Abstract. Social forestry program is intended to improve people's welfare and at the same time as an effort to conserve the forest. This paper examines the awareness of local communities toward social forestry programmes implemented by Ministry of Environment and Forestry of Republic Indonesia. This research was taken place in Bumi Kawa Village, Ogan Komering Ulu District. Survey, interview and focus group discussion methods were employed to collect the data. Descriptive qualitative method was used to analyze the data obtained during the research. Almost all of the people interviewed have a particularly favourable perception of the social forestry programmes implemented. Currently, the community has accessed the forest area and planted it with coffee. With the existence of social forestry program, community access to forests becomes a legal activity. The community can manage the land by implementing agroforestry system that is developing agricultural crops under forest trees. The type of tree that has been well known by the community is bambang lanang (Michelia champaca). This type of plant is suitable to grow in this region and has economic value. Based on the discussion, social forestry program is the best type of management for running the forests in this area. Communities were willing to further participate in tree planting activities. Moreover, women also had positive perception towards social forestry program although they were not fully involved in managing the forest. Some incentives were needed so that the local people will continue to participate in the long term environmental preservation.

1. Introduction
Community livelihoods around the forest are very dependent on the existing forest resources, both timber and non-timber forest products. According to [1] [2] there is a link between poverty and degradation of forest resources. Degraded forests will result in a decrease in the level of welfare of the surrounding community because their livelihood is reduced. Forests can reduce poverty rates [3] [4] [5] in the framework of sustainable livelihoods. Forests also have a function as financial and political capital and fulfill social and spiritual needs [6]. Limitations of livelihood assets for communities around the forest due to lack of access to land, education, health, and information, as well as the knowledge they possess causes poverty. Based on the data from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry in 2017 there were at least 25,863 villages in the forest or 36.7% of the total villages in Indonesia where 10.2 million people were categorized as poor or as much as 36.37% of the total poor population in Indonesia.

Forestry-based programs that are top down in the past without community involvement often fail because they only place the community as an object. For this reason, a paradigm shift in forest
management is needed, namely a bottom up program that involves participation and empowerment of forest communities so that the program could have an impact on people's livelihoods and forest sustainability. Delegation of rights and granting access to forests and land to the community aims to improve livelihoods, maintain forest sustainability and empowerment which are carried out by increasing participation in forest management so that it can benefit in forest and land management. Therefore, [7] argues that giving people access and management rights through capacity building and empowerment can reduce poverty and dependence on forest resources. In addition, community-managed forestry will provide management rights to local communities to manage land and forests, involvement in forest management and utilization decisions, and also the use of various forest benefits. This condition has several advantages: (1) reducing the costs incurred by the state in monitoring forests, (2) motivating local communities to participate in sustainable forest management, and (3) encouraging decentralization in realizing sustainable forest management [8]. Another advantage is being able to attract financial and technical assistance from international donor support [9].

For this reason, one of the efforts that the government has taken is to formulate a program that encourages the active role of the community in forest management and utilization, namely the social forestry program which was launched since 2006. However, in its implementation it is still not effective and has not yet proceeded well due to many obstacles both in the implementing agency, the readiness of the community and the overly complicated bureaucracy that reduces the interest of the community to participate in the program. For this reason, the study aims to evaluate how the implementation of the social forestry program that has been carried out by the community, by looking at perceptions and benefits for the community and also the implementation constraints carried out by the implementers, in this case Forest Management Unit (KPH).

2. Research Methods

2.1. Research location
This research was conducted in Ogan Komering Ulu District, South Sumatra Province (Figure 1). This area is located in South Sumatra Province, between 103°40’ until 104°33’ East longitude and between 110°15’ South latitude, and between 3°45’ until 4°55’ South latitude. Ogan Komering Ulu District area is shaped in land by 4.797,06 km2 and has 13 sub-districts [10].

Figure 1. Research location.
2.2. Data collection and analysis
Data used in this research is primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected using survey, interview and focus group discussion (FGD) to the households and stakeholders in the Bumi Kawa village, Bukit Nanti Martapura Forest Management Unit. Not only men, woman awareness to the Social Forestry Program were also identified through discussion during FGD to gather comprehensive information. Secondary data was obtained from Statistics Bureau, reports, and publications. Furthermore, data was analyzed descriptively and qualitatively to observe the awareness of the local community towards social forestry programs in Ogan Komering Ulu District, South Sumatra Province. We use the concept of qualitative analysis from Yin [11] to analyse the data.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. The implementation of social forestry program
The social forestry program aims to empower communities by increasing community capacity and access to the land and forest for providing employment, equal economic growth and increase welfare. This program has long been implemented since 2007 based on PP No. 6, 2007 [12] jo PP No. 3, 2008 [13] concerning Forest Management, and Preparation of Forest Management Plans and Forest Utilization. The newest regulation was launched in 2016 [14] and divided various forms of granting community access rights in order to empower the community through Village Forest (HD), Community Forest (HKm), Community Plantation Forest (HTR), Customary Forest (Hutan Adat) and Forestry Partnership (Kemitraan). Table 1 explains the detail of each form of Social Forestry Program.

| No. | Social Forestry Program | Description |
|-----|--------------------------|-------------|
| 1.  | Village Forest           | Management rights |
|     | Types of right/permits   | Production Forest and Protection Forest |
|     | Forest function          | Timber and non-timber collection, utilization of environmental services, non-timber forest products for protection forest and utilization of timber products for production forests |
|     | Types of activities      | 35 Years |
|     | Recipient of rights      | Village Forest Management Agency |
| 2.  | Community Forest         | Utilization permit |
|     | Types of right/permits   | Production forest and protection forest |
|     | Forest function          | Timber and non-timber collection, utilization of environmental services, non-timber forest products for protection forest and utilization of timber products for production forests |
|     | Types of activities      | 35 years and can be extended |
|     | Recipient of rights      | Forest farmer group |
| 3.  | Community Plantation Forest | Business license utilization and cooperatives |
|     | Types of right/permits   | Production forest |
|     | Forest function          | Timber and non timber forest products utilization |
|     | Types of activities      | 60 years |
|     | Time period              | |
|     | Recipient of rights      | Individuals, community groups |
| 4.  | Customary Forest         | Right to control / ownership rights |
5. **Forest function**

| Forest function          | Customary territories outside state forests |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Types of activities      | Timber and non timber forest products utilization |
| Time period              |                                             |
| Recipient of rights      | Community                                   |

### Forestry Partnership

| Types of right/permits   | MoU with the Management / Permit Holder |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Forest function          | Production forest, protection forest, conservation forest |
| Types of activities      | In accordance with the MoU             |
| Time period              | In accordance with the MoU             |
| Recipient of rights      | Community groups and cooperatives       |

Initially, the involvement of local communities living in and around forests area in forestry programs such as reforestation and forest rehabilitation programs is only as an object, which is limited to being a daily worker who is paid. They are not empowered and given the right to manage existing forest resources so that the community remains poor and the success rates of these programs are still low.

Social forestry is carried out in forest areas with the aim of providing use value and protection to forest areas by giving access, exclusion and management rights to communities and community groups but cannot be traded and inherited. Community groups are required to manage land that has been given permission to become a productive business that can increase household income and welfare. Permit holders are given training and guidance by facilitators to increase their knowledge and capacity.

Social forestry in Indonesia has been implemented since 2007. Up to 2017 the total area that has been licensed is 1.3 million hectares. Social Forestry in Bukit Nanti Forest Management Unit which has been established and issued a Decree covering 1,663.73 Ha in 3 Sub-districts namely Lengkiti Sub-district, Sosoh Buay Rayap Sub-district, and Ogan Ulu sub-district with the Community Plantation Forest (HTR) model and Community Forest (HKM) model that involved 128 households members. Overall, in South Sumatra Social Forestry (HD, HTR, HKm) licenses that have been issued were 59,934.96 hectares with a total of 8,094 households. The target of social forestry in South Sumatra is 586,393 hectares.

#### 3.2. Community livelihoods

The livelihoods of communities around the forest are very much influenced by assets, activities and access to their assets. Assets owned by the community are very limited in terms of area, only in the range of 1-2.5 ha. Ownership of large land is only owned by some communities with greater capital. Assets in the form of land owned by each member of the community will be less and less because it will be passed on to their children. Communities that do not have enough land will open forest land that is not managed or considered as idle land (vacant land) for annual crop cultivation that has economic value. Land that is controlled by the community is planted with a variety of plants that can provide cash income. However, generally the community cannot manage it properly. Their knowledge and abilities in farming are still limited and hereditary from their ancestors so that the results obtained are not optimal.

The productivity of the coffee commodity owned by the community is around 0.94 tons per hectare with a price of 20,000 IDR, thus the gross income is around 18,800,000 IDR per year. The productivity of rubber commodities per hectare is 1.37 tons per year at a price of 4,500 IDR per kg, so that the annual income is around 6,165,000, - IDR per year. The income earned from this farming business is still insufficient to meet the livelihood needs of farmers. Meanwhile, the opportunity for people to work outside the agricultural sector is still very limited because their education level is quite low. Currently they only have the opportunity to work in oil palm plantation companies as day laborers.

Plantations are potential sectors to be developed with superior commodities such as rubber, palm, coconut, coffee, pepper and fruits such as durian, duku, oranges, rambutans and mangosteen. The
smallholder plantation sector with rubber and coffee commodities is the leading commodity in the Ogan Komering Ulu District. While the commodities of coconut, pepper, cinnamon, and other types of commodities are supporting commodities.

Plantations are divided into two, namely smallholder plantations and large plantations. The most prominent smallholder production in Ogan Komering Ulu District in 2014 were: smallholder rubber production 52,447.47 tons with an area of 71,807.50 hectares, smallholder coffee production 5,991.70 tons in an area of 21,964 hectares, and palm oil production was 10,518.81 tons with an area of 1,194 hectares. During the past three years, rubber production has tended to decline. This is due to the decline in rubber prices that affect their production. Many communities do not tapping rubber in their land and choose to find other jobs to fulfill their living needs. In 2013 the number of community palm oil production was 12,084.3 tons but experienced a decline in 2014 to 10,518.8 tons. The detail of Ogan Komering Ulu District plantation production can be seen in Table 2.

| Description          | Estate crops | Smallholder crops |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------|
|                      | Rubber | Oil Palm | Rubber | Oil Palm | Coffee |
| Planted area (Ha)    | 918.09 | 34,602.82 | 71,807.50 | 1,194.00 | 21,964.0 |
| Production (Ton)     | 1,839.48 | 306,509.81 | 52,447.47 | 10,518.81 | 15,991.7 |
| Labor needs (people) | 1,285 | 18,330 | 26,779 | 245 | 29,488 |
| Gross economy (IDR/month) | 839,246,583 | 33,137,514,841 | 41,830,718,260 | 196,661,515,583 | 22,243,404,166 |

Table 2. The production of Ogan Komering Ulu District plantation.

The forestry sector also plays an important role for the regional economy. The area of forest in Ogan Komering Ulu District reaches 119,125 Ha or 32.93% of the total area of the district, covering 55,698 ha of protected forest area or approximately 15.40% and production forest (HP) reaching 55,267 Ha or around 11.51%. This production forest is located in Lubuk Batang Sub-district, Peninjauan Sub-district, partly in Semidang Aji Sub-district. Whereas the primary dry forest area is in Ulu Ogan, and secondary dry forest is found in Lengkiti.

The main results of the production are log and processed wood in the form of poles and boards. The production of forest products in the form of timber in Ogan Komering Ulu District in 2014 included 2,406.46 m³ of logs, 49,683.18 m³ of wood chips and 4,383.62 m³ of sawn timber (Table 3). Meanwhile, the production of non-timber forest products in Ogan Komering Ulu District in 2014 was mata kucing dammar at 220.30 tons. This forest production continues to decline along with the high demand for timber use and utilization. Thus forest planting (reforestation) is needed in addition to maintain the continuity of timber production as well as maintain natural balance.

| Timber types | Year | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       | 2013       | 2014       |
|--------------|------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Log          |      | 21,202.92  | 15,298.02  | 25,632.45  | 4,331.22   | 2,406.46   |
| Wood chips   |      | 38,669.03  | 12,218.87  | 52,810.14  | 0          | 49,683.18  |
| Sawn timber  |      | 13,233.57  | 12,340.48  | 10,127.89  | 4,675.10   | 4,383.62   |

Table 3. The production of forest products in Ogan Komering Ulu District.
3.3. People awareness and participation towards social forestry program

The social forestry program in principle aims to improve community welfare and forest sustainability, through participation and empowerment of communities around the forest. To assess the implementation of social forestry programs that have been running can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Assessment of social forestry program implementation

| Objectives | Component | Expected results |
|------------|-----------|------------------|
| The improvement of community income | Results from the main commodity | Increased income from the harvest of the main commodities of the society such as coffee, rubber, cacao |
| | By-products in the form of timber and non timber | Timber and non-timber forest products can be an additional source of income for the community |
| Community participation and empowerment | Access to information (markets and capital) | Communities have the same opportunity to obtain information from all parties so that they can improve their abilities and knowledge |
| | Access to land area | Access to the land is not only owned by certain groups, but all communities have the same rights |
| | The ability to make appropriate planning and decision making | Increased capacity in management and institutions can increase interaction and social capital in society |
| | Equality of women | Women have a balanced opportunity for decision making in the households and farming |
| The condition of forest and land resources | Sustainable land and forest productivity | Management can improve the productivity of land and forests |

Improving community capacity through socialization and mentoring is expected to increase the knowledge and ability of farmers to carry out productive farming activities. Cultivation practices that have been carried out so far have not been able to provide optimal results because they have not implemented good cultivation techniques as well as controlling pests and diseases. The input of fertilizers and pesticides by the community has not followed by the existing rules so that the production results are not optimal. The surrounding community only relies on the results of annual crops economic value such as coffee, rubber, cacao, etc.

Whereas timber-producing trees have not become a source of income for the community because information and knowledge about the types of plants that are suitable to be developed in their area were not yet available. Bambang lanang (Michelia champaca) as wood-producing tree is potential to be developed in Ogan Komering Ulu area because it suits the local biophysical conditions and also has economic value. In addition, non-timber forest products that used to be a source of cash income for the community are no longer cultivated like resin of dammar. This is because the resin market starts to decline and also many old resin plants are cut down and not rejuvenated due to seed difficulties.

Participation and empowerment of the community is carried out by improving access to information on the market, capital, access to land assets, improvement in planning capabilities and appropriate decision making. The equality of the role of women can improve and enhance social capital and institutional strengthening in society. Based on the discussion in focus group discussion activity, women also have eagerness to participate in the social forestry program. Some work related to the activities of the social forestry program are also shared between women and men. Women are
more involved in determining the types of plants and selling harvested products. Whereas men are dominant in planting the plants, maintaining plants and harvesting activities. The social forestry program is expected not only to improve the social economy of the people involved but also to improve environmental conditions.

Obstacles in implementing social forestry programs that are seen in terms of target (community) targets were: (1) Lack of access to the information on schemes and candidates for social forestry areas, because information is only owned by the local community elites; (2) The capacity of the community as prospective permit holders and owners of permits for utilization and social forestry management is still low. Therefore, it is necessary to have training and assistance so that candidates and permit holders are more able to manage and utilize the land more optimally. Capacity building and providing more livelihood options can be a form of incentive for the community license holder [15]; (3) the motivation of the community to participate in the social forestry program is still low due to land tenure certainty based on the permit deadline and cannot be inherited; (4) the community still does not understand about the benefits after obtaining land management permits, and; (5) lack of technology and human resources capacity. All of those explanation above emphasizes that the social characteristics and aspect of community is important in implementing social forestry and this is in line with the case in Lampung [16] where the social learning is important in building community forestry.

Figure 2. Focus group discussion

Figure 3. Farming system by community

In terms of implementers, the implementation of social forestry was still very slow due to: (1) a complicated and long submission process because it involves many stakeholders, (2) the existence of policy changes after the issuance of Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning the delegation of authority over forestry affairs to the Province. The licensing process that was previously issued by the Regent turned to the Governor for a permit for social forestry management; (3) the quality and quantity of social forestry extension assistants is still insufficient so that they cannot reach and provide more intensive assistance to prospective permit holders and definitive permit holders regarding the utilization and management of existing land.

To accelerate the implementation of social forestry, various efforts have been made: (1) Simplification of existing processes and bureaucracy by issuing government regulations, namely the Minister of Environment and Forestry Regulation no. 83 year of 2016 on Social Forestry which aims to simplify social forestry into a directorate in the Directorate of Social Forestry and Partnership Environment (PSKL) at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, (2) forming a National and Regional working group for accelerating social forestry (Pokja PPS). The Social Forestry Working Group at the National Level is set by the Directorate of PSKL and at the regional level is determined by the Governor's Decree of each Province. The PPS South Sumatra Working Group was established based on Governor Decree No. 154/KPTS/Dishut/2017. The Working Group is responsible for disseminating information to the public and related parties, conducting Indicative Map of Social Forestry Areas (PIAPS) verification and requesting local communities to permit social forestry schemes, providing assistance to social forestry groups in business development, facilitate the
handling of conflicts and become agents of change concerned with the environment and forests, (3) create an Indicative Map of Social Forestry Areas (PIAPS) with the aim of being the initial reference for determining social forestry areas (4) creating management access to social forestry, and (5) create pilot model of social forestry that can be adopted by the community.

The main goal of recent social forestry program is to increase the community income and enhance the welfare of the community. Decreasing the poverty and improving the community food security are part of the successful indicators for community based forest management program conducting by various stakeholders in the field [17]. In order to realize these goals, learning from community forestry program in Java which is not successful yet in decreasing community poverty [18] will provide an overview of the options that can be made so that the program can run more effectively and efficiently. This is intended to avoid a program that is only stuck in the procedure of administration of land ownership and tends to fulfill the interests of the government to re-control the forest [19].

4. Conclusion
The social forestry program aims to empower communities by increasing capacity and providing access to communities for land and forests to be managed so that can provide employment, equal economic growth and increase welfare. Almost all of the people have a particularly favourable perception of the social forestry programs implemented. Currently, the community has accessed the forest area and planted it with coffee. With the existence of social forestry program, community access to forests becomes a legal activity. The community can manage the land by implementing agroforestry system by developing agriculture crops under forest trees. The type of tree plant that has been well known by the community is bambang lanang (*Michelia champaca*). This type of wood plant is suitable to grow in this region and has a high economic value. Based on the discussion, social forestry program is the best type of management for running the forests in this area. However, the implementation of this program has not run optimally due to several obstacles: (1) Lack of access to the information on schemes and candidates for social forestry areas, because information is only owned by local community elites; (2) Capacity of the community as prospective permit holders and owners of permits for utilization and social forestry management is still low; (3) Motivation of the community to participate in the social forestry program is still low due to land tenure certainty based on the permit deadline and cannot be inherited; (4) The community still does not understand the benefits after obtaining land management permits; and (5) Lack of technology and human resources technology.

The community was willing to further participate in tree planting activities. Moreover, women also had positive perception towards social forestry program although they were not fully involved in managing the forest. Some incentives were needed so that the local people will continue to participate in the long term environmental preservation. Therefore, the goals of social forestry program can be achieved that is community welfare increase and the forest becomes sustainable.
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