



Determination of Community Readiness and Participation Post-Social Forestry Permit: Analysis of Internal and External Factors

Suryaningsih^{1*}

¹STISIP Imam Bonjol, Padang, Indonesia

Coressponding: suryaningsih@stisipimambonjol.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Forest; Village; Social Forestry; Community Participation.

ABSTRACT

The Indonesian government persistently advocates for advancing social forestry initiatives as a component of economic equalization and forest conservation strategies. At the local level, particularly within Lima Puluh Kota Regency, the execution of this policy encounters various challenges. The substantial achievements in the area designated for social forestry do not correspond with the community's preparedness and engagement in managing the permits that have been allocated. This research aims to elucidate the community's readiness and involvement in the stewardship of social forestry post-permit acquisition. This investigation's adopted methodological framework is qualitative and centered around case studies. Data analysis will incorporate triangulation techniques to enhance the validity of the findings. The study's findings reveal that the community's readiness and participation following permit acquisition in Lima Puluh Kota Regency is notably insufficient, influenced by internal and external factors. Internal factors encompass a deficiency in knowledge and comprehension, economic constraints, and limitations within local institutions. External factors comprise inadequate budget allocations from the government, non-governmental organizations, and donor agencies, restricted market access and infrastructure, the predominance of local elites, and reliance on external support.

1. Introduction

Social forestry represents a pivotal national initiative during the tenure of President Joko Widodo and Vice President M. Jusuf Kalla from 2014 to 2019. This initiative is encompassed within the sixth Nawacita, which aims to enhance the quality of life for the Indonesian populace through the "Indonesia Work" and "Indonesia Prosperous" programs, facilitated by agrarian reform covering an area of 9 million hectares for farmers and agricultural labourers. The government has articulated a social forestry objective of 12.7 million hectares to be realized by the conclusion 2019, as delineated in the 2015-2019 National RPJM by the Ministry of National Development Planning/Bappenas (Maryudi et al., 2022; Pambudi, 2023; Sahide et al., 2020). In

pursuit of this objective, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (LHK) is undertaking institutional enhancements by elevating the status of social forestry management from a work unit of equivalent echelon II to that of echelon I (Directorate General). Furthermore, this institution is also enacting regulations to bolster the established targets.

The foundational legal framework for enacting social forestry is encapsulated within Law No. 41 of 1999 about Forestry. Although this legislation does not explicitly delineate the term "social forestry", several provisions offer a legal scaffolding that undergirds the notion of social forestry, specifically articles 5, 30, 68, and 69 (Gunawan et al., 2022). The articles above serve as reference points for formulating subsequent

regulatory measures, including Government Regulation No. 6 of 2007, which addresses Forestry Arrangement, the Preparation of Forest Management Plans, and other regulatory frameworks. More comprehensive social forestry initiatives are articulated in later technical regulations, particularly within policies instituted by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK).

Social forestry is explicitly articulated in the Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry Number P. 83/MENLHK/SETJEN/KUM.1/10/2016 concerning Social Forestry (Gunawan et al., 2022). Article 1 paragraph (1) delineates that social forestry constitutes a sustainable forest management paradigm executed within state forest territories or customary forests, whereby local communities or communities adhering to customary law serve as the principal agents to enhance their welfare, maintain ecological equilibrium, and foster socio-cultural dynamics, manifested through Village Forests, Community Forests, People's Plantation Forests, People's Forests, Customary Forests, and Forestry Partnerships. The overarching aim of social forestry is to elevate community welfare, mitigate poverty, diminish disparities in land ownership, bolster forest conservation efforts, and augment community engagement in forest management practices (Tresno; et al., 2018).

In the Strategic Plan (Renstra) of the West Sumatra Provincial Forestry Service for the years 2016 to 2021, it is articulated that the designated target area for social forestry within West Sumatra encompasses 250,000 hectares, which constitutes approximately 20% of the protected and production forests under the jurisdiction of the West Sumatra Provincial Government. The total area governed by West Sumatra Province spans around 4,229,730 hectares, representing nearly 2.17% of Indonesia's overall land mass. Within this expanse, 54.43% is classified as a state forest area, comprising conservation, protection, and production forests distributed across various villages (Nagari) in West Sumatra. Data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) in 2020 indicates that the villages/Nagari located within or near forest areas represent approximately 81.97% of the total number of Nagari/villages within West Sumatra.

The expanse of forested regions within the West Sumatra Province, as delineated in the map appended to the Minister of Environment and Forestry Decree SK.8089/MENLHKPKTL/KUH/PLA.2/11/2018, dated November 28, 2018, about the Cartographic Representation of the Confirmation of Forest Areas in West Sumatra Province, is approximately 2,286,883.10 hectares, with the subsequent specifications:

Table 1. Area of Forest Area in West Sumatra Province According to Its Designation

No	Forest Area	Area (ha)
1.	Nature Reserve/Nature Conservation Area	± 765.623,24
2.	Protected forest	± 775.304,94
3.	Limited Production Forest (HPT)	± 228.665,68
4.	Production Forest (HP)	± 357.088,97
5.	Conservation Production Forest (HPK)	± 160.200,27
6.	Other Use Areas (APL)	± 1.942.846,90

Source: Performance Report (LKj) of the West Sumatra Provincial Forestry Service 2022

The presented data shows that the expanse of protected and production forests within West Sumatra encompasses approximately 1,132,393.91 hectares. According to information sourced from the West Sumatra

Provincial Forestry Service, the aggregate area designated for social forestry management from the years 2016 to 2020 attained approximately 227,871.80 hectares, detailed as follows:

Table 2. Area of Social Forestry Areas in West Sumatra 2016-2020

No.	Forest Area	Area (ha)
1.	Nagari Forest	185.138,83
2.	Community Forestry	33.109
3.	Community Plantation Forest (HTR)	2.247
4.	Customary Forest	6.942
5.	Forestry Partnership	435,08
Total		227.871,80

Source: Performance Report (LKj) of the West Sumatra Provincial Forestry Service 2022

The Director of the West Sumatra Provincial Forestry Service is tasked with the annual expansion of the social forestry management area by 50,000 hectares. This objective is allocated proportionately to the Regional Technical Implementation Unit (UPTD) KPHL/KPHP within the Forestry Service. According to the performance report of the West Sumatra Provincial Forestry Service for the year 2022, the actualization of social forestry initiatives surpassed the predetermined target, amounting to 50,597 hectares. The most significant accomplishment was recorded by the UPTD KPHL Pasaman Raya, which managed an area of approximately 18,323 hectares, constituting 36.21% of the overall achievement of 50,597 hectares. The Lima Puluh Kota Regency ranks third, with a social forestry area of roughly 7,587 hectares, following the UPTD KPHL Sijunjung, which achieved a social forestry area of approximately 8,567 hectares.

Lima Puluh Kota Regency encompasses a designated protected forest area measuring approximately 172,552 hectares within its total land area of 335,430 hectares. The Lima Puluh Kota Regency segment qualifies as a designated protected forest region. This regency has established a target for social forestry encompassing approximately 63,570 hectares, distributed across 45 selected groups. As of 2023, the progress towards this social forestry objective has resulted in the issuance of 38 social forestry permits, covering an area of approximately 55,830 hectares. The realization of this target must be accompanied by fulfilling the fundamental objectives underpinning the establishment of social forestry, which include promoting forest sustainability, enhancing community welfare, ensuring environmental equilibrium, and accommodating the dynamics of socio-cultural development.

Lima Puluh Kota Regency represents a distinctive case in attaining social forestry objectives, as this regency benefits from the Strengthening Social Forestry (SSF) Project in Indonesia. This initiative constitutes a collaborative grant effort between the Global Environment Facility (GEF), which is administered through The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), and the Government of Indonesia (Ministry of Environment and Forestry - Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environmental Partnerships). The primary objective of the SSF project is to enhance community access rights to forested areas designated as priorities for the advancement of Social Forestry. A notable site for the implementation of this SSF project is Lima Puluh Kota Regency.

With the allocation of numerous social forestry permits to the local populace in Lima Puluh Kota Regency, this article will examine the community's preparedness and engagement in the stewardship of social forestry following the issuance of these permits. The interplay between social forestry and community involvement is profoundly interconnected, as social forestry initiatives are formulated to enhance the well-being of communities, particularly those residing in proximity to forested regions.

2. Methods

The researcher used a qualitative case study research method. Creswell defines qualitative research methods as an approach to exploring and understanding a central phenomenon (Raco, 2010). Case studies are part of qualitative research (Sugiyono, 2018). In case study research, researchers examine a particular phenomenon (case) in a time and activity (program, event, process, institution, or social group) and collect detailed and in-depth

information using various data collection procedures over a certain period (Wahyuningsih, 2013). The research location was conducted in three LPHNs: LPHN Harau, LPHN Halaban, and LPHN Simpang Kapuak.

The methodologies employed for data collection include observation (Creswell & Creswell, 2003). In this instance, the investigator engaged with the social forestry group, interacted with the social forestry facilitator associated with the SSF project, and consulted the KPHL Lima Puluh Kota extension worker. Secondly, interviews were conducted. The researcher executed interviews with the social forestry facilitator of the SSF Project, the members of the social forestry group, and the extension worker from KPHL Lima Puluh Kota. Thirdly, documentation was undertaken. The researcher performed a comprehensive examination of written literature and scholarly research pertinent to social forestry and the legislative frameworks governing social forestry practices in Indonesia.

3. Result and Discussion

Realizing Social Forestry in Lima Puluh Kota Regency

The promulgation of Permenlhk P.83/Menlhk/Setjen/Kum.1/10/2016 regarding Social Forestry on October 25, 2016, elucidates the licensing procedure for Nagari forests and community forests within West Sumatra, particularly in the Lima Puluh Kota Regency. This regulatory framework delineates the demarcation of forest territories designated for social forestry by establishing the PIAPS (Indicative Map of Social Forestry Areas). PIAPS constitutes a cartographic representation that identifies forested regions earmarked for social forestry, serving as the foundational document for the conferral of social forestry rights and permits. The formulation of PIAPS is executed by the Director General of Forestry Planning and Environmental Management under the auspices of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. Before its ratification by the Minister of Environment and Forestry, PIAPS undergoes consultations with governmental entities and

stakeholders pertinent to the locality. Furthermore, PIAPS is subject to periodic revisions every six months after its official endorsement (Veriasa et al., 2021). The inaugural issuance of PIAPS was facilitated through the Decree of the Minister of Environment and Forestry (LHK) Number 4865 of 2017, which has since been subject to eight revisions, as articulated in the Decree of the Minister of Environment and Forestry (LHK) Number: SK.8/MENLHK-PKTL/REN/PLA.0/1/2023 concerning Indicative Maps and Social Forestry Areas (Revision VIII).

In the Lima Puluh Kota Regency, the advancement of social forestry initiatives is predicated upon the framework provided by the PIAPS. According to the data derived from the PIAPS within Lima Puluh Kota Regency, the total expanse dedicated to social forestry in this jurisdiction encompasses 63,570 hectares, distributed across 11 sub-districts, specifically Akabiluru, Bukit Barisan, Guguk, Gunuang Omeh, Harau, Kapur IX, Mungka, Pangkalan Koto Baru, Payakumbuh, Suliki, and Lareh Sago Halaban. It is noteworthy that among the 13 sub-districts within Lima Puluh Kota Regency, there exist two sub-districts that are excluded from the PIAPS framework, which are the Luak Sub-district and the Situjuh Limo Nagari Sub-district.

The expeditious acquisition of permits within the Lima Puluh Kota Regency has been facilitated by various non-governmental organizations (NGOs) supporting communities and villages, specifically KKI WARSI, WALHI, and QBAR. Several villages have benefitted from the assistance provided by these NGOs, including Koto Tengah Village, located in Bukit Barisan District, Kurai Village, and Sungai Rimbang Village within Suliki District, as well as Sialang Kapur IX Village, among others. In 2017, 15 villages successfully secured social forestry permits, manifested in the form of village forests and community forests, as issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. The area designated for social forestry that has been officially allocated encompasses approximately 22,654 hectares.

Table 3. Villages that Received PS Permits in 2017 in Lima Puluh Kota Regency

No.	Nagari	Subdistrict	KPS Name	No. SK KPS	Decree Date	Area (ha)
1	Sialang	Kapur IX	LPHN Sialang	SK.5881/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/10/2017	30/10/2017	7.256
2	Nagari Tanjung Pauh	Pangkalan Koto Baru	HKm Saiyo Sakato	SK.7011/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/12/2017	29/12/2017	4.790
3	Pangkalan	Pangkalan Koto Baru	HKm Sungai Abu Mandiri	SK.2627/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/5/2017	08/05/2017	260
4	Baruah Gunuang	Bukit Barisan	LPHN Baruah Gunuang	SK.5890/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/10/2017	30/10/2017	2.133
5	Banja Loweh	Bukit Barisan	LPHN Banja Loweh	SK.3890/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/7/2017	13/07/2017	807
6	Koto Tangah	Bukit Barisan	HKm Simpang Tanjuang	SK.859/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/3/2017	03/03.2017	350
7	Kurai	Suliki	LPHN Kurai	SK.4389/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/8/2017	21/08/2017	1.464
8	Sungai Rimbang	Suliki	LPHN Sungai Rimbang	SK.4390/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/8/2017	21/08/2017	663
9	Koto Tinggi	Gunuang Omeh	LPHN Koto Tinggi	SK.5894/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/10/2017	27/10/2017	1.460
10	Pandam Gadang	Gunuang Omeh	LPHN Pandam Gadang	SK.3894/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/7/2017	13/07/2017	850
11	Taram	Harau	LPHN Taram	SK.3891/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/7/2017	13/07/2017	800
12	Sungai Balantiak	Akabiluru	LPHN Sungai Balantiak	SK.4175/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/8/2017	08/08/2017	467
13	Tujuh Koto Talago	Guguak	LPHN Tujuh Koto Talago	SK.5891/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/10/2017	30/10/2017	186
14	Kubang	Guguak	LPHN Kubang	SK.3892/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/7/2017	13/07/2017	73
15	Taeh Bukik	Payakumbuh	LPHN Taeh Bukik	SK.3893/Menlhk-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/7/2017	13/07/2017	438

Source: Primary data, 2024

The mentoring procedure aimed at the augmentation of social forestry zones within the

Lima Puluh Kota Regency persists and is facilitated by both the Forestry Service and non-governmental organizations. In the year 2018, there was a notable increment in the quantity of social forestry permits within the Lima Puluh Kota Regency, with an addition of five permits distributed across five villages, culminating in a

cumulative area of social forestry that has been sanctioned amounting to 9,315 hectares. The villages conferred the social forestry approval decree include Simpang Kapuak, Sarilamak, Harau, Halaban, and Balai Panjang. For further elucidation, please refer to Table 4.

Table 4. Villages that Received PS Permits in 2018 in Lima Puluh Kota Regency

No.	Nagari	Nagari	Subdistrict	KPS Name	Decree Date	Area (ha)
1	Simpang Kapuak	Mungka	LPHN Simpang kapuak	SK.2703/MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/4/2018	30/04/2018	4.612
2	Sarilamak	Harau	LPHN Sarilamak	SK. 6845/MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/10/2018	08/10/2018	858
3	Harau	Harau	LPHN Harau	SK.1298/MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/3/2018	28/03/2018	3.096
4	Halaban	Lareh Sago Halaban	LPHN Halaban	SK.5674/MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/9/2018	05/09/2018	470
5	Balai Panjang	Lareh Sago Halaban	LPHN Balai Panjang	SK.5343/MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/8/2018	13/07/2018	279

Source: Primary data, 2024

The cumulative number of social forestry groups that have successfully acquired social forestry permits within the jurisdiction of Lima Puluh Kota Regency stands at 20 entities, including Nagari Forest (HN) and Community Forest (HKm). Concurrently, the expanse of social forestry that has secured permits has attained an approximate area of $\pm 31,969$ hectares. In 2019 and 2020, no supplementary social forestry permits were issued in Lima Puluh Kota Regency, attributable to the COVID-19 pandemic, which imposed restrictions on interpersonal interactions.

In July 2021, Lima Puluh Kota Regency was designated as one of the locales that benefitted from initiatives aimed at enhancing social forestry, specifically within the framework of the SSF Project. This initiative represents a collaborative effort involving the Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environmental Partnerships (Ditjen PSKL) of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) along with the Global Environment Facility (GEF), which is

facilitated through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). The execution of this project encompasses five regencies and one city across four distinct provinces, including Lima Puluh Kota Regency (West Sumatra Province), South Lampung Regency (Lampung Province), Bima Regency (Bima City), and Dompu Regency (North Maluku Province). The primary agenda of the project is directed towards expediting community access to the management of social forestry resources. Furthermore, the activities also emphasize post-permit facilitation efforts that are centered on the enhancement of group institutions, the fortification of area management plans, and the development of group business plans (KUPS) through the allocation of Small-Scale Grants.

After 2021, three supplementary social forestry permits were granted in the Nagari Maek, Harau, and Tarantang regions, encompassing an authorized area of approximately 4,752 hectares.

Table 5. Villages that Received PS Permits in 2021 in Lima Puluh Kota Regency

No.	Nagari	Subdistrict	KPS Name	No. SK KPS	Decree Date	Area (ha)
1	Maek	Bukit Barisan	LPHN Maek	SK.8468/MENLH- PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/12/2021	24/12/2021	3.270
2	Harau	Harau	HKm Hulu Aia	SK.8495/MENLH- PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/12/2021	24/12/2021	1.184
3	Tarantang	Harau	HKm Maju Basamo	SK.8496/MENLH- PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/12/2021	24/12/2021	298

Source: Primary data, 2024

KPHL Lima Puluh Kota and pre-existing non-governmental organizations continue to advance the social forestry area within the Lima Puluh Kota Regency as of 2022. Among the various villages that were facilitated for the establishment of social forestry initiatives (including village forests, community forests, and customary forests) which acquired the necessary permits in 2022, five villages have been identified: Pauh Sangik, Talang Maur, Sungai

Antuan, Durian Tinggi, and Lubuk Batingkok. Each of these villages is situated within four distinct sub-districts: Akabiluru, Mungka, Kapur IX, and Lubuk Batingkok Districts. The cumulative area that has been granted permits amounts to approximately 7,528 hectares. As of 2022, the total social forestry area that has received official approval from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry is approximately 44,249 hectares.

Table 6. Villages that Received PS Permits in 2022 in Lima Puluh Kota Regency

No.	Nagari	Subdistrict	KPS Name	No. SK KPS	Decree Date	Area (ha)
1	Pauh Sangik	Akabiluru	LPHN Pauh Sangik	SK.10364/MENLH- PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/12/2022	27/12/2022	207
2	Talang Maur	Mungka	LPHN Talang Maur	SK.10277/MENLH- PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/12/2022	27/12/2022	4.930
3	Sungai Antuan	Mungka	LPHN Sungai Antuan	SK.10274/MENLH- PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/12/2022	27/12/2022	385
4	Durian Tinggi	Kapur IX	LPHN Durian Tinggi	SK.10271/MENLH- PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/12/2022	27/12/2022	1.834
5	Lubuak Batingkok	Harau	HKm Kilalang	SK.7492/MENLHK- PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/9/2022	26/09/2022	172

Source: Primary data, 2024

In the year 2023, the quantity of Social Forestry Groups (KPS) within the Lima Puluh Kota Regency is projected to exhibit a continued upward trajectory, culminating in a total of 38 KPS, as opposed to the objective of 45 KPS, encompassing an expanse of approximately

55,830 hectares. In the same year, an increment of nine KPS will be introduced, distributed across various villages, including but not limited to Koto Lamo, Suliki, Piobang, Lubuk Alai, Gurun, Koto Alam, Gunuang Malintang, Durian Gadang, and Solok Bio-Bio. For further

elucidation, please refer to table 7, presented below:

Table 7. Villages that Received PS Permits in 2023 in Lima Puluh Kota Regency

No.	Nagari	Subdistrict	KPS Name	No. SK KPS	Decree Date	Area (ha)
1	Koto Lamo	Kapur IX	HKm Lolo Maju Jaya	SK.10538/MENLH-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/9/2023	22/09/2023	1.483
2	Suliki	Suliki	HKm Puncak Laih Soraik	SK.11300/MENLH-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/10/2023	18/10/2023	316
3	Piobang	Payakumbuh	HKm Harapan Kito	SK.10699/MENLH-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/9/2023	29/09/2023	88
4	Lubuak Alai	Kapur IX	LPHN Lubuak Alai	SK.10765/MENLH-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/9/2023	29/09/2023	2.043
5	Gurun	Harau	LPHN Gurun	SK.10285/MENLH-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/9/2023	15/09/2023	385
6	Koto Alam	Pangkalan Koto Baru	LPHN Koto Alam	SK.8510/MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/8/2023	25/08/2023	3.832
7	Nagari Gunuang Malintang	Pangkalan Koto Baru	LPHN Gunuang Malintang	SK.8537/MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/8/2023	25/08/2023	3.098
8	Durian Gadang	Akabiluru	LPHN Durian Gadang	SK.8545/MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/8/2023	25/08/2023	314
9	Solok Bio-Bio	Harau	LPHN Solok Bio-Bio	SK.9653/MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/9/2023	11/09/2023	679

Source: Primary data, 2024

From the year 2016 to 2023, a total of 38 KPS groups have been established, encompassing an area of 55,830 hectares. About the predetermined target, there remains an approximate area of $\pm 7,347$ hectares that has yet to attain the requisite authorization. This land is distributed across five villages, namely Koto Bangun Village (Kapur IX District), Muaro Paiti Village (Kapur IX District), Manggilang Village (Pangkalan Koto Baru District), Tanjuang Balik Village (Pangkalan Koto Baru District), and Sungai Beringin Village (Payakumbuh District). The advancement of KPS in West Sumatra, particularly within Lima Puluh Kota Regency, presents considerable challenges. The primary impediment encountered by KPHL, non-

governmental organizations, and social forestry facilitators pertains to land tenure or ownership rights issues.

Forests in West Sumatra are predominantly found within customary land domains, which engenders conflicting claims among indigenous populations, governmental entities, and commercial enterprises. Within the Minangkabau indigenous society, the term pusaka encapsulates their entire material wealth, encompassing forests, land, rice paddies, jewelry, currency, and other assets. This pusaka is bifurcated into two categories: high pusaka and low pusaka. Low pusaka comprises all assets derived from the parents' livelihoods (both father

and mother) during their marital union and any additional assets not attributable to high pusaka. Conversely, high pusaka encompasses assets that predate the current generation, with the present generation jointly benefiting from their existence and inheriting them through maternal lineage, as articulated by Damsar (2001). Typically, the customary community predominantly holds forest ownership within Lima Puluh Kota Regency. This scenario complicates establishing social forestry initiatives, particularly within Lima Puluh Kota Regency. Consequently, KPHL, non-governmental organizations, and community facilitators must exert considerable effort to disseminate knowledge regarding social forestry to the community.

The repudiation of five villages, as facilitated by KPHL Lima Puluh Kota in conjunction with the SSF Project, constitutes unequivocal evidence of conflict at the grassroots level about social forestry initiatives. The primary factors contributing to this resistance include the community's pervasive distrust towards governmental programs. The populace expresses skepticism regarding the intentions of the government or the institutions that initiated the social forestry initiative, positing that prior forestry programs have failed to yield tangible benefits. Secondly, there exists an internal discord within the community. The presence of disputes among various factions or familial groups is a significant impediment to establishing social forestry practices. Thirdly, there is a marked dependence on traditional land management methodologies. Certain community factions are reluctant to alter their forest management practices, relying heavily on conventional agricultural or logging methods. Ultimately, a principal factor contributing to community rejection is the apprehension regarding the potential loss of their land rights. The ambiguity surrounding tenurial rights engenders concerns that the state may appropriate or usurp their customary lands.

Post-Permit Management of Social Forestry in Lima Puluh Kota

The complexities associated with the administration of social forestry manifest not solely in the pre-approval phase but rather escalate significantly after the acquisition of the

social forestry permit. The stipulations articulated in the Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry No. 9 of 2021 regarding Social Forestry Management, particularly in Article 93, delineate that the holders of HD, HKm, and HTR management permits are mandated to a) execute forest management in alignment with the tenets of sustainable forest management; b) safeguard their designated areas from ecological degradation and pollution; c) demarcate the peripheries of their operational zones; d) formulate forest management plans, business work plans, and annual work plans, subsequently submitting reports on their execution to the authority responsible for granting Social Forestry Management approval; e) undertake forest planting and maintenance activities within their designated work areas; f) manage forest products effectively; g) remit non-tax state revenues derived from social forestry management by the applicable legal provisions; and h) implement measures for forest protection.

From examining the article, it becomes evident that numerous obligations impose significant burdens on KPS. Firstly, delineating the perimeters of the operational territory is essential. According to Article 102 of the Ministerial Regulation of the Environment and Forestry No. 9/2021 about social forestry, it is explicitly stated that the boundary of the PS area is to be executed by KPS to secure clarity regarding the confines of the operational territory. The forest topography of the Lima Puluh Kota Regency predominantly comprises hilly and mountainous terrains. This administrative division lies in the western area of Sumatra, which is included in the Bukit Barisan, a mountain system stretching across the island. The forests within this vicinity are positioned in elevated areas with diverse altitudes and on steep inclines characterized by pronounced slopes. Furthermore, the expanse of PS overseen by the community is vast, ranging from 500 to 7000 hectares. Such topographical conditions necessitate considerable financial resources to accurately delineate the boundaries of the social forestry management agreement area.

Second, the formulation of social forestry plans is paramount. By the Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry No. 9/2021

regarding Social Forestry, Article 106 articulates those entities possessing permits for the administration of HD, HKm, HTR, Customary Forests, and Forestry Partnerships are mandated to devise social forestry plans. The plan encompasses a) the development of the Social Forestry Management Plan (RKPS) for ten years and b) the establishment of the Annual Work Plan (RKT) for a timeframe of 1 year. On average, the community that possesses the permit (encompassing both Nagari forest and community forest) within Lima Puluh Kota Regency encounters significant challenges in formulating this RKPS due to insufficient technical capabilities. The permit holders typically comprise *ninik mamak* and a subset of youth affiliated with the LPHN who lack the requisite skills to construct this RKPS. Consequently, this predicament results in the community, which holds the permit, becoming excessively reliant on external resources, including extension workers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and social forestry facilitators. Similarly, in the annual formulation of the RKT, the communities holding permits exhibit a pronounced dependence on extension workers, NGOs, and social forestry assistants.

Third, it is imperative to implement afforestation and forest management practices within the designated work area. The challenging hilly and steep topography significantly impedes Lima Puluh Kota Regency permit holders from engaging in planting activities within the PS zone. Furthermore, the considerable distance from local community settlements constitutes another critical factor that hinders the execution of planting initiatives in this region. Should planting be undertaken in the PS zone, the efforts would likely be futile, as the planted saplings would be susceptible to damage from wildlife.

Based on the points above, it can be inferred that the community exhibits diminished engagement in the activities after issuing post-social forestry permits. Numerous internal factors contribute to the community's inability to hold Lima Puluh Kota Regency licenses to fulfill their responsibilities. Firstly, there exists a deficiency in the community's knowledge and comprehension regarding the social forestry program. Often, community members lack

adequate information concerning the objectives, advantages, and sustainable management of forest ecosystems. The insufficient dissemination of information results in a diminished awareness of the significance of participation in social forestry endeavors. Furthermore, the community's limited foundational knowledge of mental conservation and forest management results makes them unaware of the long-term advantages associated with social forestry initiatives.

Second, economic constraints. Generally, the livelihoods of individuals residing in Lima Puluh Kota Regency no longer hinge upon forest resources. Numerous individuals, confronted with financial pressures, prioritize fulfilling their immediate needs through alternative employment rather than engaging in long-term investments in forestry management. They exhibit a greater inclination towards economic activities that yield immediate benefits. A substantial portion of their time is dedicated to occupations that generate direct income rather than endeavors associated with forest stewardship. Effective forestry management necessitates a sustained commitment to realize its benefits over time.

Third, local institutional constraints. The established social forestry groups (entities for the governance of village and community forests) lacked robustness and organizational coherence. The community members incorporated into this framework merely satisfied the formal criteria for institutional membership without engaging in active participation subsequently. In such an institutional context, the collective and sustainable management of forest resources is likely to be impeded. This third element is significantly corroborated by the preceding factors, specifically the deficiencies in knowledge and comprehension as well as the economic conditions of the community.

In addition to the aforementioned internal factors, several external determinants contribute to the community's diminished participation in the Lima Puluh Kota Regency following the issuance of social forestry permits. Firstly, there is a constrained allocation of financial resources. Government bodies (KPHL), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and

donor agencies frequently fail to allocate adequate funding to facilitate the execution of social forestry initiatives. Consequently, the community does not receive sufficient support, particularly in activities such as demarcating boundaries and training to prepare RKT. Secondly, there is restricted access to markets and infrastructure. Communities often lack sufficient access to markets for non-timber forest products, including honey, coffee, crafts, and similar items. This inability to effectively market forest products renders the program less economically viable for the community. Thirdly, local elite dominance is prevalent. In certain instances, village elites or community leaders possessing political and economic influence may monopolize the decision-making processes associated with social forestry initiatives. This results in the broader public feeling disenfranchised and deprived of equitable benefits from the program. Fourthly, there is a notable reliance on external assistance. Numerous social forestry initiatives are contingent upon governmental or donor organizations' support. When such assistance is withdrawn, communities encounter significant difficulties sustaining forest management, as they have become reliant on external resources.

4. Conclusion

The significant challenge encountered in advancing social forestry is not restricted to the pre-approval phase but is also prevalent in the post-issuance of social forestry permits. Social forestry encompasses not merely the attainment of the designated area for which forestry permits are granted but also the imperative of ensuring the economic well-being of the surrounding communities. The prevailing situation in Lima Puluh Kota Regency indicates that the local populace lacks active engagement after acquiring social forestry permits. Although they have possessed a forest management permit for three decades, they fail to fulfill their responsibilities in alignment with existing laws and regulations. This phenomenon is ostensibly attributable to internal and external factors originating from the community. Numerous internal determinants impede communities from engaging proactively in forest management, specifically the inadequate knowledge and comprehension of social forestry programs among community

members, economic constraints faced by the community, and the limitations imposed by local institutions. Conversely, external determinants encompass restricted governmental budget allocations, the roles of non-governmental organizations and donor institutions, insufficient access to markets and infrastructure, the predominance of local elites, and a reliance on external aid.

5. Limitation

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. Firstly, the research is geographically confined to the Lima Puluh Kota Regency, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other regions with different social, economic, and environmental contexts. The unique socio-cultural dynamics and institutional structures in this area could lead to findings that are not entirely applicable elsewhere. Secondly, the study relies heavily on qualitative data collected through interviews, observations, and document analysis, which could introduce bias. The participants' perspectives may have been influenced by their roles, experiences, and expectations, potentially skewing the results. Additionally, the triangulation method used in data analysis, while beneficial for enhancing validity, does not eliminate the inherent subjectivity in interpreting qualitative data. Thirdly, the study's focus on internal and external factors affecting community readiness and participation post-social forestry permit issuance may overlook other relevant variables, such as environmental conditions, which could also significantly influence outcomes. Furthermore, the long-term impacts of social forestry initiatives are not fully explored due to the study's temporal limitations, leaving potential future developments and challenges unaddressed.

6. Implication

The findings of this study have several important implications for policy and practice in social forestry management. Firstly, the identified internal factors, such as a lack of knowledge and economic constraints, suggest that enhancing community education and providing monetary incentives could significantly improve community engagement and the success of social forestry initiatives.

Policymakers and practitioners should consider developing targeted educational programs and financial support mechanisms to address these issues. Secondly, the study highlights the importance of strengthening local institutions. The lack of robust organizational structures within social forestry groups hampers effective forest management. Therefore, initiatives to build institutional capacity and foster stronger organizational cohesion are critical. This could involve training programs, leadership development, and establishing clear governance frameworks to empower local communities to manage their forest resources sustainably. Lastly, the study underscores the need for more effective government and NGO support. Limited budget allocations, restricted market access, and the dominance of local elites are significant external barriers to successful social forestry implementation. Addressing these challenges requires a multifaceted approach, including increased funding, improved infrastructure, and efforts to ensure more equitable participation in decision-making processes. By addressing these limitations and implications, future social forestry programs can be better designed to achieve their goals of ecological conservation and community welfare.

References

- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design*. Sage publications Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Gunawan, H., Yeny, I., Karlina, E., Suharti, S., Murniati, Subarudi, Mulyanto, B., Ekawati, S., Garsetiasih, R., & Pratiwi. (2022). Integrating social forestry and biodiversity conservation in Indonesia. *Forests*, 13(12), 2152.
- Maryudi, A., Sahide, M. A. K., Daulay, M. H., Yuniati, D., Syafitri, W., Sadiyo, S., & Fisher, M. R. (2022). Holding social forestry hostage in Indonesia: Contested bureaucracy mandates and potential escape pathways. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 128, 142–153.
- Pambudi, A. S. (2023). Capaian, Tantangan Implementasi, Dan Rekomendasi Kebijakan Perhutanan Sosial Di Indonesia. *Kebijakan Pemerintahan*, 6 (2), 74–94.
- Raco, J. . (2010). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Jenis, Karakteristik, dan Keunggulannya*. PT. Grasindo.
- Sahide, M. A. K., Fisher, M. R., Erbaugh, J. T., Intarini, D., Dharmiasih, W., Makmur, M., Faturachmat, F., Verheijen, B., & Maryudi, A. (2020). The boom of social forestry policy and the bust of social forests in Indonesia: Developing and applying an access-exclusion framework to assess policy outcomes. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 120, 102290.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (edisi 2). Alfabeta.
- Tresno, Ana, R. F. ;, Wicaksono, M., Wicaksana, A. R. ., & Deswita, R. (2018). Antara Ulayat Adat dan Hutan Nagari: Sebuah Kebijakan Perhutanan Sosial di Minangkabau. *JANTRO*, 2(191–211).
- Veriasa, T. O., Maulana, S. J., & Hariyadi, C. (Eds.). (2021). *Perhutanan Sosial Asa Menjaga Sumber Daya Bersama: Kumpulan Studi Pembelajaran di Indonesia* (Cetakan 1.). IPB Press.
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Studi Kasus*. UTM Press.