Analysis of social forestry governance in Jeneberang I forest management unit
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Abstrak. Social forestry is one of the Ministry of Forestry policies in alleviating poverty and creating employment for people in and around forests, and forests sustainability. Social forestry governance is one of the important things in evaluating the performance of social forestry policy implementation. This study aims to analyze 5 key elements of social forestry governance, referring to Cadman T. (2011), that is interest representation, accountability and transparency, decision-making, and implementation. The study was conducted in the KPH Jeneberang I area, Gowa Regency, South Sulawesi Province. Two groups of social forestry scheme permit holders were selected purposively as research locations. Primary and secondary data were obtained through field observations, in-depth interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGD), and documentation studies. The study found that the implementation of social forestry policy with the target area as the main indicator of performance achievements has implications for the suboptimal quality of social forestry governance. Conflicts between the community and the government and between the community and the community are the effects of current governance. Changing the target area of social forestry licenses to target the number of social forestry business groups operating as key indicators of performance achievements, becoming one of the solutions to optimize the quality of social forestry governance.

I. Introduction

Social forestry is one of the Ministry of Forestry policies in alleviating poverty and creating employment for people in and around forests, as well as preserving forests. Various obstacles in implementing the policy have influenced its success. For example, tenure conflicts between the community and the government or other actors involved, the capacity of stakeholders to manage social forestry schemes is low, the problem of social forestry product markets, unavailability of financial capital, community institutions that manage social forestry schemes that are not strong, and the level of regional accessibility that is not strong [1].

The implementation of the social forestry program aimed at reducing forest management conflicts, actually led to new conflicts, due to conflicts of interest between actors, complicated mechanism for obtaining permits, the obligation of the community to pay for the provision of forest resources, and illegal logging in forest areas outside the permit area [2,3].

Based on the Decree of the Minister of Environment and Forestry No.744/Menhk-PKTL/REN/PLA.0 / 1/2019, concerning Indicative Map of Social Forestry Areas (PIAPS), the target of the Social Forestry program in South Sulawesi Province is 403,162 ha. Realization of the achievements of the Social Forestry program in South Sulawesi up to July 2019 was 217,364.87 ha.
Specifically for the Community Forest scheme, the realization reached 23,727.07 ha or 27%, of which 1,289 ha (18.0%) were in the Jenneberang I Forest Management Unit. This study aimed to analyze social forestry governance in KPH Jenneberang I, South Sulawesi Province.

2. Research Methods
The study was conducted in the FMU Jenneberang I area, Gowa Regency, South Sulawesi Province. Two groups of license holders of the Community Forest (HKM) scheme were selected as research locations. Primary data were obtained through field observations, in-depth interviews, and Focus Group Discussion (FGD). While secondary data obtained through the study of documentation. Analysis of governance focuses on five key elements of forest governance, according to Cadman T. (2011), namely, interest representation, accountability and transparency, decision-making, and implementation.

3. Discussion
3.1. Brief Description of the Social Forestry Scheme
Di wilayah KPH Jeneberang I, Kabupaten Gowa, terdapat 2 pemegang izin skema perhutanan sosial dalam bentuk Hutan Kemasyarakatan (HKm), mengelola kawasan hutan negara seluas 3,294 ha. Pemegang izin yang pertama adalah Kelompok Tani Hutan (KTH) Rimba Lestari, mengelola kawasan hutan lindung seluas 294 ha, berdasarkan Surat Keputusan Menteri Kehutanan Nomor: 7015/MenLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/12/2017, dengan jangka waktu izin 2018 – 2053. Pemegang izin yang kedua adalah PT. Adimitra Pinus Utama, mengelola kawasan hutan produksi seluas 3,000 ha, berdasarkan Surat Keputusan Menteri Kehutanan Nomor: 6624/MenLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/8/2019, dengan jangka waktu izin 2020 – 2055 [4].

In the KPH Jenneberang I area, Gowa Regency, there were 2 license holders of social forestry schemes in the form of Community Forests (HKm), managing 3,294 ha of state forest area. The first permit holder is the Rimba Lestari Forest Farmer Group (KTH), managing a protected forest area of 294 ha, based on the Minister of Forestry Decree Number: 7015 / MenLHK-PSKL / PKPS / PSL.0 / 12/2017, with a license period of 2018 - 2053. The second permit holder is PT. Adimitra Pinus Utama, manages a production forest area of 3,000 ha, based on the Minister of Forestry Decree Number: 6624 /MenLHK-PSKL / PKPS / PSL.0 / 8/2019, with a permit period of 2020 – 2055 [4].

3.2. Analysis of Social Forestry Governance
Social forestry as one of the empowerment models, is a step forward in overcoming the problem of forest management conflicts between the government and the local community. However, in certain cases, the implementation of social forestry schemes actually creates new problems on the ground. Differences in interests between the actors involved, weak technical capacity of forest management, complicated procedures and licensing administration requirements, tenure conflicts with local communities, administration of forest products, and misuse of licenses are a number of problems in managing social forestry schemes.

The quality of social forestry management, based on 5 key elements at the study site, is described as follows:

3.2.1. Interest representation. Social forestry policies still tend to be centralized, which is both administratively and technically referenced and controlled by standards applied by the central government. As a result, social capital models that have a basis and develop in local communities are ignored. The interests of local elites around social forestry areas are also often overlooked in the implementation of social forestry programs.

The representation of interests that should have been active since the beginning in the management of social forestry was the community that was incorporated in the group, however, in reality it was carried out by other actors / stakeholders. The involvement of local stakeholders such as KPH
Jenneberang I and the village head was also relatively low, even in certain cases not involved. This causes the location of social forestry areas not to target, both the area and the community group holding the permit. The implication is that there are vertical and horizontal conflicts in the management of social forestry.

According to Ribot and Peluso (2003), The strongest actors that inhibit community success in obtaining rights or access to forest areas are the actors that issue permits [5]. Therefore, it is needed the involvement of supporting actors such as universities, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), KPHs, and other relevant stakeholders in facilitating the community to build cooperative relationships with licensing actors.

3.2.2. accountability and transparency. Transparency and accountability mean, there is an openness that can be accounted for, from the beginning of the process of obtaining permits until the community carries out management of social forestry schemes in the field. The social forestry scheme is expected to provide access to the community to manage forest resources, so that they get benefits in the form of job creation and income. The benefit is obtained because of the authority of the permit holder to manage the state forest area, through various forms of mechanisms, processes, and relationships that influence the practice of policy implementation in the field.

The implementation of social forestry policies that still tend to be oriented towards the target area rather than the area managed, has led to a case where there has been a discrepancy between the area proposed by the community and the area of the permit issued by the government. In this case, the area issued is wider than the proposed area. There are also cases where the social forestry permit area is not managed by the permit holder, because the location of the permit area is not in accordance with the proposed location. This indicates the quality of accountability and transparency of social forestry management that still needs to be improved.

3.2.3. decision-making. The application of boundaries or arenas of action, rules and regulations, and the determination of stakeholders involved, have not yet become a priority in decision making on social forestry management. According to Ostrom (1994), boundaries or arenas of action focus on the analysis, prediction, and explanation of behavior or negotiations on the process of making an arena of action, including the components of stakeholders / actors [6]. The establishment of boundaries or arenas of action is the basis for building a resource management framework that can adopt various factors including the rules, resource conditions and the community.

The results of the study found that the community holder of the social forestry permit scheme and other relevant stakeholders did not understand well the rules of the game and the limits of their rights and responsibilities in managing the social forestry scheme, which was regulated in the existing policies. This often results in cases where permit holders understand their obligations as their rights or vice versa, in managing social forestry schemes. This indicates a hasty decision-making process in granting licenses for social forestry schemes, without beginning with good community preparation before obtaining permits.

3.2.4. Implementation, dan evaluating governance quality. The management of social forestry schemes aims to sustainably manage forest resources and create prosperity for the community. However, in practice, the orientation of the community to obtain a permit is more dominant towards the economic orientation than the orientation of sustainable forest management. Weak capacity of the community to manage forestry business units, weak business institutions, and the lack of optimal synergy between various stakeholders are factors that influence the quality of social forestry governance. Management conflicts between the community and the government before and after obtaining a permit are also indicators of the need to improve the quality of social forestry management at this time.

The implementation of social forestry policy should be based on flexible steps, respecting the natural processes that occur in society and running in balanced goals and roles. The stages of the
process of joint learning, building effective communication, implementing risk management, making sets of rules, monitoring and evaluation as well as enforcing constructive sanctions, are some elements of management in an effort to improve the quality of social forestry governance.

4. Conclusion
The implementation of social forestry policy with the target area as the main indicator of performance achievements has implications for the quality of social forestry management that is not yet optimal, based on governance elements namely, interest representation, accountability and transparency, decision-making, and implementation. Conflicts between the community and the government and between the community and the community are the effects of current governance. Changing the target area of social forestry licenses to target the number of social forestry business groups operating as key indicators of performance achievements, becoming one of the solutions to optimize the quality of social forestry governance.
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