The bureaucratic politics in developing Forest Management Unit (FMU) after the forestry decentralization in South Sulawesi province
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Abstract. The construction of Forest Management Unit (FMU) in South Sulawesi province created uncertainty for the FMU development. The institutional transformation of FMU from 16 FMU to 24 FMU has a lag impact development of FMU and waste an invested budget. This study analyzed the formal and informal dimensions of the FMU bureaucracy by using the Weberian tradition to reveal the facts, especially for the main duties, function and authority in forming its institution. The research was conducted at Forestry Service in South Sulawesi province from May up to September 2020. In this case the participants were observed through the depth interviews and studied the dates of 2019 and 2020 to collect the primary and secondary data; a stakeholder analysis was carried out to achieve the research objectives. The results of the study found 1) The formal dimension in the form of a) Technical Implementation Unit in the area has a difficulty in coordinating the local government due to the resisting of some district governments presence of FMU, b) The FMU operational budget was inadequate and uneven divided proportionally 2) The informal dimension in the form of a) The increase number of FMU was carried out to append the structural positions that were lost due to the Branch of forestry service abolition, b) There were six district Governments were still averse to hand over the forestry assets to the Provincial Government so that the total asset acquisition value was IDR 4,991,898,137.63.

1. Introduction
The development of FMU is intended to answer the need of an important unit forestry management at the site level and organize its management to achieve the sustainability [1]. The FMU establishment creates an opportunity for the people to manage its resources in accordance with the forest characteristics resources. It is necessary then to build a professional management institution to be liable for the duties and functions of the organization. As a response, the Governor of South Sulawesi, through the Forestry Service, established the Production FMU and Protected FMU areas due to the Law 23/2014 on Regional Government. Its law revealed the authority of Provincial Government to manage production of FMU and protected FMU.

The FMU institution is closely related to the surrounded bureaucratic structure [2]. It generally refers to the public institutions such as ministries and certain agencies that have an authority to make a legal and formal standard decision [3]. The bureaucratic structure consists of various institutions, from central to local indeed [4]. In one particular issue or problem, political decisions are the result of negotiation and bargaining between competing bureaucratic structures [5–7]. Formally, the bureaucracy carries out the public interest due its mandate [8]. However, it often induces a competition for each institution or agency due to get the domains and political influence [9].
The FMU is expected to accelerate the rebuilding of forest resources [10] which conceptually has been going on from 2017, and it does not show a well progress. The vagueness region is the toughest challenges to face. The Regional has been changed for three times in a recent three years. Its vagueness formation area will have an impact on economic losses. It could be in funds that have been invested in each previous region formation and the loss of the FMU opportunity to get an operational budget. Beside it, a long vagueness time area will have an impact on the FMU’s performance and its maturity level to become an independent institution. The institutional changes that occur repeatedly are allegedly made by bureaucrats with any different interest. According to Bowornwathana and Pooccharoen (2010) bureaucratically politics is a main and great part influences in deciding a reform policies and its managerial tools [11].

The bureaucracy has a dual duty to fulfill a formal responsibility and pursue an informal mission [12]. The formal dimensions cover a legal status, available budget, and kind of unit organization with informal dimensions included the way in getting an authority, donors and funding, and trust [13]. It has traditionally defined their formal role as institutions that work to maintain the biodiversity resources. Informally, it keep expanding increasing the number of staff and access to share the overall budget [14].

Based on the problems above, the researcher considers that it is important to research the formal and informal bureaucratic politics that occurs in the transforming the FMU area from 16 units to 24 units to be used as input and a form to evaluate for each agency in regional formation.

2. Method
This research was conducted from May up to August of 2020 in the Forestry Service and FMU of South Sulawesi province. In this research, a qualitative exploratory approach to analyze the extent of formal and informal bureaucratic politics in formatting the FMU areas in South Sulawesi province which was carried out through the depth interviews, observe the participant, and literature study to obtain primary and secondary data. Then, the data were analyzed with institutional and stakeholder analysis.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. The development history of FMU in South Sulawesi province
FMU in South Sulawesi Province began with the Minister of Forestry Decree No. SK.88 / Menhut-II / 2011 concerning the Designation of Protected Forest Management Units (protected FMU) and Production Forest Management Units (Production FMU) of South Sulawesi Province dated March 9, 2011. Protected forest areas and production forests in South Sulawesi were divided into 10 FMU Units. It consisted of 7 Protected FMU Units (Protected FMU) with an area of ±1,505,921 Ha and 3 Production FMU Units (Production FMU) with an area of ±308,569 Ha. Those units were Protected FMU Unit I (Larona Malili), Protected FMU Unit II (Kalaena), Protected FMU Unit III (Rongkong), Protected FMU Unit IV (Saddang), Protected FMU Unit V (Noling Gilireng), Protected FMU Unit VI (If), Protected FMU Unit VII (Maros Sawitto), Production FMU VIII (Walanae), Production FMU IX (Jeneberang) and Production FMU X (Selayar, Ds), with a total area of ±1,814,490 Ha. The zoning of FMU in South Sulawesi area was based on the watershed area (DAS). Thus in one FMU area could be consisted of more than 1 district except Protected FMU in Larona Malili which was located in East Luwu regency and Production FMU Selayar in Selayar regency only.

The implementation of South Sulawesi FMU development started to realize through the establishment of the Larona Malili Protected FMU Model based on Decree No. SK.722/Menhut-II/2011 dated December 20, 2011, with a total area of ±241,992 Ha and Production FMU Jeneberang based on Decree No. SK.715/Menhut-II/2011 dated December 19. 2011, which were located in 7 districts, namely Bone, Sinjai, Bulukumba, Bantaeng, Gowa, Jeneponto and Takalar regencies, with a total area of ±160,854 Ha. Protected FMU Larona was the current one. It was continued with the formation of the Awota model Production FMU due to the Forestry Minister decree Number 979/Menhut-II/2013 concerning the Establishment of an Awota Model Production Forest Management Unit with an area of ±19,071 Ha located in Wajo regency.
Through the Governor Regulation Number 16 of 2017 concerning an Organization and Working Procedure of Forest Management Technical Implementation Units at the Forestry Service in South Sulawesi province, 22 FMUs were formed, however these 22 FMU were reviewed and proposed again for amendment through the proposal of the Governor of South Sulawesi Number: 146.3/3134/Dishut dated June 2, 2017 proposing the state changes of the South Sulawesi Province FMU Area and followed by the Decree of the Environment and Forestry Minister Number: SK.665/MENLHK /SETJEN/PLA.0/11/2017 concerning the Designation of Protected and production Forest Management Units in South Sulawesi Province, 16 FMU Units were re-assigned then, based on the watershed areas consisting of 13 Protected FMU Units (Protected FMU) with an area of ±1,556.219 Ha and 3 Production FMU Units (Production FMU) with an area of ±262,881 Ha. The Decree was followed by the South Sulawesi Governor Regulation, Number 45 of 2018 concerning an Organization and Working Procedure of the Forest Management Technical Implementation Unit of South Sulawesi Province Forestry Service. Immature FMU which regarded unable to carry out forest management activities in accordance with the forest management plan document that has been approved by the Environment and Forestry Minister will be redeveloped into 24 FMU units based on the Decree of the Environment and Forestry Minister Number SK .371/MENLHK/SETJEN/PL.0/9/2020. The FMU in South Sulawesi will be developed into 7 (seven) FMUs, those were Production FMU Jeneberang I devided into 2 FMU namely Jeneberang and Kelara, Protected FMU Walanae into 2 FMU namely Walanae and Awota, Production FMU Cenrana into 2 FMU namely Cenrana and Ulubila FMU, Larona Malili Protected FMU becomes 2 FMU namely Larona and Angkona, Protected FMU Rongkong into 3 FMU namely Rongkong, Baliasa and Kambuno, Protected FMU Latimojong into 2 FMU namely Latimojong and Lamasi and Protected FMU Jeneberang II into 2 FMU Bialo and FMU Tangka.

3.2. The formal bureaucratic politics in the FMU areas establishment

3.2.1. Legality. FMU was a legal organization established based on Number: SK. 665/MENLHK/ SETJEN/PLA.0/11/2017 concerning the Designation of Protected and Production Forest Management Units in South Sulawesi Province reassigned 16 FMU Units which were consisted of 13 Protected FMU Units (Protected FMU) with an area of ±1,556.219 Ha and 3 Production FMU Units (Production FMU) with an area of ±262,881 Ha. Those were formed as UPTD based on South Sulawesi Governor Regulation Number 45 of 2018, concerning Organization and Work Procedure of the Technical Implementation Unit for Forest Management Units at the Forestry Service of South Sulawesi province. The UPTD FMU was led by an Echelon III b that was responsible for the forest protection and management with a large area across different districts. Its responsibility implicateS for the increased responsibilities and challenges for the FMU heads to assume. Ranking level was considered irrational with the main tasks that must be implemented. Its impact induced the difficulties coordinating with the local district government. The presence of FMUs in the regions has not been well accepted by the local government because of the protected forest areas were included in their working areas. A lack of human resources was another problem to be faced. It needs competency, professionalism and must meet the requirements in their fields because the FMUs were the operational forest management, as stated finding evidence that the level of knowledge related to the performance improvement working. In addition, the placement of employees who were staying far from their families greatly influences for the employee performance in FMU development.

The process of FMUs establishing must be approved by the Environment and Forestry Ministry, while the forest management authority granted to FMUs was limited. Rehabilitation authority can be held by the UPT of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry in the area and conducts its activities in the FMU working area. In addition, FMUs were assigned the task of protection; on the other hand FMUs are required to make an economic contribution to the State to become an independent institution.
3.2.2. Budget

Table 1. The budget allocation and featured activities for each FMU.

| Name of FMU | Area (Ha) | Featured activities                                                                 | Number of personnel | Total budget (IDR) |
|-------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Bulusaraung | 51,027.94 | Development of HHBK Bamboo Development of Tourism Services for Pong Bunga Waterfall  and Bami Waterfall | 49                  | 1,961,880,847      |
|             |           | Development of candlenut and sugar ants                                                |                     | 123,830,000        |
| Ajatappareng| 69,536.64 | Lappalaona tourism development and Tanete Riaja Pine tourism                           | 34                  | 321,600,500        |
|             |           | Potential for HHK Teak and Bitti Wood Potential for HHBKs Palm Sugar and Rattan         |                     | 503,830,000        |
| Sawitto     | 97,730.49 | Development of Ecotourism Latta Pitu Waterfall, Development of candlenut and sugar ants| 41                  | 229,029,000        |
| Bila        | 73,809.42 | Potential for Environmental Services (Sidrap PLTB Tour and Cable Car), Potential for HHK Teak and Bitti Wood Potential for HHBKs Palm Sugar and Rattan | 32                  | 503,830,000        |
| Mataallo    | 76,906.80 | Potential of Environmental Services for Bubau Cave Tourism and Development of the Potential of Arabica Coffee | 29                  | 753,628,060        |
| Saddang I   | 110,654.54| Making Silvaposture agroforestry patterns, Environmental Service Management Pango-Pango and Mapongka | 20                  | 1,103,326,550      |
| Saddang II  | 52,404.47 | Development Kaleakan tourism Development of Passion Fruit Agro Tourism                  | 25                  | 657,083,150        |
| Latimojong  | 113,177.89| Ecosystem Areas for Anoa & Butterfly Development of Non-Timber Forest Products, Oyster Mushrooms & Honey Bees Mangrove Land Rehabilitation | 39                  | 2,155,651,197      |
| Rongkong    | 418,415.53| Development of resin and sugar palm Environmental Services Management Sarambu Allia  | 23                  | 1,410,288,023      |
|              |           | Mangrove Land Rehabilitation                                                           |                     | 50,000,000         |
| Kalaena     | 163,194.32| Development Agro tourism Fruit Garden and Rest Area                                    | 19                  | 600,918,769        |
| Larona Malili| 240,676.03| Development Mata Buntu                                                                  | 19                  | 229,292,000        |
| Cenrana     | 133,792.70| Management of Environmental Services Agglomeration of Sumpang Labbu Ecotourism Destinations | 57                  | 558,617,665        |
| Walanae     | 64,428.12 | Silk Development                                                                       | 40                  | 872,096,710        |
| Jeneberang I| 56,187.29 | Management of Environmental Services in Belabori Village, Parangloe District            | 60                  | 3,546,383,378      |
| Jeneberang II| 30,376.01 | Rombeng Pine Ecotourism Development HHBK Palm Sugar                                    | 40                  | 1,962,116,000      |
| Selayar     | 18,897.18 | Environmental Services Development of HHBK Kemiri                                      | 15                  | 298,242,000        |

BS : BS : Long term planning management for the forest of FMUs in South Sulawesi province.

Budget was a main component in FMU development. The Research that conducted Peters and O’Connor (1980) found that an availability budget as one of the situational factors that will affect to the managerial performance. Managers and employees with sufficient budget will be able to achieve higher performance than managers and employees with insufficient budget. However, in this case, the FMU was lack of supporting budget and it was not divided proportionally [15].

The lack of budget has an impact on employee performance because they were not supported by an infrastructure and operational costs for the implementation of activities, including patrols for forest protection and security.

Based on the data above, it can be concluded that the budget distribution was disproportionate Jeneberang I was the FMU that gain the maximum budget allocation of IDR 3,545,638,378 with an area of 56,187.29 Ha compared to FMU Rongkong that gain a budget allocation of IDR1,410,288,023 with an area of 418,415.54 Ha. Beside its disproportionate distribution budget, the Forestry Service averse to submit budget management to the FMU, this was evidenced by the year of
2019 Technical Implementation Officer still at the Forestry Service, but in 2020 it has been managed directly by the FMU. Environmental service activities were the main focus of all FMUs in South Sulawesi, but it required a large amount of money, so it was certain that the development of environmental services will not be possible to execute in the near future.

3.3. An informal political bureaucracy on establishment the FMU areas
Based on the study of FMU Development in South Sulawesi province, the transformation of FMUs from 16 became 24 units was based on the large management area. Several FMUs that still have a large forest area, as well as other reasons related to the range of control and effectiveness of development, protection and forest management, were divided into two or three Capacity FMU. If it was considered from the mount of area, it can be revealed that there were several narrow FMU but it was still divided into 2 FMU. The fact of the increase number of FMU was carried out because of the Branch of forestry service institutional elimination plan, so that vacant structural positions were needed for non-job Civil Servant and Temporary employee officials who were previously in Branch of forestry service as a result of its elimination.

The diversion of FMU authority to the province has also been formally carried out and has a clear legal basis, however, the District Government averse to release Forestry Sector assets that previously obtained through procurement sourced from the Special Allocation Fund. It was evidenced by the fact that there were still six districts, namely Bantaeng, Maros, Tana Toraja, Luwu, East Luwu and Palopo districts that have not surrendered these assets and the total asset acquisition value was IDR 4,991,898,137.63.

4. Conclusion
Bureaucratic politics was a major part and greatly influences in making any decision to reform policies and managerial tools, including the repeated transformation of FMU. The uncertain of FMU management areas, disproportionate budget distribution, the reluctance of district governments to hand over forest management authority to FMU impact and being hampered to the performance working of FMU, thus causing them were still under institutional arrangement.
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