CBFM policy intervention, focusing on the role of disadvantaged groups or gender communities in particular village areas (see also Agrawal, 2001b; Hampton, 2004; Nawir & Santoso, 2005), the earlier studies have not explored explicitly the participation process at a central (national) level from the perspective of different actors at multilayers of government institutions (e.g. central, province, district, and local level);
2. The previous research has not discussed in detail the external factors (threats) that might significantly affect the success of the policy implementation, especially to reduce deforestation and support sustainable supplies to local industries (e.g. palm oil development, illegal squatters, and transmigration programs);
3. Even though recently there has been interest in investigating the role of CBFM for supporting economic outcomes (see Nawir & Santoso, 2005) and poverty alleviation (Gilmour, et al., 2004; Mahanty, et al., 2006; Vermeulen, Nawir, & Mayers, 2008), little attention has been paid to exploring the factors that shape the success of poverty alleviation (e.g. limited access, standardised contracts, the role of elite and distributional benefit mechanisms/ issues, and local institutions)

Conclusion

In brief, our investigation of research gaps shows that further research is required to evaluate and investigate the dynamic process of a planned development intervention, such as CBFM policy (Long, 2001, 2002b; Long & Ploeg, 1989), focusing on the dynamics of public participation and policy communication processes at the multiple layers of government institutions (see Eko, 2010; King, Feltey, & Susel, 1998). At the policy implementation level, research is needed to explore the external factors (threats) that might significantly affect the success of policy implementation, such as palm oil, rubber development, illegal squatters, and transmigration programs (O'Connor, 2004; Potter, 2001; Purnamasari, 2009). Research must also explore factors such as standardised contracts, local institutions, and the role of elite and distributional benefit mechanisms, that shape and affect the success of poverty alleviation (Agrawal & Ostrom, 2001; Baumann,

2000; Mahanty, et al., 2002). Finally, it must investigate cross cutting issues of different CBFM models and their link with policy development at central level.

Acknowledgments

I gratefully acknowledge the contribution of my office at the Indonesian Forestry Research and Development Agency (FORDA) – Ministry of Forestry that allowed me to continue my PhD research at Charles Sturt University, Australia. I also would like to express my sincere thanks to the Australian Government's Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR), which funded the scholarship for my study. I also acknowledge and thank my many colleagues in the School of Environmental Sciences at Charles Sturt University, for their academic support and encouragement during my study, of which some are listed below.

Special thanks to Dr Digby Race my principal supervisor. He was an excellent supervisor and always encouraged me even though I have many limitations. He not only gave very valuable inputs and comments but was also a colleague, friend and part of my family during my stay in Australia. I also would like to thank Professor Allan Curtis who acted as a valuable secondary supervisor for my research.

In particular, I also would like to thank Dr Slamet R. Gadas the former Director of Pusat Penelitian Social Ekonomi Kebijakan (the Centre for Social Economic and Forest Policy) where I have been working as a junior researcher. He supported and recommended me in continuing my study by providing a recommendation. Then I would also like to thank the Director of Pusat Penelitian Perubahan Iklim dan Kebijakan (the Centre for Climate and Forest Policy Research), Dr Krisfianti L. Ginoga, who recommended that I pursue my post graduate degree. Special thank also goes to Ibu Kristiana Wahyudiati, PhD candidate at CSU who always supported

me to undertake the PhD training. Special thanks to Ass/Prof Ben Wilson, the Head of School, and his staff, and especially Mrs Lynn Furze who provided any facilities needed to support my work during my study.

References

- Adi, N. J., Arganata, F., Chehafudin, M., Fuad, F. H., Nugraheni, S. C. A., & R., S. (Eds.). (2004). *Communities Transforming Forests Land: Java Indonesia*. Bohol: Philippines Asia Forest Network.
- Abelson, J., Forest, P.-G., Eylesa, J., Smitha, P., Martin, E., & Gauvin, F. P. (2003). Deliberations about Deliberative Methods: Issues in the Design and Evaluation of Public Participation Processes. *Social Science & Medicine* 57, 239-251.
- Agrawal, A. (2001a). Common Property Institutions and Sustainable Governance of Resources. *World Development*, 29(10), 1649-1672.
- Agrawal, A. (2001b). The Regulatory Community: Decentralisation and the Environment in the Van Panchayats (Forest Councils) of Kumaon, India. *Mountain Research and Development*, 21(3), 208-211.
- Agrawal, A. (2001c). State Formation in Community Space? Decentralisation of Control Over Forests in the Kumaon Himalaya India. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 60(1), 9-40.
- Agrawal, A., & Chhatre, A. (2006). Explaining Success on the Commons: Community Forest Governance in the Indian Himalaya. *World Development* 34(1), 149-166.
- Agrawal, Chhatre, A., & Hardin, R. (2008). Changing Governance of the World's

- Forests. *Science* 320, 1460 (2008); 320, 1460-1462.
- Agrawal, A., & Gibson, C. C. (1999). Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation. *World Development*, 27(4), 629-649.
- Agrawal, A., & Gupta, K. (2005). Decentralization and Participation: The Governance of Common Pool Resources in Nepal's Terai. *World Development* Vol. 33, No. 7, pp. 1101-1114, 2005, 33(7), 1101-1114.
- Agrawal, & Ostrom, E. (2001a). Collective Action, Property Rights and Decentralisation in Resource Use in India and Nepal. *Politics Society*, 29, 485-514.
- Agrawal, & Ostrom, E. (2001b). Collective Action, Property Rights, and Decentralization in Resource Use in India and Nepal. *Politics Society*, 29, 485-514.
- Angelsen, A. (1994). Shifting Cultivation and "Deforestation" A Study from Sumatra, Indonesia. Vol. 1 (pp. 1-24). Bergen: Chr. Michelsen Institute Development Studies and Human Rights Bergen Norway.
- Anderson. (2006). Understanding Decentralized Forest Governance: An Application of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework. *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy*, 2(1), 25-35.
- Andrew, M. C., Fabricius, H., & Timmermans, H. (2000). An Overview of Private Sector Community Partnerships in Forestry and other Natural Resources in Eastern Cape. *Instruments for Sustainable Private Sector Forestry, South Africa Series*. London and Pretoria.: International Institute for Environment and Development and CSIR-Environmentek International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) In association with: Department for Water Affairs and Forestry Forestry South Africa Production of this report has been made possible by the financial support of the UK Department for International Development and the European Commission.
- Angelsen, A., & Kaimowitz, D. (1999). Rethinking the Causes of Deforestation: Lessons from Economic Models. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 14(1), 73-98.
- Angelsen, A., & Kaimowitz, D. (2001). Introduction: the Role of Agricultural Technologies in Tropical Deforestation. In A. Angelsen, and Kaimowitz, D. (Ed.), *Agricultural Technologies and Tropical Deforestation* (1 ed., pp. 1-19). Jakarta: CABI Publishing in association with Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).
- Angelsen, A., & Wunder, S. (2003). *Exploring the Forest-Poverty Link: Key Concepts, Issues, and Research Implications*. (pp. 1-54). Bogor: Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).
- Arnold, J.E.M. (2001). Forestry, Poverty, and Aid. *OCCASIONAL PAPER 33: Vol. 33* (pp. 1-15). Bogor: Center for International Forestry Research.
- Awang, S. (2003). *Politik Kehutanan Masyarakat* (1st Maret 2003 ed.). Yogyakarta: Center for Critical Social Studies (CCSS) in collaboration with Kreasi Wacana Yogyakarta.
- Awang, S. (2004). *Dekonstruksi Sosial Forestry* (1st January 2004 ed.). Yogyakarta: BIGRAF Publishing.
- Awang, S. (2011). Sosialisasi Hutan Tanaman Rakyat 9 Maret 2011. (Online). (From Balai Pelayanan Informasi Kehutanan Provinsi Jambi <http://infokehutanan.jambiprov.go.id/>

- ?page=2, retrieved 28th November 2011).
- Babili, H. I., & Wiersum, F. K. (2010). *Evolution of Community Forestry Regimes and Decentralization of Forest Management in Babati District, Tanzania*. Paper presented at conference on taking stock of smallholder and community forestry: where do we go from here? Montpellier, France.
- Barr, C. (2003). Reformasi Konsesi HPH: Mempertanyakan Paradigma "Pembalakan Lestari". In I. A. Y. Resosudamo & C. P. Colfer (Eds.), *Ke Mana Harus Melangkah? Masyarakat, Hutan, dan Perumusan Kebijakan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Baumann, P. (2000a). *Equity and Efficiency in Contract Farming Schemes: The Experience of Agricultural tree Crops*. 111 Westminster Bridge Road London SE1 7JD UK.
- Baumann, P. (2000b). *Equity and Efficiency in Contract Farming Schemes: The Experience of Agricultural tree Crops. Working Paper 139*. 111 Westminster Bridge Road London SE1 7JD UK: Overseas Development Institute
- Bentrup, G. (2001). Evaluation of a Collaborative Model: A Case Study Analysis of Watershed Planning in the Intermountain West. *Environmental Management* 27(5), 739-784.
- Bhumibhamon, S. (2005). *Forest and Poverty Alleviation in Thailand*. Paper presented at the Workshop Forest for Poverty Reduction: Changing Role for Research, Development and Training Institutions 17-18 June 2003.
- Bijman, J. (2008). Contract Farming in Developing Countries: An Overview. *Working Paper May 2008*. Hollandseweg 1 6706 KN Wageningen. The Netherlands Wageningen University Department of Business Administration
- Blaikie, & Soussan, J. (2000) Understanding Policy Process. *Livelihood-Policy Relationships in South Asia Working Paper 2: The UK Department for International Development (DFID)*.
- BPK. (2007). *The Establishment of People Forest Plantation*. Bina Produksi Kehutanan. Director General of Forestry Product Development (BPK). The Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia.
- Bruntrup, M., & Peltzer, R. (2006). Outgrowers – a Key to the Development of Rural areas in Sub-Saharan Africa and to Poverty Reduction. *Report of the DEG / DIE Workshop*. Bonn, January 2007: Workshop jointly organised by DEG and DIE.
- Carson, L., & Hart, P. (2005). *What Randomness and Deliberation can do for Community Engagement*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Engaging Communities, Brisbane, Australia. 14-17.
- Campbell, J. Y. (2003). Beragam Pandangan Mengenai Kehutanan Masyarakat. In I. A. P. Resosudarmo & C. J. P. Colfer (Eds.), *Kemana Harus Melangkah? Masyarakat, Hutan, dan Perumusan Kebijakan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Charnley, S. (2006). Industrial Plantation Forestry: Do Local Communities Benefit?. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 21(4), 35-57.
- Charnley, S., & Poe, M. R. (2007). Community Forestry in Theory and Practice: Where are We Now?. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 36, 301-410.

- Colchester, M. (2002). *Bridging the Gap: Challenges to Community Forestry Networking in Indonesia* (pp. 1-34). Bogor.
- Contreras-Hermosilla, A., & Fay, C. (2005). *Strengthening Forest Management in Indonesia through Land Tenure Reform: Issues and Framework for Action: Forest Trends*.
- Crevello, S. M. (2003). *Local Land Use on Borneo: Applications of Indigeneous Knowledge Systems and Natural Resource Utilisation among the Benuaq Dayak of Kalimantan, Indonesia*. PhD, Louisiana State University.
- De Janvry, A., Murgai, R., & Sadoulet, E. (1999). *Rural Development and Rural Policy*. Paper presented at the Forthcoming Handbook of Agricultural Economics, University of California at Berkeley. (Online). (<http://are.berkeley.edu/~sadoulet/papers/Murgai-JDE-2002.pdf>, retrieved 15th October 2008).
- Djogo, T., Sunaryo, Suharjito, D., & Sirait, M. (2003). *Kelembagaan dan Kebijakan dalam Pengembangan Agroforestri*. (pp. 1-44). Bogor: World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAFT).
- Djogo, T., & Syaf, R. (2003). *Decentralization without Accountability: Power and Authority over Local Forest Governance in Indonesia*. Jakarta. (Online). (<http://en.scientificcommons.org/1544553>, retrieved 15th October 2008).
- Dove, M. R. (1993a). A Revisionist View of Tropical Deforestation and Development. *Environmental Conservation*, 20(1), 17-56.
- Dove, M. R. (1993b). Smallholder Rubber and Swidden Agriculture in Borneo: Sustainable Adaptation to the Ecology and Economy of the Tropical Forest. *Economic Botany*, 17(2), 136-147.
- Duinker, P. N., Matakala, P. W., & Zhang, D. (1991). Community Forestry and its Implications for Northern Ontario. *The Forestry Chronicle*, 67(2), 131-135.
- Eko, S. (2010). *Mengubah Perencanaan Birokratis Menjadi Teknokratis*. Yogyakarta: IRE.
- Emila, & Suwito. Februari 2007. Peoples' Plantation Forest (HTR): Is a New Agenda for Poverty Alleviation? Working Group on Forest Land Tenure. *Warta Tenure No.4*.
- Feintrenie, L., & Levang, P. (2009). Sumatra's Rubber Agroforests: Advent, Rise and Fall of a Sustainable Cropping System. *Small-scale Forestry* 8, 323-335.
- Fernando, N. A. (2008). *Rural Development Outcomes and Drivers: An Overview and Some Lessons*. Asian Development Bank.
- Fonseca, H. (Ed.). (2004). *Community Forests Equity, Use and Conservation*. Montevideo, Uruguay: World Rainforest Movement.
- Garver, R. A. (1962). Communication Problems of Underdevelopment: Cheju-Do, Korea. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 26(4), 613-625.
- Gaventa, J. (2002) Introduction: Exploring Citizenship, Participation and Accountability. *IDS Bulletin Vol 33 No 2 2002: Vol. 33*.
- Gilmour, Malla, Y., & Nurse, M. (2004). *Linkages between Community Forestry and Poverty* (pp. 1-12). Bangkok.
- Guritno, A. D. (2000). Indonesian Forest Management Problems: What are the Comments and Opinions of the Group and Organisation Concerned?. *Southeast Asian Studies*, 37(4), 492-510.
- Hampton, G. (2004). Enhancing Public Participation through Narrative Analysis. *Policy Sciences*, 37(3-4), 261-276.

- Harrison, S. & Suh, J. (2004). Progress and Prospects of Community Forestry in Developing and Developed Countries. *Small-scale Forest Economics, Management and Policy*, 3(3), 287-302.
- Henley, D., & Davidson, J. S. (2008). In the Name of Adat: Regional Perspectives on Reform, Tradition, and Democracy in Indonesia. *Modern Asian Studies* 42(4), 815-852.
- Hidayat, H. (1996). *Social Forestry and Empowering Communities in North Bengkulu-South Sumatra*. LIPI.
- Hindra, B. (2005). *Indonesia Community Forestry*.
- Hjortsø, C. N. (2004). Enhancing Public Participation in Natural Resource Management using Soft OR – an Application of Strategic Option Development and Analysis in Tactical Forest Planning. *European Journal of Operational Research* 152, 667-683.
- Hobley, M. (2007a). *Does Forestry Have a Role in Poverty Reduction?*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Poverty Reduction and Forests Bangkok, September 2007.
- Hobley, M. (2007b). *Where in the World is there Pro-poor Forest Policy and Tenure Reform?*. Washington, DC: Rights and Resources Initiative.
- Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (1998). Policy Subsystem Configurations and Policy Change: Operationalising the Positivist Analysis of the Politic of the Policy Process. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26, 466-481.
- IFAD. (2001). The Challenge of Ending Rural Poverty: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). *Rural Poverty Report 2001*.
- IFAD. (2010). *Rural Poverty Report 2011: The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)*.
- Janse, G. (2007). *Communication in Forest Policy Decision-making in Europe: a Study on Communication Processes Between Policy, Science and the Public*. Ph.D Dissertation, Faculty of Forest Sciences University of Joensuu, Yliopistokatu 7. (Online). (<http://www.metla.fi/dissertationes/df48.htm>, retrieved 15th October 2010)
- Kaimowitz, D. (1996). *Livestock and Deforestation in Central America in the 1980's and 1990's: A Policy Perspective*. Bogor, Indonesia: Center for International Forestry Research.
- Kaimowitz, D. (2000). Forestry Assistance and Tropical Deforestation: Why the Public Doesn't Get What it Pays for?. *International Forestry Review*, 2(3), 225-231.
- Kaimowitz, D. (2003). Forest Law Enforcement and Rural Livelihoods. *International Forestry Review* 5(3), 199-209.
- Keeley, J. (2001). *Influencing Policy Process for Sustainable Livelihoods: Strategies for Change*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Keeley, J., & Scoones, I. (1999). *Understanding Environmental Policy Process: A review IDS Working Paper 89, June*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Keeley, J., & Scoones, I. (2000). Knowledge, Power and Politics: The Environmental Policy-making Process in Ethiopia. *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 38(1), 89-120.
- Kellert, S. R., Mehta, J., Ebbin, S. A., & Lichtenfeld, L. L. (2000). Community Natural Resource Management: Promise, Rhetoric, and Reality. *Society & Natural Resources*, 13, 705-715.
- King, C. S., Feltey, K. M., & Susel, B. O. (1998). The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation

- in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 58(4), 317-326.
- Kingston, R. (2007a). Public Participation in Local Policy Decision-making: The Role of Web-Based Mapping. *The Cartographic Journal* 44(2), 138-144 ICA Special Issue 2007.
- Kingston, R. (2007b). Public Participation in Local Policy Decision-making: The Role of Web-Based Mapping. *The Cartographic Journal*, 44(2), 138-144. ICA Special Issue 2007.
- Krogman, N., & Beckley, T. (2002). Corporate "Bail-Outs" and Local "Buyouts": Pathways to Community Forestry?. *Society & Natural Resources*, 15(2), 109-127.
- Kubo, H. (2008). Diffusion of Policy Discourse into Rural Spheres through Co-Management of State Forestlands: Two Cases from West Java, Indonesia. *Environmental Management*, 42, 80-92.
- Kubo, H. (2010). Understanding Discretionary Decision Making of Frontline Bureaucrats in State Forestland Management: A Case from Java, Indonesia. *Society & Natural Resources* 23(3).
- Kumar, S. (2006). Review/synthesis: Agroforestry: The New Old Paradigm for Asian Food Security. *Journal of Tropical Agriculture* 44(1-2), 1-14.
- Kumar, S. & Kant, S. (2005). Bureaucracy and New Management Paradigms: Modeling Forester's Perceptions Regarding Community-Based Forest Management in India. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 7, 651- 669.
- Kusters, K., de Foresta, H., Ekadinata, A., & Noordwijk, V. M. (2007). Towards Solutions for State vs. Local Community Conflicts Over Forestland: The Impact of Formal Recognition of User Rights in Krui, Sumatra, Indonesia. *Human Ecology* 35, 427-438.
- Kusumanto, Y., & Sirait, M. T. (2002). Community Participation in Forest Resource Management in Indonesia: Policies, Practices, Constraints and Opportunities. *Southeast Asia Policy Research Working Paper* (Vol. 28, pp. 1-28).
- Lambin, E. F., Geist, H. J., & Lepers, E. (2003). Dynamics of Land-Use and Land-Cover Change in Tropical Regions. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour*, 28, 205-241.
- Lane, M. B., & Corbett, T. (2005). The Tyranny of Localism: Indigeneous Participation in Community-Based Environmental Management. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 7(2), 141-159.
- Larson, Pacheco, P., Toni, F., & Vallejo, M. (2007). The Effects of Forestry Decentralisation on Access to Livelihoods Assets. *The Journal of Environment Development*, 16(3), 251-268.
- Larson, & Ribot, J. C. (2007). The Poverty of Forestry Policy: Double Standards on an Uneven Playing Field. *Sustain Sci*, 2, 189-204.
- Leach, M., Mearns, R., & Scoones, I. (1999). Environmental Entitlements: Dynamics and Institutions in Community-Based Natural Resource Management. *World Development* 27(2), 225-247.
- Leisher, C., Sanjayan, M., Blockhus, J., Kontoleon, A., & Larsen, S. N. (2010). *Linking Biodiversity Conservation and Poverty Alleviation: A State of Knowledge Review the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity*.
- Lemos, M. C., & Agrawal, A. (2006). Environmental Governance. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour*, 31, 297-325.

- Levang, P., Dounias, E., & Sitorus, S. (2005). Out of the Forest, Out of Poverty?. *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods*, 15, 211-235.
- Long, N. (1999). *The Multiple Optic of Interface Analysis*. Paper presented at the UNESCO Background Paper on Interface Analysis.
- Long, N. (2001). *Development Sociology: Actors Perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Long, N. (2002a). An Actor-oriented Approach to Development Intervention. In Cruz (Ed.), *Rural Life Improvement in Asia*: Published by the Asian Productivity Organization.
- Long, N. (2002b). *An Actor-oriented Approach to Development Intervention*. Paper presented at the Background paper prepared for APO Meeting. Tokyo 22-26 April 2002.
- Long, N., & Ann, L. (1992). *Battlefield of Knowledge. The interlocking theory and practice in social development*. Londong & New York: Routledge.
- Long, N., & Heriot-Watt. (1975). Participation and the Comity. *Regress in Planning*, 5(2), 61-134.
- Long, N., & Ploeg, J. D. V. (1989). Demythologizing Planned Intervention: An Actor Perspective. *Sosiologia Ruralis*, XXIX(3/4), 226-249.
- Li, T. M. (2000) Articulating Indigenous Identity in Indonesia: Resource Politics and the Tribal Slot. *Vol. WP00-7* (pp. 1-26). California: Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
- Li, T. M. (2002). Engaging Simplifications: Community-Based Resource Management, Market Processes and State Agendas in Upland Southeast Asia. *World Development*, 30(2), 265-283.
- Lindayati, R. (2000) Community Forestry Policies in Selected Southeast Asian Countries. (pp. 1-67). Canada: International Development Research Centre PO Box 8500, Ottawa, ON, Canada K1G 3H9.
- Lindayati, R. (2003). Ideas and Institutions in Social Forestry Policy. In I. A. Y. Resosudamo & C. J. P. Colfer (Eds.), *Whic Way Forward? People, Forest and Policy Making in Indonesia* Washington DC USA: Resource for the Future and the Centre for International Forestry Research
- Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2004). Community-Based and Driven Development: A Critical Review. *World Bank Res Obs*, 19(1), 1-39.
- Mahanty, S., Fox, J., McLees, Nurse, M., & Stephen, P. (2002). *Introduction: Equity in Community-based Forest Resource Management*.
- Mahanty, S., Gronow, J., Nurse, M., & Malla, Y. (2006). Reducing Poverty through Community-Based Forest Management in Asia. *Journal of Forest and Livelihood* 5, 78-89.
- Mahanty, S., & Guernier, J. (2008). *A Fair Share: Sharing the Benefits and Costs of Community-Based Forest Management*. Paper presented at the Paper for IASC Theme on Understanding the Benefits of the Commons.
- Malla, Y. B., Neupane, H. R., & Branney, P. J. (2003). Why aren't Poor People Benefiting More from Community Forestry?. *Journal of Forest and Livelihood* 3(1), 78-93.
- Mazur, R. E., & Stakhanov, O. V. (2008). Prospects for Enhancing Livelihoods, Communities, and Biodiversity in Africa through Community-Based Forest Man-

agement: A Critical Analysis. *Local Environment*, 13(5), 405–421.

- Mayers, J. (2006). Poverty Reduction through Commercial Forestry What Evidence? What Prospects? In T. F. D. Y. U. S. o. F. E. Studies (Series Ed.), *Research Paper A TFD Publication Number 2*. (pp. 1-25). The Forests Dialogue Yale University School of Forestry & Environmental Studies.
- McCarthy, J. (2001). *Decentralisation, Local Communities, and Forest Management in Barito Selatan District, Central Kalimantan*. Bogor.
- Michon, G., & De Foresta, H. (1993). *Indigenous Agroforests in Indonesia: Complex Agroforestry System for Future Development*. Paper presented at the International Course on Sustainable Land Use Systems and Agroforestry Research for the Humid Tropics of Asia, Indonesia.
- Michon, G., De Foresta, H. P., Levang, & Verdeaux, F. (2007). Domestic Forests: A New Paradigm for Integrating Local Communities Forestry into Tropical Forest Science. *Ecology and Society*, 12(2), 1-24.
- Moniaga, S. (1997). *Advocating for Community-Based Forest Management in Indonesia's Outer Islands: Political and Legal Constraints and Opportunities*.
- Moore, P. (2005). *Regulatory Frameworks Trends, Challenges & Issues*. Paper presented at the a Regional Forum Bangkok, Thailand, August 24-25, 2005.
- Muntasyarah, A. S. (2006). *Agroforest Karet di Jambi: Dapatkah Bertahan di Era Desentralisasi?* (pp. 1-4). Bogor: Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).
- Nawir, A. A., & ComForLink. (2007). *Forestry Companies Perspectives: Improving Community Roles in Plantation Forest Development through Partnerships*. Paper presented at the Paper for the World Bank as a contribution to the national meeting organised by Dewan Kehutanan Nasional (DKN) - National Forestry Committee on: 'Konsolidasi dan Percepatan Pelaksanaan Restrukturisasi Kehutanan' (Consolidation and Revitalisation in Restructuring Forest Policy), Jakarta.
- Nawir, A. A., Kassa, H., Sandewall, M., Dore, D., Campbell, B., Ohlsson, B., & Bekele, M. (2007). Stimulating Smallholder Tree Planting – Lessons from Africa and Asia. *Unasylva* 228, 58, 53-58.
- Nawir, A. A., Murniati, & Rumboko, L. (Eds.). (2007). *Forest Rehabilitation in Indonesia: Where to After more than Three Decades?* (1 ed.). Jakarta: Center for International Forestry Research.
- Nawir, A. A., & Santoso, L. (2005). Mutually Beneficial Company-Community Partnerships in Plantation Development: Emerging Lessons from Indonesia. *International Forestry Review*, 7(3), 177-192.
- Nebel, G., Jacobsen, J. B., Quevedo, R., & Helles, F. (2003). *A Strategic View of Commercially Based Community Forestry in Indigenous Territories in the Lowlands of Bolivia*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Rural Livelihoods, Forests and Biodiversity Bonn, Germany.
- Noordwijk, V. M., Mulyoutami, E., Sakuntaladewi, N., & Agus, F. (2008). *Swiddens in Transition: Shifted Perceptions on Shifting Cultivators in Indonesia*. Bogor: The World Agroforestry Centre ICRAF Southeast Asia Regional Office.
- Noordwijk, V. M., Suyanto, S., Budidarsono, S., Sakuntaladewi, N., Roshetko, J. M.,

- Tata, H. L., Fay, C. (2007). *Is Hutan Tanaman Rakyat a New Paradigm in Community-Based Tree Planting in Indonesia?* (pp. 1-32). Bogor: World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF).
- Nugroho, H. (2002). *Frozen Democracy in Forestry Sector: A Preface for the Politics of Social Forestry* (Pengantar untuk Buku dengan Judul Politik Kehutanan Masyarakat in Azwang, S). (1 st March 2003 ed.). Yogyakarta: Center for Critical Social Studies (CCSS) bekerjasama dengan Kreasi Wacana Yogyakarta.
- Nurjaya, I. N. (2005). Policy and Legislation in Community Forestry: Study on Indigenous Rights within Community Forestry Development in Southeast Asia *Reflections on the Human Condition: Change, Conflict and Modernity* (pp. 39-58).
- Obidzinski, K., & Chaudhury, M. (2009). Transition to Timber Plantation Based Forestry in Indonesia: Towards a Feasible New Policy. *International Forestry Review* 11(1):79-87. 2009, 11(1), 79-87.
- O'Connor, C. M. (2004). Effects of Central Decisions on Local Livelihoods in Indonesia: Potential Synergies between the Programs of Transmigration and Industrial Forest Conversion. *Population and Environment* 25(4), 319-333.
- Ojwang, A. (2000). Community-Company Partnerships in Forestry in South Africa: An Examination of Trends. *Instruments for sustainable private sector forestry, South Africa series. International Institute for Environment and Development and CSIR-Environmentek, London and Pretoria.* (pp. 1-30): Forestry and Land Use Programme, International Institute for Environment and Development, 3 Endsleigh Street, London, WC1H 0DD, UK.
- O'Laughlin, J. (2001). *Policy Analysis and Natural Resources: Bringing science to policy makers.*
- Oyono, P. R., Kouna, C., & Mala, W. (2005). Benefits of Forests in Cameroon. Global Structure, Issues Involving Access and Decision-making Hiccoughs. *Forest Policy and Economics* 7, 357-368.
- Pagdee, A., Kim, Y., & Daugherty, J. (2006). What Makes Community Forest Management Successful: A Meta-Study From Community Forests Throughout the World. *Society and Natural Resources*, 19, 33-52.
- Pandit, B. H., Albano, A., & Kumar, C. (2009). Community-Based Forest Enterprises in Nepal: An Analysis of Their Role in Increasing Income Benefits to the Poor. *Small-scale Forestry* 8, 447-462.
- Peluso, N. L. (1992a). The Ironwood Problem: (Mis)Management and Development of an Extractive Rainforest Product. *Conservation Biology*, 6(2), 210-219.
- Peluso, N. L. (1992b). *Rich Forests, Poor People: Resource Control and Resistance in Java*. California: University of California Press.
- Peluso, N. L. (1993). Traditions of Forest Control in Java: Implications for Social Forestry and Sustainability. *Global Ecology Biogeography Letter*, 3, 138-157.
- Peluso, N. L. (1995). Whose Woods are These? Territories in Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Antipode* 274, 1995,, 383-406.
- Peluso, N. L. (2005). Seeing Property in Land Use: Local Territorializations in West Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Danish Journal of Geography* 105(1), 1-15.
- Peluso, N. L. (2006). *Hutan Kaya, Rakyat Melarat: Penguasaan Sumber Daya dan Perlawanan di Jawa* (L. Simatupang, Trans. Indonesia ed.). Jakarta: Konphalindo.

- Ploeg, J. D. V., Renting, H., Brunori, G., Knickel, K., Mannion, J., Marsden, T., Ventura, F. (2000). Rural Development: From Practices and Policies towards Theory. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40(4), 392-407.
- Poffenberger, M. (2006). People in the Forest: Community Forestry Experiences from Southeast Asia. *Int. J. Environment and Sustainable Development*, 5(1), 57-69.
- Potter, L. (2001). Agricultural Intensification in Indonesia: Outside Pressures and Indigenous Strategies. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 42(2/3), 305-324.
- Potter, L., & Badcock, S. (2004). Tree Crop Smallholders, Capitalism, and Adat: Studies in Riau Province, Indonesia. *Asia Pasific Viewpoint*, 45(3), 341-356.
- Potter, L., & Cooke. (2004). Introduction: Negotiating Modernity, Themes and Ideas. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 45(3), 305-309.
- Potter, L., & Lee, J. (1998). Tree Planting in Indonesia: Trends, Impacts, and Directions. Vol. 18: Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).
- Potter, L., & Cooke, F. M. (2004). Introduction: Negotiating modernity, themes and ideas. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 45(3), 305-309.
- Pulhin, J.M. (2000). *Community Forestry in the Phillipines: Paradoxes and Perspectives in Development Practice*. Paper presented during the Eight Biennial Conference of the International Assosiation for the Study of Common Property (IASCP). Bloomington Indiana USA.
- Pulhin, J.M., & Tapia, M. A. (2009). *Devolving bundles of rights or bundles of responsibilities? Impacts of forest tenure reform in the Philippines*. Paper presented at the XIII World Forestry Congress Buenos Aires,, Argentina.
- Purnamasari, R.S. (2009). *The dynamics of small-scale deforestation in Indonesia: temporal and spatial analysis of the effects of poverty and socio-economic development*. Paper presented at the XIII World Forestry Congress, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- Quayle, M. J. (2003). Log Supply and Price Adjustment Mechanisms in Industrialized Economies: Impacts on Small-Scale Forest Farmers. *Small-Scale Forestry* 2(1), 93-108. doi: 10.1007/s11842-003-008-4
- Race, D., Bisjoe, A. R., Hakim, R., Hayati, N., Julmansyah, Kadir, A., Suwarno, A. (2009). Partnerships for Involving Small-Scale Growers in Commercial Forestry: Lessons from Australia and Indonesia. *International Forestry Review*, 11(1), 88-97.
- Race, D., & Desmond, H. (2001, March 2001). *Forestry Out-Grower Schemes: A Global View*. Paper presented at the Forest Plantations Thematic Papers, Rome.
- Race, D., & Desmond, H. (2002). Forestry Out-Grower Schemes: A Review from Selected Countries. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 15(4), 79-98.
- Raymond, D. H., & Wooff, W. G. (2005). *Small-Scale Forest Plantations are the Key to the Future of the Solomon Islands Forest Industry*. Paper presented at the 17th Commonwealth Forestry Conference, Colombo, Srilanka.
- Renn, O., Webler, T., Rakel, H., Dienel, P., & Johnsom, B. (1993). Public Participation in Decision Making: A Three-Step Procedure. *Policy Sciences*, 26(3), 189-214.
- Roe, D. (2010). *Linking Biodiversity Conservation and Poverty Alleviation: A State of Knowledge Review*. World Trade Cen-

- tre 413 St. Jacques Street, Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Y 1N9:
The Secretariat of the Convention on
Biological Diversity.
- Safitri, M. A. (2006). *Change without Reform? Community Forestry in Decentralizing Indonesia*. Paper presented at the The 11th IASCP Conference, Bali.
- Salomo, A., & Matose, F. (2007). *Toward Community-Based Forest Management of Miombo Woodlands in Mozambique*. Bogor: CIFOR.
- Sardjono, M. A. (2006). *PHBM and the Future of CBFM in Indonesia*. Paper presented at National Workshop in Pekan Hutan and Masyarakat UGM, Yogyakarta.
- Sardjono, M. A. (2008). *Community Forestry: As a Tradition or Paradigm in Managing Forest*.
- Sayogyo. (1971). *Kemiskinan dan Distribusi Pendapatan di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta 1984-1987*. Yogyakarta.
- Scherr, S.J. (2004). Building Opportunities for Small-Farm Agroforestry to Supply Domestic Wood Markets in Developing Countries. *Agroforestry Systems* 61: 357–370, 2004, 61, 357-370
- Scherr, S.J. White, A., & Kaimowitz, D. (2003). *A New Agenda for Forest Conservation and Poverty Reduction: Making Markets Work for Low-Income Producers*. Washington, D.C.: Forest Trends and CIFOR.
- Sen, O.L., Wang, Y., & Wang, B. (2004). Impact of Indochina Deforestation on the East Asian Summer Monsoon. *Journal of Climate*, 17(6), 1366-1380.
- Sirait, M. (2009). Indigenous Peoples and Oil Palm Plantation Expansion in West Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Indonesia Country Report prepared for the study: Environmental Degradation, Natural Resources and Violent Conflict in Indigenous Habitat in Kalimantan-Indonesia, Bayaka-Central African Republic and San Marcos-Guatemala* (pp. 1-94). Amsterdam, the Netherlands The Amsterdam University Law Faculty.
- Sirait, M., Bulor, D. B., Sofyar, Y., Anugrah, D., Rismawan, R., & Suryadin, D. (2005). Perjalanan “Kilip” Mencari Pengakuan; Refleksi Pengembangan Metodologi Identifikasi Masyarakat Adat dan Wilayah Adat Secara Partisipatif di Kabupaten Kutai Barat, Kalimantan Timur. *Resource Tenure, Kemiskinan, dan Ketahanan Pangan; Suatu Pengantar Kondisi di Indonesia*.
- Sunito, S. (2005). *Continuation and Discontinuation of Local Institution in Community-Based Natural Resource Management*. PhD, Kasel University.
- Sunderlin, W.D. (2004). *Community Forestry and Poverty Alleviation in Cambodia, Lao-PDR, and Vietnam: An Agenda for Research*. Paper presented at the Regional Consultation Workshop for ADB-RETA 6115: “Poverty Reduction in Upland Communities in the Mekong Region through Improved Community and Industrial Forestry”, Ambassador Hotel, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Sunderlin, W.D., Angelsen, A., Belcher, B., Burgers, P., Nasi, R., Santoso, L., & Wunder, S. (2005). Livelihoods, Forests, and Conservation in Developing Countries: An Overview. *World Development* 33(9), 1383–1402.
- Sunderlin, W.D., Angelsen, A., & Wunder, S. (2003). Forests and Poverty Alleviation. In FAO (Ed.), *State of the World’s Forest 2003*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.
- Sunderlin, & Resosudarmo, I. A. P. (1999). The Effect of Population and Migration on Forest Cover in Indonesia. *The Jour-*

- nal of Environment Development*, 8(2), 152-169.
- Sunderlin, & Thu Ba, H. (2005). *Poverty Alleviation and Forests in Vietnam*. Bogor: CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Sutaryo, S. (2006). *Kebijakan dan Kelembagaan CBFM di Tingkat Nasional dan Pengalaman Mengelola Kerja-Kerja Multipihak*. Paper presented at the Pekan Raya Hutan dan Masyarakat 2006 UGM Yogyakarta.
- Travis, R., McFarlin, J. N., A.J, C., Rooyen, V., & Gray, M. (1999). Community Development in South Africa: Its Use as an Intervention Strategy. *International Social Work* 43(2), 177-187.
- Vermeulen, S., Nawir, A. A., & Mayers, J. (2008). Rural Poverty Reduction through Business Partnerships? Examples of Experience from the Forestry Sector. *Environ Dev Sustain* 10, 1-18.
- Wardojo, W. (2003). *Empowering Communities to Manage Forests: Social Forestry in Indonesia*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Rural Livelihoods, Forests and Biodiversity, Bonn.
- Wardojo, W., & Masripatin, N. (2002). *Trends in Indonesian Forest Policy* (pp. 77-87).
- Wollenberg, E., & Kartodihardjo, H. (2002). *Devolution and Indonesia's New Basic Forestry Law*. Departemen Manajemen Hutan Fakultas Kehutanan IPB.
- World Bank. (2010a). Beyond Causing Hunger and Malnutrition, Poverty Makes People Vulnerable to Shocks such as the Financial Crisis, Climate Change and Natural Disasters. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank. (2010b). People Living below the US\$ 1.25 a Day Poverty Line (millions). (Online). (http://sitere-sources.worldbank.org/INTPOVERTY/Images/PovTrends_large5.gif, retrieved 28th November 2011).
- Wulan, Y. C., Yasmi, Y., Purba, C., & Wollenberg, E. (2004). *Analisa Sektor Kehutanan di Indonesia 1997 - 2003* (pp. 1-79). Bogor.



Mohon dicatat sebagai pelanggan JSP

Nama:

Alamat:

Kode Pos: Telepon/HP: email:

Harap dikirim Eksemplar JSP mulai volume nomor tahun

Dengan ini saya kirimkan uang sebesar Rp. melalui:

- Bank Mandiri, KC Gedung Magister Yogyakarta, rekening nomor 137-0007162445 a.n. Arie Ruhyanto cq Jurnal Fisipol
- Pos wesel dengan resi nomor tanggal

Harga:

- Harga langganan (3 edisi) untuk satu tahun termasuk ongkos kirim sebesar Rp. 125.000,- (kilat khusus) untuk seluruh wilayah di Indonesia
- Harga satu edisi JSP Rp. 50.000,- (kilat khusus) untuk seluruh wilayah di Indonesia


.....,201...

(.....)

FORMULIR INI BOLEH DIFOTOKOPI

-----gunting dan kirimkan ke alamat Redaksi JSP atau fax ke (0274) 563362-----

**PERMINTAAN
LANGGANAN**



Kepada: Redaksi Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik
Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik
Universitas Gadjah Mada
Jl. Sosio-Yustisia, Bulaksumur
Yogyakarta 55281