



# IDENTIFYING INTERNATIONAL FOREST-RELATED ISSUES IN INDONESIA BASED ON ACTORS' STATEMENTS IN PUBLIC AND EXPERT DELIBERATIONS

Agung Wibowo<sup>1,2,3</sup> and Lukas Giessen<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

Over the last 20 years a considerable number of international forest-related policies has evolved, collectively referred to as the international forest regime complex. The objectives of this study are to identify the most relevant international forest-related issues discussed in Indonesia as well as the most active actors and their positions on these issues. The empirical methods used include content analysis of Indonesian newspapers, national expert journals, expert mailing lists, and international organizations' position papers. In addition, experts were interviewed to verify and complement the data. As a result, seven forest-related international issues in Indonesia are identified, namely: timber legality; harmonisation of wood and forest certification schemes; oil palm plantation and its environmental aspects; land use change; climate change including REDD initiative; forest and species conservation; and deforestation and decentralised forest governance. Public and expert deliberations are found to differ regarding the depth of information as well as their immediate importance for the people and their long-term objectives. The Ministry of Forestry and, surprisingly, the Ministry of Trade are the most active actors in these issues. The main lines of conflict lie between forest utilisation interests which are supported by the Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Trade, oil palm and wood industry associations vis a vis forest conservation interests powered by WWF and Greenpeace.

**Keywords:** international issues, forest policy, international forest regime complex, Indonesia.

## Introduction

In political science, the theory of international regimes began to emerge in the early 1980s. Krasner (1982) defines *international regimes* as "a set of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given area of international relations." Simply put and applied to the field of forest policy, this theory describes and

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Forestry, University of Palangka Raya, Indonesia.

<sup>2</sup> Chair of Forest and Nature Conservation Policy, University of Göttingen, Germany.

<sup>3</sup> Corresponding author: agung.wibowo@stud.uni-goettingen.de

analyses international cooperation, primarily among states, and how internationally agreed principles, norms and rules become relevant in national contexts (Smouts 2008). International regimes are designed in order to influence state behaviour including their implementation through national action and policies (Bernstein and Cashore 2012, Giessen 2012). However, every country does not necessarily have equal influence in the arena of international diplomacy when advancing its interest, and eventually politically weak countries have to accept unsatisfactory international agreements (Lindstad and Solberg 2010). A basic question, however, remains: are international commitments made relevant, implemented and enforced in individual countries? And how are specific issues of the international forest regimes complex (IFRC) put on the political agenda in public and expert networks and their deliberations.

Forests, a resource covering about 4 billion hectares, or around 31 per cent of the earth's land surface (FAO 2010), have many functions for billions of people around the world. Humphreys (2006) identifies an international forest regime complex (IFRC)<sup>4</sup> which consists of the following elements: forests as a carbon sink under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) regime; protection of endangered species under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) regime; concerning indigenous and tribal people under the regime of ILO Convention No. 169; sustainable forest management issues under the United Nations Forum on Forest (UNFF) regime; trade liberalisation of forest products under the World Trade Organization (WTO) and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) regime; land management issue under the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) regime; conservation of forest biodiversity as an issue under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) regime and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) regime; and chain of custody rules under the private Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) regime.

Each of these forest-related regimes has not necessarily been established simultaneously in all countries signatory to the respective agreements. The Global Forest Expert Panel on the International Forest Regime mentions a number of regimes influencing forest-related policy in several countries (Rayner *et al.* 2010, similar McDermott *et al.* 2010a, 2010b). Indonesia, the third-largest tropical rainforest country and the largest tropical lumber producer (UN-REDD 2012, ITTO 2011) is also influenced by diverse interests in its forests (Nurrochmat 2005, Maryudi *et al.* 2012, Brockhaus *et al.* 2012). Identification of the major domestic political issues related to international forest policies, the actors involved and their positions are then crucial to

---

<sup>4</sup> The notion of a regime complex has been added lately.

understand the actual implementation of the IFRC and its specific components in Indonesia.<sup>5</sup>

Based on this, the objectives of this article are to identify the most relevant international forest-related issues discussed in Indonesian public and expert deliberations, and to identify the most active actors in these deliberations and their positions on the issues noted. In doing so, the authors are able to identify which parts of the international forest regime complex (IFRC) are currently the most relevant in Indonesia and which actors might have an interest in shaping the ways in which the IFRC is implemented in Indonesia.

### **Theoretical Propositions**

“Actor” in this study refers to an individual person, governmental or non-governmental organization with a stake in any forest-related policy. Actors have their own interests which are not always precisely displayed in public arena (Krott 2005). Public bureaucracies (e.g. a ministry) have dual goals: they strive for public service according to their mandates and are pursuing informal organizational goals. Due to these goals, public bureaucracies compete for resources, political domains and influence (Peters 2010). To reach their goals successfully, actors seek other actors with (rather) similar interest, set up coalitions, raise bargaining positions and gain power. In this context, mass media could be used as a channel to send signals of preference and positions to other actors.

Issue is a specific problem and could be a starting point of a forest policy process (Sadath and Krott 2012). Issue arises because actors succeed in getting their goals onto the political agenda. They are rooted in conflictual underlying interests of the actors and manifest in public or semipublic deliberations of actors. An issue may come from within or beyond the country, depending on its scope and urgency. In this study, an international issue relevant in Indonesia means a specific issue comes from both national and international levels, and it has goals, measures, assumed effect, implementing actors and related to the global agenda on forest in Indonesia. An issue brought by powerful actor has a big opportunity to go into agenda setting, policy formulation then convert into government policy (Howlett and Ramesh 1995). Accordingly, issue and actor cannot be separated. Ojha *et al.* (2009) suggest redistributing cultural/ideological power to actors with less power in order to raise the quality of deliberations.

Steffek (2009) identifies five groups involved in influencing policy making, viz.: representatives of the state, independent experts, activists and lobbyists, journalists and citizens. Each has diverse power in policy making process. Yet, their voices could be even louder if sounding through mass

---

<sup>5</sup> This exploratory study is part and basis of a broader research project, which will subsequently analyse the implementation of the IFRC in Indonesia in more detail.

media. Contrarily, the goals which are only delivered in actors' private spheres will fail in showing real political orientation, especially to the public (Krott 2005). According to this, any statement from actors through mass media can be seen as their initial positions in a specific issue recorded by public. An actor's statement in expert deliberations draws more concrete position of the actor and less bias although, due to their hidden agenda, it may differ from which was published in public mass media.

## Methods

In order to map the international forest related issues in Indonesia, this research distinguishes between deliberations of actors made either in public, such as newspapers, or in a more limited quasi-public arena, such as in expert media. Both differ regarding their degree of publicity and hence can be used differently by actors, e.g. by mobilising the general public or by discussing detailed issues in expert circles as a selected audience. The authors consider articles/information published by these source of data within publication period of 2008 and 2012. The public deliberation is derived from magazines and newspapers easily accessible to a wide public audience. For analysing public deliberations, the authors take two steps. First, choose two national newspapers in the Indonesian language, viz. *Media Indonesia* and *Kompas*, and a national newspaper in English, namely *The Jakarta Post*.<sup>6</sup> The combination of keywords *hutan* ("forest"), *kayu* ("wood"), *internasional* ("international") and *global* were inserted on each newspaper's search engine to elicit 200 first set of relevant articles in order to identify relevant international issues within Indonesian public deliberation. The determination of relevance of an article depended upon the connection of its content with international forest-related issues in Indonesia.

Second, based on identified keywords in the first step, the Google search engine was employed to find more relevant and concrete articles and comments. As an example, when an article in the selected newspapers talks about timber legality, it actually discusses SVLK (Sistem Verifikasi Legalitas Kayu), FLEGT (Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade) and VPAs (Voluntary Partnership Agreements) implementation and the debate around it. The authors then put SVLK, FLEGT and VPA into Google to collect a wider discussion. Only articles from public mass media were considered in order to map the public deliberation on a given issue.

To explore the expert deliberations on international forest-related issues in Indonesia the authors collected data from four sources.

First, interviewed experts whose deeper knowledge on forestry-related issues and international policy influences on Indonesian forestry policies as

---

<sup>6</sup> These sources are available in the Internet at <http://www.mediaindonesia.com/>, <http://kompas.com/>, and <http://www.thejakartapost.com/> respectively.

listed in Table 1. Interview is required as supplementary method to verify specific data from other sources. Interviewees were selected based on quick and ease of field access. To each of them, the authors posed two questions: (1) what are the rules/agreements/policies/issues at the international level that are currently relevant for forest, forestry or forest-related policy making in Indonesia? (2) How are these issues relevant in Indonesia?

Table 1. List of Experts Interviewed

Expert	Affiliation	Interview	
		Date	Type
Expert 1	Senior lecturer at Bogor Agricultural University	13 June 2012	Email
Expert 2	Senior lecturer at Gadjah Mada University	1 July 2012	Personal communication
Expert 3	Senior advisor to The World Bank, Jakarta	13 June 2012	Email
Expert 4	Senior advisor to the Ministry of Forestry	17 June 2012	Email
Expert 5	High official in the Ministry of Forestry	2 August 2012	Email
Expert 6	Administrator at Indonesian forester mailing list	25 July 2012	Email
Expert 7	Editor at an Indonesian forestry journal	24 August 2012	Email
Expert 8	Minister, Ministry of Forestry	8 October 2012	Personal communication

Second, data from professional journals in the fields of forestry, agriculture and conservation were collected to catch the discussion circulating among these experts' networks. These journals are *Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia*, *Tabloid Agro Indonesia* and *Mongabai (Conservation)*.<sup>7</sup> *Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia* (Indonesian Forestry Magazine) is a monthly magazine published by the Ministry of Forestry. All articles it contained from 2008 to 2011 (issues from 2012 are not yet available on the Internet) are examined and only those with international pertinence to be considered. *Agro Indonesia* is a weekly tabloid, published since June 2004 and widely read by practitioners and policy analysts in the fields of forestry, agriculture, fishery, plantations and husbandry. All relevant topics from February 2009 (the first online edition) to October 2012 are screened.

<sup>7</sup> These are available in the Internet at <http://www.dephut.go.id/index.php?q=id/node/5070>, <http://agroindonesia.co.id/> and <http://indonesia.mongabay.com/> respectively.

Third, the discussions among academics, observers and practitioners on the Indonesian forester interactive mailing list (*rimbawan-interaktif@yahoogroups.com*) were also taken into account. This mailing list was founded in 2000 and had 1309 members as of October 2012. The authors only considered entries within years 2010 until 2012.

Fourth, any publications from international organizations related to the Indonesian forest sector such as Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) files are also studied.

Based on the data from all sources (interviews, professional journals, environmental and conservation news sites, mailing list archives and international publications), the specific issues were identified. Selected issues may partly overlap in categorization due to difference context or focus of deliberations. From the public and expert data sources, the authors elicited and interpreted the main actors' positions on the issue if applicable. The absence of any relevant news in public media indicating the issue was not important for public or had not become a public concern.

## **Results**

By scrutinising source of data above, the authors identify seven main issues on international policies relevant to forests in Indonesia. These are: timber legality; harmonisation of wood and forest certification schemes; oil palm plantation and its environmental aspects; land use change; climate change including REDD initiative; forest and species conservation; and deforestation and decentralised forest governance (Table 3). Detailed descriptions for each issue follow below, distinguishing between public and expert deliberations and summarising the positions taken by the main actors in each issue.

### ***Timber Legality***

Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) is the European Union (EU) policy to combat illegal logging and illegal trade in forest products. This includes the adoption of the FLEGT Action Plan (2003) which contains EU's commitment to develop a Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) with timber producing countries to prevent illegal timber products from entering the European market. On 4 May 2011, the Indonesian Minister of Forestry and the EU Trade Commissioner signed the FLEGT document. Through this agreement, the EU will ensure free and unrestricted access to all FLEGT-licensed timber products from Indonesia. In order to implement the agreement, the Indonesian government developed the Timber Legality Verification System (*Sistem Verifikasi Legalitas Kayu* or SVLK). It is up to the EU now to recognise SVLK as a tool to determine the legality of Indonesian timber products exported to the EU.

### Public Deliberation

The agreement lists 48 kinds of certified wood products under that SVLK scheme that may be imported without restriction into EU countries (Media Indonesia 2011a; Harian Terbit 2012a). The government stated that this policy was fully supported by the industry. According to the Director of Processing and Marketing of Forest Products of the MoF, by the end of 2011 there were about 125 timber companies implementing SVLK along with 30 forest concessionaires and timber estates. An industrial group represented by Director of Riau Andalan Pulp and Paper said they supported the government's efforts to encourage timber legality verification standards to be recognised internationally (Media Indonesia 2011a, 2011b). At the SVLK launching event, the Minister of Forestry also claimed SVLK would prevent timber laundering in other countries (Kompas 2012a). Hence, the government expects the programme would be supported by small and medium scale enterprises (SMEs). For that purpose government allocated IDR 3 billion in financial assistance for handicraft producers in Bali and furniture makers in Jepara (The Jakarta Post 2012a). The government committed to implementing SVLK for forest unit management and processing industries in December 2012 and 2013 respectively, and rejected a proposal from the APhi (Asosiasi Pengusaha Hutan Indonesia or Association of Indonesian Forest Concessionaires) and Asmino (Asosiasi Industri Permebelan dan Kerajinan Indonesia or Indonesian Furniture Industry and Handicraft Association) to delay (Harian Terbit 2012b, Suara Merdeka 2012). However, later on, the EU was still reviewing SVLK rules and not yet ready to sign the agreement as of November 2012 (The Jakarta Post 2012b). Regarding this point, Deputy Minister of Trade said he questioned the readiness of the EU to implement wood export rules, and even bring this case to WTO if they found evidence of unfair trade (Antara 2012a).

### Expert Deliberation

Using SVLK as the sole governmental tool for determining timber legality and applied to all kinds of wood-based products is actually not fully supported by industry groups. The chairman of Asmino refused enactment of SVLK for furniture products since their raw materials are derived from primary industries that hold legality certificates (Agro Indonesia 2012a). By contrast, Minister of Forestry felt confident that SVLK was the answer to the Indonesian timber trade's problems and he asked all wood industries to meet it (Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia 2011a, 2011b). On the other hand, the Conservation Director at WWF Indonesia said that 50% of consumers in the country ask about wood products legality when they buy it (Agro Indonesia 2012b).

The third suspension of VPA signing by the EU raised questions. The Chair of the Indonesian Delegation for VPA Negotiation argues that VPA looks like a non-tariff barrier to trade (Agro Indonesia 2012c). The Director of Forest Production Development and Forest Products Marketing of the MoF also doubted the EU's commitment to reducing illegal logging since the reason for postponement was an administrative matter, namely translating the documents into the 27 languages of EU member countries (Agro Indonesia 2012d). Furthermore, analysts blamed the severe economic crisis in some EU countries and industry protectionism as the real reasons for SVLK delay (Rimbawan Interaktif 2012a). Researchers criticised the VPA as disguised trade barriers to obstruct Indonesian wood products, especially for pulp and paper. Similarly, the Director of the Forestry Multistakeholder Programme also condemned the EU's postponement of VPA endorsement (Agro Indonesia 2012c).

In response to the VPA and SVLK controversies, a lecturer at IPB said that the issue was not about legality but legitimacy (Agro Indonesia 2012e). Other experts and practitioners were still debating whether SVLK had to be implemented, since approximately 40% of sawmills are illegal and this would affect the legality of wood products (Rimbawan Interaktif 2012b). They then asked the government to place more emphasis on bilateral agreements rather than waiting for EU agreement on SVLK, since they said EU regulation is not legally binding for its members (Rimbawan Interaktif 2012c).

There are six groups involved in the timber legality issue, namely the Ministries of Forestry and of Trade; primary and large-scale forest industries; Asmindo, APhi and the downstream industries; the European Union (EU); the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF); and researchers and academics. The government, large-scale companies, environmental groups and the EU support a wood certification programme in order to achieve sustainable forest management. Meanwhile, Asmindo and APhi consider certification for furniture and handicrafts unnecessary because the raw materials they use are legal, and certification would increase production cost and lead to a decline in competitiveness. On the other hand, academics suggested all parties seek the legitimacy of Indonesian timber products with the assurance of forest sustainability.

### *Harmonisation of Wood and Forest Certification Schemes*

Issue on timber and forest certification emerged from the need for an information system to assess whether a timber product has been processed through environmentally friendly ways. For this purpose, environmental activists and other groups set up the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification scheme in 1993. By this time, there also emerged other certification schemes such as the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest

Certification (PEFC) in Europe, Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) in North America and Lembaga Ekolabel Indonesia (LEI) in Indonesia. All of them are voluntary, which means participants could adopt the standards if they are willing and fulfil the requirements. In 2009, the Indonesian government developed SVLK as a timber legality assurance and will apply it in 2013 to all wood-based industries. Each certification scheme has specific attributes, such as market acceptance, cost, length of the certification process, emphasised aspects, as well as standards flexibility. Business units, however, constantly use economic considerations in choosing affordable schemes in line with profit maximisation. For this reason, some of them took more than one certification scheme at once (Bisnis Indonesia 2012). This leads to a double charge, whereas buyers do not require a specific certification model. There was no any valuable public deliberation to this issue. Conversely, five of seven experts interviewed unequivocally stated that forest and timber certification was an international issue that strongly influenced Indonesian forest policy and practices.

#### Expert Deliberation

As a matter of fact, the FSC scheme is voluntary and has been adopted by industries that primarily export wood-based products to Europe. Regarding this point, the Deputy Minister of Trade stated that there should be a bridge between mandatory and voluntary schemes so that those who receive SVLK automatically become FSC certified (Agro Indonesia 2012f). A similar idea was also conveyed by the Executive Director of APHI, since the government was to do so on a voluntary basis (Agro Indonesia 2012g). Along with the talks, on 6 March 2012, the Indonesia Forestry Certification Coordination (IFFC) introduced the PEFC certification scheme, which is known to have weak environmental criteria compared to the FSC, but was received well in Europe and the US. At present, the issue on harmonisation of certification schemes is still on going.

Based on previous information, there are four groups with strong interest in this issue, namely the Ministries of Forestry and Trade; the Indonesian timber industry; the WWF; and certification scheme owners. The Indonesian government must fight for wood products to be accepted in overseas markets. Therefore, trade barriers must be removed, and agreement with buyer countries have to be signed as soon as possible. Meantime, logging companies and other large-scale wood-based industries want their products accepted by the market with or without certification. Nevertheless, the furniture and handicraft industries reject double certification because their raw materials have already been certified, so they expect their products to be certified automatically. Lastly, certification scheme owners also want to preserve their certification schemes.

### *Oil Palm Plantation and Its Environmental Aspects*

Indonesia has the biggest size of oil palm plantation with 48% of world palm oil production in 2012 (Majalah Swa 2012). This status was achieved in 2007 after Indonesian palm oil production exceeded that of Malaysia. At 34%, palm oil has the largest market share compared to other vegetable oils. Palm oil gradually shifted the market share of soybean oil produced by subtropical countries, which only reaches 30.1% (Media Indonesia 2010a).

#### Public Deliberation

Palm oil production per hectare which takes around six to ten times compared to other vegetable oils' grown in Europe and the US has been triggering unfair competition among the producers. The Secretary General of Indonesian Palm Oil Association (GAPKI) said that the pressure on the oil has been going on since early 1980s. He detailed that NGOs' allegations ranging from claim that palm oil having high cholesterol, inducing heart disease, causing pollution and destroying orangutan habitats (Media Indonesia 2010b). The Indonesian government considered that claims of environmental destruction against the Indonesian palm oil industry as a part of a trade war, which was to be countered by providing more accurate information. The Coordinator Minister for Economic Affairs said the government and industry had to fight against a smear campaign related to palm oil, even bringing unfair trade practices allegations to the World Trade Organization or to bilateral meetings (The Jakarta Post 2012c). Previously, in 2011, GAPKI resigned from the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) and supported Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO) as an alternative framework standard for palm oil certification, though still allowing their members to stay in RSPO (Bisnis Indonesia 2011, Republika Online 2011a). At the APEC CEO Summit 2012 in Vladivostok, a number of developed countries, led by the US, did not approve palm oil as an environmental goods. At the time, President Yudhoyono said that palm oil was an environmentally friendly product, but it was blocked by unfair competition (Suara Pembaruan 2012). In November 2012, Greenpeace indicated Indonesian oil palm companies did not protect the environment, since they did not hold RSPO certificates and were planting in shallow peat land, which however is legal in Indonesia (Antara 2012b).

#### Expert Deliberation

Oil Palm plantation issue in the Ministry of Forestry focused more on licensing forestland for plantation and mining. Hence, MoF did not pay much attention to this issue. Conflicts between Indonesian palm oil producers and other vegetable oil producers from Europe and the US have been going more intense and are recognised by Indonesian government as well as GAPKI. The Indonesian Deputy Minister of Trade challenged the EU to conduct research

and prove their claim that oil palm destroys the environment and is harmful to health. He even presented scientific data to refute all such claims (Agro Indonesia 2011a). In addition, the Indonesian government is also awaiting the US response on charges that palm oil did not meet the minimum standard of greenhouse gas emissions reduction (Agro Indonesia 2012h). This unpleasant business attitude convinced GAPKI to resign from RSPO, since RSPO tends to support consumers' interests. RSPO membership consists 30% of growers and 70% of non-growers, while RSPO decisions are based on a majority voice. GAPKI considered RSPO rules as only complicating matters for producers, and consumers did not buy palm oil with RSPO certificates at premium prices (Agro Indonesia 2011b). GAPKI also suspects RSPO directed non-governmental organizations to protect western countries' interests since they bluntly call for open war against palm oil. Apparently, this conflict would take a long time since President Yudhoyono fully supports expanding oil palm plantations (Investor Daily Indonesia 2012).

In general, groups involved in palm oil issue polarised into producer and non-producer. Group of producer consists of the Ministries of Forestry, Ministry of Trade, large-scale oil palm companies and their association (GAPKI); while the non-producer group comprises the EU, the USA, and environmental NGOs, to wit WWF and Greenpeace. Surprisingly, buyers' alignment was determined by the groups' campaign through mass media. Although buyers, being rational, like qualified products at low prices, they do not want to be accused as a group who degrades the environment.

### *Land Use Change*

Land use change in Indonesia is a warm issue among industrial groups and environmental activists. This comes from the USD 1 billion Letter of Intent (LoI) between Indonesia and Norway that includes moratorium of new forest utilisation permits as Indonesian commitment to reduce carbon emissions. As known, the Oslo Agreement on forest moratorium actually applies only to primary forests and peat lands, and effectively began in early 2011. However, foreign NGOs tried to pressure the government to implement the moratorium on all types of forest, including secondary forests, which then was opposed by palm producers. In this issue, there is no any meaningful debate arising in public media.

### *Expert Deliberation*

The Chairperson of Indonesian Enterprises Association (Apindo) said that the President had to prioritise national interests rather than satisfy foreign insistence to implement the moratorium on all type of forests. The Association of Indonesian Palm Oil (GAPKI) stated that the moratorium on oil palm development and expansion was not possible since this commodity delivered

considerable economic and social benefits (Agro Indonesia 2010). In May 2011, President Yudhoyono issued Presidential Decree No. 10, delaying all new utilisation permits within primary forest and peat lands for two years, and instructed the Minister of Forestry to improve forest management policies (Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia 2011d). However, the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Forestry and Greenpeace both said that the moratorium had to expand beyond two years (Mongabai Indonesia 2012b). On the other hand, the Indigenous Peoples' Alliance of the Archipelago (AMAN) took this opportunity to have included 6 million hectares of customary land into the New Integrated National Map (Mongabai Indonesia 2012c). Some experts argue that the government should commit to a moratorium in all of primary forest and peat land area in order to meet the presidential pledge to reduce carbon emission by 26% in 2020. They also ask the government to increase palm oil production through intensification rather than extensification (Rimbawan Interaktif 2012d).

Based on these findings, there are five groups strongly involved in this issue. First, the Ministry of Forestry as the authority in control of forestland use; second, plantation companies and other business groups who need vast land resources to running their business; third, indigenous people's groups concerned with keeping their land from encroachment by industry. Environmental organizations such as Greenpeace also pay attention to the land-use change issue to make sure the forest moratorium is implemented properly. Lastly, scientists raise the government's awareness of how to balance both economic growth and forest and environmental sustainability.

### *Climate Change Including REDD Initiative*

Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) was an approach proposed at Climate Change Conference 13 in Bali in 2007 and amended in 2009 at the Copenhagen Climate Change Summit. It contains mechanisms for REDD and forest-rich countries to earn compensation for preserving their forests. President Yudhoyono, at the G20 Summit in Pittsburgh, filed a voluntary commitment to reduce Indonesia's carbon emissions by 26% by 2020, up to 41% with international assistance. Following the commitment, the government set up 70 programs funded by the state budget to reduce emissions as promised.

### *Public Deliberation*

Climate change has attracted people's attention successfully. The emergence of the REDD initiative, however, raises a lot of pros and cons. Indigenous environmental groups reject REDD and call it "colonialism of forests". They argue that REDD scheme will only seize control of indigenous forest people's land and allow capital owners to occupy it (Kompas 2009). At

provincial level, some governors felt their provinces were appropriate for REDD implementation. Nevertheless, at that time the central government designated only eight provinces for the REDD trial (Kompas 2011a). In the practice, each stage of REDD implementation program involved many parties and this led to slow progress. Many are worried, since the program was launched and approved internationally (Kompas 2011b).

#### Expert Deliberation

The Indonesian commitment to reduce carbon emissions concerned the involvement of the Norwegian government. In May 2010, Indonesia and Norway signed a Letter of Intent (LoI) with USD 1 billion of REDD+ funding for emission reduction activities (Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia 2010). In 2011 the Ministry of Forestry also received a grant of USD 3.6 million from the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility to support Indonesia in reducing greenhouse gas emission by 26% by 2020 (Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia 2011c). To meet its commitment the Indonesian government's REDD+ Task Force has done many things, including a logging moratorium on 64 million hectares of primary forests and peatlands and limiting plantation size area (Agro Indonesia 2011c, 2012i). However, Norway said the effort was not enough and Indonesia must do more (Agro Indonesia 2012j). Lately, Norway would like to resign from the LoI (Rimbawan Interaktif 2012e).

Regarding this issue the authors consider there are three most active actors who affecting Indonesia policies, namely the Presidential Working Unit for Supervision and Development Control (UKP4) which also leads REDD+ Task Force, the Ministry of Forestry, and scientists. UKP4 has set many policies related to forest utilisation and national strategic for REDD implementation. Those policies have wide implications for all REDD activities throughout Indonesia. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Forestry as a technical actor has an important role since forest sector is expected to reduce emission by 14% of the total national target. Their performance would be significant contribution to the success of REDD implementation. Scientists have much influence through academic discussion and policy formulation.

#### *Forest and Species Conservation*

Forest degradation and deforestation caused by fires, improper land use and logging activities have deflated biodiversity in Indonesia and lead to some species being endangered or extinct. The Indonesian government, people and communities in and around forests, business groups and conservation organizations then put much effort to prevent its deterioration.

#### Public Deliberation

There were not so many articles on forest, land and species conservation in public mass media. If any, they put more emphasis on conflicts of interest in

the conservation field, not conservation activities themselves. Conservation activities were undertaken to protect nature and build livelihood. For example, a breeding centre for the endangered Bali starling was launched by Begawan Foundation in Bali (The Jakarta Post 2011). They bred local birds with others to enhance genetic diversity. In Lampung, the Artha Graha Network in cooperation with the Ministry of Forestry conserve forest for tigers, elephants, gibbons and other wildlife (Media Indonesia 2011c). Other groups take indirect activities to conserve nature, such as the Indonesian Wild Birds Reservation, which launched a postage stamp series featuring endangered Indonesian birds (The Jakarta Post 2012d). At the international level, the United States erased USD 28.5 million of Indonesian debt in a debt-for-nature swap agreement, namely the transfer of debt used for forest conservation. Previously, the US government wrote off USD 19.6 million of Indonesian debt for forest conservation focusing on the 13 national parks on Sumatra (Republika Online 2011b).

#### Expert Deliberation

The Ministry of Forestry has agencies for conserving nature under the supervision of the Directorate General of Forest Preservation and Natural Conservation. They are very concerned about endangered species such as Sunda pangolin (*Manis javanica*), Badak Jawa (*Rhinoceros sondaicus*), and Elang Jawa (*Spizaetus bartelsi*) in Java; Badak Sumatra (*Dicerorhinus sumatrensis*) in Sumatra; Cendana (*Santalum album*) in East Nusa Tenggara; snake-necked turtle (*Chelodina mccordi*) in Rote Island and tiger and orchid species (Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c also Mongabai 2012a). Most articles about species conservation were linked to the species status according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) or CITES (the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora). On the Indonesian forester mailing list, the discussions about conservation circulate around the forest as the habitat of animals and plants and the function of forests in mitigating natural disaster. Discussion also arose when mass media revealed violations committed by companies, such as the poaching of orangutans (*Pongo pygmaeus*) when opening oil palm plantations (Rimbawan Interaktif 2012f, 2012g).

Only three actors with two meaningful roles were present in this issue, namely the Ministry of Forestry versus forest companies and conservation organizations. Mass media consider their activities important for arousing public awareness in environmental protection. Although environmental organizations and scientists talk about this issue, their roles were not very noticeable. In fact, the latter actors did not have a lot of influence on the issue, since mass media only reported the actors who took real action as preserving environment.

### ***Deforestation and Decentralised Forest Governance***

The high rate of deforestation in Indonesia and its impact has become a concern of the world. Sunderlin and Resosudarmo (1996) mentioned meaningful publications stated that deforestation in the 1990s was caused mainly by shifts in cultivation, transmigration and population growth. Similar conclusion derived by data from the Ministry of Forestry indicated that 66% of deforestation was caused by commercial, local and subsistence agriculture (Kissinger, Herold and De Sy 2012). However, issues related to deforestation are often associated with corruption, weak law enforcement, inappropriate policy and the inability of central government to manage the forest (Suparna 2001, FWI and GFW 2002). These arguments then led to a rethink of authority sharing between central and local governments in forest management. In CGI meeting in 2001, forestry decentralisation was agreed as a condition of loan debt. The central government then issued a series of regulations called forest policy reform. However, the deforestation rate has even peaked in the decentralisation era (Nurrochmat 2005).

#### **Public Deliberation**

The Secretary General of APHI recognised local autonomy as the driving factor of deforestation. He said regional autonomy provides the opportunity for regents to issue concessions of less than 30 thousand hectares according to Law No. 22/1999 on Regional Government. Unfortunately, these licenses did not meet with sustainable forest management practices, and massive deforestation occurred in most of the forest-rich districts (Media Indonesia 2012). Supporting this claim, some of former heads of districts have been tried in court for forestry-related crimes (Kompas 2012b). Environmental organizations such as WWF, Indonesia Working Group on Forest Finance (IWGFF) and Transparency International Indonesia (TII) stated that decentralisation opened space for corruption and collusion in natural resource utilisation (Gatra 2012). The Director General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation of the MoF reported that potential losses due to inappropriate permits during the era of decentralisation reached IDR 276.4 trillion, including 770 illegal logging cases and 1724 for mining from 2004 until 2012 in eight provinces (Kompas 2012c).

#### **Expert Deliberation**

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)'s report entitled *Green Carbon, Black Trade* mentioned rampant deforestation and illegal timber trade in various parts of the world caused by organised crime. In Indonesia, it was caused mainly by corruption at upper and lower state levels and system failure (Nellemann and INTERPOL Environmental Crime Programme 2012). The MoF realised the decentralisation process has not shown meaningful

progress yet. Conflicts and disharmonized power sharing between central and local governments have enlarged opportunities in unsustainable forest utilisation instead and led to new pressure on forests (Ministry of Forestry 2010). On the other hand, the central government seems to be very careful in setting new policies to avoid accusations of recentralisation. Apparently, decentralisation brought trouble and confusion for Indonesia in the middle of a desire to create greater regional autonomy (Kadjatmiko 2008). Many researchers emphasised formulating suitable policy regarding forest decentralisation. For instance, CIFOR has conducted 14 studies on decentralisation and forest throughout Indonesia during period 2001-2005.

The central and local governments and environmental organizations are the main actors playing important roles in this issue. The central government has to share its power with local governments for decentralisation to work. In the meantime, it also faces heavy international pressure to manage the environment well. Local governments for their part harness unstable decentralisation to profit from forest utilisation. On this point, environmental organizations come and use national and international publications to warn about long-term environmental damage.

## Discussion

The result of this study indicates that there are seven main issues currently discussed in public and expert deliberations in Indonesia, although two of them, namely harmonisation of wood and forest certification schemes and land use change, were not present in public deliberations. The main actors and their positions in each issue are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Main Actors and Their Positions on Each Issue

Issue	Main actors	Actors' main positions
Timber legality	Ministry of Forestry and Ministry of Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support FLEGT and VPA</li> <li>• Produce legal instruments and force industries to obey it</li> <li>• Promote global recognition of SVLK</li> </ul>
	Primary and large scale forest industries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support FLEGT and VPA</li> <li>• Willing to be certified</li> </ul>
	Asmindo, APHI and downstream industries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support FLEGT and VPA</li> <li>• Not willing to be certified</li> <li>• Downstream industries' products automatically legal since their raw are certified</li> </ul>

	EU countries (Indonesian wood products destination)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postponed signing FLEGT and VPA three times</li> <li>• Unclear position</li> </ul>
	WWF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support FLEGT, VPA and SVLK</li> </ul>
	Researchers and academics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distrust EU commitment</li> <li>• Bilateral agreements more important than VPA since the EU agreement is not legally binding</li> <li>• Push sustainable forest management practice to build Indonesian wood products' legitimacy</li> <li>• Warn about SVLK as new gateway for corruption</li> </ul>
Harmonisation of wood and forest certification schemes	Ministry of Forestry and Ministry of Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fight for SVLK in buyer countries</li> <li>• Recognise voluntary scheme and expect the opposite for SVLK</li> </ul>
	Indonesian timber industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Want mutual recognition between two kinds of certification so that they could get both at once</li> </ul>
	WWF and other environmental organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support FSC becoming the powerful and well-accepted wood and forest certification scheme</li> </ul>
	FSC, LEI, PEFC and SVLK scheme owners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fight for their scheme to be recognised by buyers and accepted by industry</li> </ul>
Oil palm plantation and its environmental aspects	Ministry of Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permits for plantation</li> </ul>
	Ministry of Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fight for acceptance of palm oil products without any restriction and as a source of national income</li> </ul>
	Indonesian Palm Oil Association (GAPKI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to expand oil palm production</li> </ul>
	Greenpeace and WWF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote sustainable environment irrespective of national policy</li> </ul>
	EU and US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect domestic vegetable oil</li> </ul>

	industries	production by blocking palm oil imports
Land use change	UKP4 and REDD Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes policies related to national strategy for land utilization</li> </ul>
	Ministry of Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain control over forest land use</li> <li>• Keep land use change as their concern</li> </ul>
	Plantation companies (GAPKI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to expand oil palm plantation</li> <li>• Consider restrictions a business obstacle</li> <li>• Worry about influence of foreign lobby on Indonesian policy making</li> </ul>
	Indigenous peoples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure their land from occupation by companies</li> </ul>
	Greenpeace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit Indonesia from utilising primary and secondary forests and peat lands</li> </ul>
	Scientists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counsel government to balance economic development and environmental protection</li> </ul>
Climate change including REDD initiative	UKP4 and REDD+ Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesian representation in international forums</li> <li>• Much interaction with international actor and less power</li> </ul>
	Ministry of Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical actor</li> </ul>
	Scientists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing studies and conceptual frameworks for government</li> </ul>
Forest and species conservation	Ministry of Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect genetic resources and consider it a precious heritage the future</li> </ul>
	Forest companies and conservation organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participate in environmental preservation and species conservation</li> </ul>
Deforestation and decentralised forest governance	Central government (Ministry of Forestry)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure forest for diplomatic purposes</li> </ul>

Local government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilise forest and other idle natural resources as source of income</li> </ul>
WWF, IWGFF, TII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Produce and utilise reports of poor forest management in Indonesia in widespread forums</li> </ul>

***Public versus Expert Deliberation***

There are three differences in how the issues were presented in public and expert deliberation. First, public mass media did not pay much attention to issues that did not have direct and immediate importance for the citizen, i.e.: harmonisation of wood and forest certification schemes and land use change. This means that public mass media consider public preferences for their articles and ignore irrelevant topics for short-term interests of society. This finding is similar to work by Sadath (2012). Second, public deliberations also differ from expert deliberations in terms of the depth of information. Third, public deliberations only touch debates on policymaking process and its implementation, while the expert’s give long-term strategic discussions, policy options, studies on policy impacts and dialogue space among interested groups.

***The Most Active Actors***

The Ministry of Forestry is the most active actor in all issues. Another active actor is the Ministry of Trade, which actively involved in three issues, namely timber legality, harmonization of wood and forest certification scheme, as well as oil palm plantation and its environmental aspects. It indicates that forest-related issues at an international level are closely related to international trade and business. In these cases, the Ministries of Forestry as well as Trade work in similar directions, primarily in order to get Indonesian natural products into EU and the US markets (Kementerian Kehutanan 2012a, 2012b). This is surprising as the theory of bureaucratic politics suggest only a single actor has dominant role in a particular sector (Peters 2010). Future studies must scrutinise this relationship not based on discursive contributions, but on on-going politics.

This study also finds industrial groups, namely wood-based industry and oil palm plantation groups, involved in five of the seven issues. Most industries support foreign trade policies issued by the Ministry of Forestry and the Ministry of Trade even though some of them disagree on the certification policy for downstream industries. However, they are in conflict with WWF and Greenpeace, who oppose these industries as destructive to the forest and environment. Industrial groups still demand proof of these allegations. Environmental groups were another active actor that was present

in almost issues. In the case of timber legality and harmonisation of wood and forest certification schemes, both industry and WWF tend to a similar direction although each group has its own interests.

### *The “Missing” Actors*

The roles of scientists and indigenous people were not apparently clear on these issues. Scientists’ role in analysing issues is limited to scientific and policy discussions among themselves, not in the public media. This finding is in line with prior findings on the limited impact of scientific experts on public deliberation (e.g. Sadath 2012, Grundmann 2009, Giessen, *et al.* 2009). Meanwhile, Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara (AMAN), as a representative of indigenous peoples, tries to circulate information regarding their predicament through several channels of group and social media. However, the complexity of the social order and conflicting interests among indigenous people makes this problem quite difficult to raise in public mass media, let alone at an international level.

### **Conclusion**

This paper has identified seven current international forest-related issues in Indonesia: timber legality; harmonisation of wood and forest certification schemes; oil palm plantation and its environmental aspects; land use change; climate change including REDD initiative; forest and species conservation; and deforestation and decentralised forest governance. Two issues that are more technical as well as potentially contentious, specifically harmonisation of wood and forest certification schemes and land use change were not present in public deliberations, but rather remained limited to expert circles. Hence the IFRC seems to be relevant in many ways in Indonesia. The issues identified do cover a wide range of policy domains described by Humphreys (2006) and Giessen (2012). In Indonesia, global climate agreements are made relevant through REDD, endangered species conservation is discussed and free trade issues are touched upon by timber legality and certification issue. However, elements of indigenous people, desertification, CBD and SFM are not discussed in Indonesian public and expert deliberations.

Altogether the issues show that the most active actors in public and expert deliberations are the Ministry of Forestry and the Ministry of Trade, environmental NGOs like WWF and Greenpeace as well as wood and palm oil industry groups. This suggests that the competition of public bureaucracies and their societal clientele (i.e. ministries, see Peters 2010, Rayner *et al.* 2001, Hogl *et al.* 2009, Giessen 2010a, 2010b, and Giessen and Krott 2009) is an important driver of forest-related issues and politics in Indonesia. Their contribution to the issues indicates a relatively weak coalition on forest protection, whereas forest utilisation and trade interests

seem to be rather strong. Moreover, the main lines of conflict as represented in the issues lie between forest utilisation (e.g. for profitable timber or other land use) and forest conservation, which is in line with research by Winkel (2007). This study only analysed the issues measured by more or less public statements in newspapers, expert journals and so forth. These only indicate the *formal claims* and positions of the actors which they are willing to display in more or less public deliberations in public and expert arena (Krott 1990). Based only on this data on formal statements, the authors draw conclusions on which issues from the IFR are made relevant in Indonesia. Other issues which may become relevant based on informal goals of specific actors cannot be revealed by this study.

### Acknowledgement

This research has been kindly supported by Directorate General of Higher Education at the Ministry of Education and Culture in Indonesia (Dikti), the Eva Mayr-Stihl Stiftung, the German Research Foundation under the project "Fragmentation of the International Forest Regime Complex" (PAK813), as well as the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

### References

- Agro Indonesia. 2010. *GAPKI: Tak Mungkin Moratorium Pengembangan Sawit* [GAPKI: Oil Palm Development Moratorium is Impossible]. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2010/05/27/gapki-tak-mungkin-moratorium-pengembangan-sawit/> (Accessed 25 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2011a. *RI Tantang UE Teliti Kebun Sawit* [Indonesia Challenge EU Researching Oil Palm Plantations]. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2011/10/25rspo-untuk-kepentingan-siapa/> (Accessed 25 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2011b. *RSPO untuk Kepentingan Siapa?* [Who Takes Advantages from RSPO?]. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2011/10/25/rspo-untuk-kepentingan-siapa/> (Accessed 25 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2011c. *Seluas 64 Juta Hektare Hutan Di-verboden* [64 Million Hectares of Forest Forbidden] <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2011/05/23/seluas-64-juta-hektare-hutan-di-verboden/> (Accessed 25 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2012a. *Legalitas yang Memangkas Daya Saing?* [Slashed-Competitiveness Legality?]. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/01/25/legalitas-yang-memangkas-daya-saing/> (Accessed 22 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2012b. *Lokal pun Mulai Sadar Lingkungan* [Locals' Environmental Awareness Began]. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/06/19/masalah-indonesia-legitimasi-bukan-legalitas/> (Accessed 15 October 2012).

- Agro Indonesia. 2012c. *Indonesia akan Paksa Implementasi VPA [Indonesia will Force VPA Implementation]*. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/10/02/indonesia-akan-paksa-implementasi-vpa/> (Accessed 1 November 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2012d. *Indonesia Pertanyakan Komitmen Uni Eropa [Indonesia Questioning EU Commitment]*. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/10/02/indonesia-pertanyakan-komitmen-uni-eropa/> (Accessed 1 November 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2012e. *Masalah Indonesia: Legitimasi, Bukan Legalitas [Indonesian Problem: Legitimacy, not Legality]*. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/06/19/masalah-indonesia-legitimasi-bukan-legalitas/> (Accessed 15 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2012f. *Pengusaha Hutan Makin Peduli Kelestarian [Timber Concessionaires Care More about Sustainability]* <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/06/19/pengusaha-hutan-makin-peduli-kelestarian/> (Accessed 1 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2012g. *Berharap Ada Pengakuan Bersama [Hoping for Mutual Recognition]*. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/06/19/pengusaha-hutan-makin-peduli-kelestarian/> (Accessed 1 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2012h. *AS Ulur Waktu Soal Minyak Sawit [US Stalling on Palm Oil]*. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/06/27/as-ulur-waktu-soal-minyak-sawit/> (Accessed 18 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2012i. *UKP4 Pangkas Luas Pemilikan Kebun [UKP4 Limiting Plantation Size]*. <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/08/28/ukp4-pangkas-luas-pemilikan-kebun/> (Accessed 18 October 2012).
- Agro Indonesia. 2012j. *Norwegia Kritik Moratorium RI [Norway Criticises Indonesian Moratorium]* <http://agroindonesia.co.id/2012/05/29/norwegia-kritik-moratorium-ri/> (Accessed 5 October 2012).
- Antara. 2012a. *Kemendag akan Pertanyakan Kesiapan SVLK Uni Eropa [Ministry of Trade Would Question the EU's Readiness for SVLK]*. <http://www.antaranews.com/berita/335804/kemendag-akan-pertanyakan-kesiapan-svlk-uni-eropa> (Accessed 5 October 2012).
- Antara. 2012b. *Greenpeace Keluarkan Rapor Perusahaan Sawit di Indonesia [Greenpeace Issues Indonesian Oil Palm Report Assessment]*. <http://www.antaranews.com/berita/341119/greenpeace-keluarkan-rapor-perusahaan-sawit-di-indonesia> (Accessed November 2, 2012).
- Bernstein, S. and Cashore, B. 2012. "Complex Global Governance and Domestic Policies: Four Pathways of Influence." *International Affairs* 88(3):585-604.
- Bisnis Indonesia. 2011. *Gapki Resmi Keluar dari RSPO [Gapki Resigns from RSPO]*. <http://www.bisnis.com/articles/gapki-resmi-keluar-dari-rspo>. (Accessed 29 October 2012).

- Bisnis Indonesia. 2012. *Pengusaha Kehutanan Minta Model Sertifikasi Lacak Balak Kayu Disinergikan* [Forest Enterprises Ask for Certification Harmonisation]. <http://www.bisnis.com/articles/pengusaha-kehutanan-minta-model-sertifikasi-lacak-balak-kayu-disinergikan> (Accessed 25 October 2012).
- Brockhaus, M., Obidzinski, K., Dermawan, A., Laumonier, Y. and Luttrell, C. 2012. "An Overview of Forest and Land Allocation Policies in Indonesia: Is the Current Framework Sufficient to Meet the Needs of REDD+?" *Forest Policy and Economics* 18:30-37
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). 2010. *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010–Main Report*. FAO Forestry Paper 163. Rome.
- Forest Watch Indonesia (FWI) and Global Forest Watch (GFW). 2002. *The State of the Forest: Indonesia*. Jakarta and Washington.
- Gatra. 2012. *Korupsi & Pencucian Uang Pun Jadi Penyebab Degradasi Hutan* [Corruption and Money Laundering Causing Forest Degradation]. <http://www.gatra.com/nusantara/nasional/20180-korupsi-pencucian-uang-pun-jadi-penyebab-degradasi-hutan.html> (Accessed 5 November 2012).
- Giessen, L. 2010a. Regional Governance für ländliche Räume-innovativer Ansatz, politischer Gegenwind und der Weg vorwärts. In: *Raumforschung und Raumordnung* 68(1):3-14.
- Giessen, L. 2010b. *Regional Forest Governance-Potentials for Forestry and Political Drivers in Integrated Rural Development Policy*. Goettingen University Press, 313pp.
- Giessen, L. and Krott, M. 2009. Forestry Joining Integrated Programmes? A Question of Willingness, Ability and Opportunities. In: *Allgemeine Forst- und Jagdzeitung* 180(5-6): 94-100.
- Giessen, L. 2012. "Temporary Governance and Persistent Government-Rural Policy Integration in Pilot and Mainstream Funding Programmes." In: Hogl, K., Kvarda, E., Nordbeck, R., Pregernig, M. (Eds.): *Environmental Governance: The challenge of Legitimacy and Effectiveness*. Edward Elgar. p. 155-177.
- Giessen, L., Kleinschmit, D. and Böcher, M. 2009. "Between Power and Legitimacy-Discourse and Expertise in Forest and Environmental Governance." *Forest Policy and Economics* 11(5-6):452-453.
- Grundmann, R. 2009. "The Role of Expertise in Governance Processes." *Forest Policy and Economics* 11(5-6):398-403.
- Harian Terbit. 2012a. *UE Hanya Terima Kayu SVLK* [The EU Only Accepts SVLK-Certified Wood]. <http://www.harianterbit.com/2012/07/24/ue-hanya-terima-kayu-svlk/> (Accessed 22 October 2012).
- Harian Terbit. 2012b. *Menhut Tolak Usulan Pengusaha. Penerapan Sertifikasi Kayu Tetap 21 Desember* [Minister of Forestry Rejects APhi Proposal. Wood Certification Will Be Implemented on 21 December]. <http://www.harian>

- terbit.com/2012/09/12/menhut-tolak-usulan-pengusaha/ (Accessed 24 October 2012).
- Hogl, K., Nordbeck, R. and Kvarda, E. 2009. "When International Impulses Hit Home: The Role of Domestic Policy Subsystem Configurations in Explaining Different Types of Sustainability Strategies." *Forest Policy and Economics* 11(5-6):357-364.
- Howlett, M. and Ramesh, M. 1995. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. 2nd edition. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Humphreys, D. 2006. *Logjam: Deforestation and the Crisis of Global Governance*. London: Earthscan.
- International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO). 2011. *Annual Review and Assessment of the World Timber Situation 2011*. Yokohama.
- Investor Daily Indonesia. 2012. *Tak Ada Sawit Indonesia yang Merusak Lingkungan [Indonesian Oil Palm Not Damaging Environment]*. <http://www.investor.co.id/agribusiness/tak-ada-sawit-indonesia-yang-merusak-lingkungan/39387> (Accessed 18 October 2012).
- Kadajatmiko. 2008. "Implementing Decentralisation: Lessons from Experiences in Indonesia." In Colfer, Carol J., Ram, Ganga Dahal, and Capistrano, Doris (editors). *Lessons from Forest Decentralisation: Money, Justice and the Quest for Good Governance in Asia-Pacific*. London: Earthscan.
- Kementerian Kehutanan. 2012a. *Kemenhut Launching Sistem Informasi Legalitas Kayu. Siaran Pers. [Ministry of Forestry Launch Timber Legal Assurance System. Press Release]*. <http://www.dephut.go.id/index.php?q=id/node/8547> (Accessed 10 November 2012).
- Kementerian Kehutanan. 2012b. *Uji Pengapalan Ekspor Produk Kayu Bersertifikat ke Uni Eropa. Siaran Pers. [Shipment of Test Certified Wood To EU. Press Release]*. <http://www.dephut.go.id/index.php?q=id/node/8649> (Accessed 10 November 2012).
- Kissinger G., Herold, M., and De Sy, V. 2012. *Drivers of Deforestation and Forest Degradation: A Synthesis Report for REDD+ Policymakers*. Vancouver: Lexeme Consulting.
- Kompas. 2009. *REDD Dituntut Tidak Tinggalkan Masyarakat Adat [REDD Sued to Not Leave Indigenous Peoples]*. <http://nasional.kompas.com/read/2009/12/14/09421281/REDD.Dituntut.Tidak.Tinggalkan.Masyarakat.Adat> (Accessed 18 October 2012).
- Kompas. 2011a. *Riau Tuntut Dimasukkan dalam REDD Indonesia-Norwegia [Riau Demands Inclusion in Indonesia-Norway REDD]*. [http://www.Media-indonesia.com/webtorial/tanahair/?bar\\_id=MjE3Njkw](http://www.Media-indonesia.com/webtorial/tanahair/?bar_id=MjE3Njkw) (Accessed 18 October 2012).
- Kompas. 2011b. *Koordinasi Pemerintah Buruk [Government Coordination Was Poor]*. [http://www.mediaindonesia.com/webtorial/tanahair/?bar\\_id=MjY0NDcx](http://www.mediaindonesia.com/webtorial/tanahair/?bar_id=MjY0NDcx) (Accessed 18 October 2012).

- Kompas. 2012a. *SVLK Cegah Praktek Log Laundering [SVLK Prevents Log Laundering]*. <http://sains.kompas.com/read/2012/08/01/18175122/svLK.cegah.praktek.log.laundering> (Accessed 18 October 2012).
- Kompas. 2012b. *Mantan Bupati Kampar Dituntut 6 Tahun Penjara [Former Head of Kampar District Indicted to 6 Years]*. <http://cetak.kompas.com/read/2012/10/02/02490121/mantan.bupati.kampar.dituntut.6.tahun.penjara> (Accessed 10 October 2012).
- Kompas. 2012c. *Hutan Dirambah, Negara Rugi Ratusan Triliun [Forests Cleared, State Loses Hundreds of Trillions]*. <http://bisniskeuangan.kompas.com/read/2012/10/23/07424761/Hutan.Dirambah.Negara.Rugi.Ratusan.Triliun> (Accessed 30 October 2012).
- Krasner, S. D. 1982. "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables." *International Organization* 36(2):185-205.
- Krott, M. 1990. *Öffentliche Verwaltung im Umweltschutz. Ergebnisse Einer Behördenorientierten Policy-Analyse am Beispiel Waldschutz*. Wien: Braumüller Verlag.
- Lindstad, B. H. and Solberg, B. 2010. "Challenges in Determining National Effects of International Policy Processes: Forest Protection in Norway as a Case." *Forest Policy and Economics* 12(7):489-496.
- Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia. 2008. *Dua Harimau Sumatera Kembali ke Hutan [Two Sumatran Tigers Return to Forest]*. Edition VII:36.
- Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia. 2009a. *Elang Jawa, Burung Asli Indonesia yang Kian Hilang [Java Eagle, Indonesia's Native Birds are Going Extinct]*. Edition I:30-31.
- Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia. 2009b. *Menteri Kehutanan Canangkan Pengembangan Cendana di NTT [Minister of Forestry Declares Sandalwood Development in NTT]*. Edition II:5-9.
- Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia. 2009c. *Selayang Pandang Kawasan Konservasi Mangrove dan Bekantan [An Overview of Mangrove and Proboscis Conservation Area]*. Edition I:30-31.
- Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia. 2010. *Norwegia Siap Kucurkan Dana REDD+ USD 1 Miliar [Norway Ready to Give USD 1 Billion of REDD+]*. Edition VI:12-13.
- Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia. 2011a. *Menhut Janji Kampanyekan Legalitas Kayu [Minister of Forestry Promises to Campaign for Timber Legality]*. Edition 11:5-6.
- Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia. 2011b. *Promosi Kayu Legal ala Indonesia-Uni Eropa [Legal Timber Promotion à la Indonesia-EU]*. Edition 5:5-7.
- Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia. 2011c. *Perlu Kompensasi Nagara Maju untuk Kurangi GRK [Developed Countries' Assistance is Needed for Reducing Greenhouse Gases]*. Edition VII:29-31.

- Majalah Kehutanan Indonesia. 2011d. *Perdebatan Moratorium Berakhir [Debate on Moratorium is Over]*. Edition VI:5-7.
- Majalah Swa. 2012. *Indonesia Sumbang 48% Produksi Minyak Sawit Dunia [Indonesia Contributes 48% of World Palm Oil Production]*. <http://swa.co.id/business-research/indonesia-sumbang-48-produksi-minyak-sawit-dunia> (Accessed 14 September 2012).
- Maryudi, A., Devkota, R.R., Schusser, C., Yufanyi, C., Salla, M. Aurenhammer, H., Rotchanaphatharawit, R. and Krott, M. 2012. "Back to Basics: Considerations in Evaluating the Outcomes of Community Forestry." *Forest Policy and Economics* 14:1-5
- McDermott, C.L., Cashore, B. and Kanowski, P. 2010a. *Global Environmental Forest Policies : An International Comparison*. London: Earthscan.
- McDermott, C.L., Humphreys, D., Wildburger, C. and Wood, P. 2010b. "Mapping the Core Actors and Issues Defining International Forest Governance." In: Rayner, J., Buck, A. and Katila, P. (Eds.). 2010. *Embracing Complexity: Meeting the Challenges of International Forest Governance. A Global Assessment Report*. Prepared by the Global Forest Expert Panel on the International Forest Regime. IUFRO World Series Volume 28. Vienna. P 19-36.
- Media Indonesia. 2010a. *Indonesia Surga Sawit Dunia [Indonesia the World's Oil Heaven]* [http://www.mediaindonesia.com/webtorial/asianagri/?ar\\_id=Nzc1Ng](http://www.mediaindonesia.com/webtorial/asianagri/?ar_id=Nzc1Ng) (Accessed 5 October 2012).
- Media Indonesia. 2010b. *Internasional Akan Terus Menekan Industri Sawit [International Pressure on Palm Oil Industry Continuously]*. [http://www.Mediaindonesia.com/webtorial/tanahair/?bar\\_id=MTc3MDYy](http://www.Mediaindonesia.com/webtorial/tanahair/?bar_id=MTc3MDYy) (Accessed 13 September 2012).
- Media Indonesia. 2011a. *Indonesia-Uni Eropa Ikat Perjanjian Legalitas Perdagangan Kayu [Indonesia and the European Union Agree on Timber Legality Agreement]*. [http://m.mediaindonesia.com/index.php/read/2011/03/22/212261/21/2/Indonesia-Uni\\_Eropa\\_Ikat\\_Perjanjian\\_Legalitas\\_Perdagangan\\_Kayu\\_](http://m.mediaindonesia.com/index.php/read/2011/03/22/212261/21/2/Indonesia-Uni_Eropa_Ikat_Perjanjian_Legalitas_Perdagangan_Kayu_) (Accessed 13 September 2012).
- Media Indonesia. 2011b. *Produk Kayu Indonesia Diakui Uni Eropa [Indonesian Wood Products Recognised by the EU]*. <http://www.mediaindonesia.com/read/2011/09/27/263023/4/2/-Produk-Kayu-Indonesia-Diakui-Uni-Eropa> (Accessed 27 October 2012).
- Media Indonesia. 2011c. *Konservasi Tambling Lampung, Bukti Keseriusan Indonesia Cegah Pemanasan Global [Tambling Conservation in Lampung, the Evidence of Indonesia's Awareness to Prevent Global Warming]*. [http://www.mediaindonesia.com/read/2011/05/05/222543/89/14/Konservasi-Tambling-Lampung-Bukti-Keseriusan-Indonesia-Cegah-Pemanasan-Global\\_](http://www.mediaindonesia.com/read/2011/05/05/222543/89/14/Konservasi-Tambling-Lampung-Bukti-Keseriusan-Indonesia-Cegah-Pemanasan-Global_) (Accessed 27 October 2012).

- Media Indonesia. 2012. *Otonomi Daerah Akibatkan Penebangan Hutan Secara Sporadis [Autonomy Results in Sporadic Deforestation]*. [http://www.mediaindonesia.com/webtorial/tanahair/?bar\\_id=MzUxMzg4](http://www.mediaindonesia.com/webtorial/tanahair/?bar_id=MzUxMzg4) (Accessed 13 October 2012).
- Ministry of Forestry. 2010. *Strengthening Forest Administration. Integrative Research Planning 2010-2014 Document*. [http://forda-mof.org/files/RPI\\_24\\_Penguatan\\_Tatakelola\\_Kehutanan.pdf](http://forda-mof.org/files/RPI_24_Penguatan_Tatakelola_Kehutanan.pdf) (Accessed 27 October 2012).
- Mongabai Indonesia. 2012a. *BKSDA Sulut Pulangkan Seekor Macan Tutul ke Jawa [BKSDA Sulut Brings Back Leopard to Java]*. <http://www.mongabay.co.id/2012/11/15/bksda-sulut-pulangkan-seekor-macan-tutul-ke-jawa/> (Accessed November 15, 2012).
- Mongabai Indonesia. 2012b *Kebijakan Moratorium Hutan Tak Cukup Hanya Dua Tahun [Two-Year Forest Moratorium Policy is Not Enough]* :<http://www.mongabay.co.id/2012/10/01/kebijakan-moratorium-hutan-tak-cukup-hanya-dua-tahun/> (Accessed 29 October 2012).
- Mongabai Indonesia. 2012c. *Peta Wilayah Adat Diakomodir Masuk One Map Indonesia [Customary Land Accommodated into One Map Indonesia]* <http://www.mongabay.co.id/2012/11/15/peta-wilayah-adat-diakomodir-masuk-one-map/#ixzz2CGjyh1F1> (Accessed 29 October 2012).
- Nellemann C., INTERPOL Environmental Crime Programme (eds). 2012. *Green Carbon, Black Trade: Illegal Logging, Tax Fraud and Laundering in the Worlds Tropical Forests. A Rapid Response Assessment*. United Nations Environment Programme, GRID-Arendal.
- Nurrochmat, D. N. 2005. *The Impacts of Regional Autonomy on Political Dynamics, Socio-Economics and Forest Degradation: Case of Jambi-Indonesia*. Göttingen: Cuvillier.
- Ojha, H. Cameron, J. and Kumar, C. 2009. "Deliberation or Symbolic Violence? The Governance of Community Forestry in Nepal." *Forest Policy and Economics* 11:365–374
- Peters, B. G. 2010. *The Politics of Bureaucracy-An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration*. 6th edition. Oxon: Routledge.
- Rayner, J., Buck, A. and Katila, P. (Eds.). 2010. *Embracing Complexity: Meeting the Challenges of International forest Governance. A Global Assessment Report*. Prepared by the Global Forest Expert Panel on the International Forest Regime. IUFRO World Series Volume 28. Vienna. 172 p.
- Rayner, J., Howlett, M., Wilson, J., Cashore, B. and Hoberg, G. 2001. "Privileging the Sub-sector: Critical Sub-sectors and Sectoral Relationships in Forest Policy-making." *Forest Policy and Economics* 2(3–4):319-332.
- Republika Online 2011a. *Gabungan Pengusaha Sawit Keluar dari RSPO [Palm Oil Association out of RSPO]*. <http://www.republika.co.id/berita/nasional/>

- umum/11/10/11/lsvl90-gabungan-pengusaha-sawit-keluar-dari-rspo. (Accessed 25 October 2012).
- Republika Online. 2011b. *AS Hapus Utang RI untuk Konservasi Hutan [US Writes Off Indonesian Debt for Forest Conservation]*. <http://www.republika.co.id/berita/ekonomi/keuangan/11/09/29/lsvl90-gabungan-pengusaha-sawit-keluar-dari-rspo>. (Accessed 18 October 2012).
- Rimbawan Interaktif. 2012a. *Apa Kabar SVLK [How is SVLK]*. Message no. 37354.
- Rimbawan Interaktif. 2012b. *Abstract tentang FLEGT VPA dan SVLK [Abstract on FLEGT, VPA and SVLK]*. Message no. 36812-36814.
- Rimbawan Interaktif. 2012c. *Apa Kabar SVLK [How is SVLK]*. Message no. 37382.
- Rimbawan Interaktif. 2012d. *APEC CEO SUMMIT 2012, SBY Terus Perjuangkan Sawit [APEC CEO SUMMIT 2012, SBY Struggling for Palm Oil]*. Message no. 36883, 36886, and 36887.
- Rimbawan Interaktif. 2012e. *Apa Kabar Lol Norway? [How is the Norway Lol?]*. Message no. 36672.
- Rimbawan Interaktif. 2012f. *Kompas: Petisi Daring-Dari Gambut hingga Sirip Hiu [Kompas: Petition Online-From Peat to Shark Fins]*. Message no. 37406.
- Rimbawan Interaktif. 2012g. *Orangutan Terbakar Saat Evakuasi [Orang-utan Burned during Evacuation]*. Message no. 37034 and 37035.
- Sadath, N. 2012. *Media as a Driver of Policy Change: The Example of Forest-Climatic Policy in Bangladesh*. PhD Dissertation. University of Goettingen. 131p.
- Sadath, N. and Krott, M. 2012. Identifying Policy Change-Analytical Program Analysis: An Example of Two Decades of Forest Policy in Bangladesh. *Forest Policy and Economics* 25:93-99.
- Smouts, M. C. 2008. "The Issue of an International Forest Regime." *International Forestry Review* 10(3): 429-432.
- Steffek, J. 2009. "Discursive Legitimation in Environmental Governance." *Forest Policy and Economics* 11:313-318.
- Suara Merdeka. 2012. *Asmindo Tolak Sertifikasi Legalitas Kayu [Asmindo Reject Wood Legality Certification]*. <http://www.suaramerdeka.com/v1/index.php/read/news/2012/02/10/109171/Asmindo-Tolak-Sertifikasi-Legalitas-Kayu> (Accessed September 11, 2012).
- Suara Pembaruan. 2012. *APEC CEO Summit 2012, SBY Terus Perjuangkan Sawit [APEC CEO Summit 2012, SBY Struggled for Palm Oil]*. <http://www.suarapembaruan.com/ekonomidanbisnis/apec-ceo-summit-2012-sby-terus-perjuangkan-sawit/24426> (Accessed 12 September 2012).
- Sunderlin W. D. and Resosudarmo, I. A. A. P. 1996. *Rates and Causes of Deforestation in Indonesia. Towards a Resolution of the Ambiguities*. CIFOR Occasional Paper no. 9. Bogor.

- Suparna, N. 2001. "Forest Governance and Law Enforcement in Indonesia." Paper presented at the Forest Law Enforcement & Governance–East Asia: A Ministerial Conference. Bali, September 11-13.
- The Jakarta Post. 2011. *Bali Starling Breeding Center Opened*. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2011/11/09/bali-starling-breeding-center-opened.html> (Accessed 12 September 2012).
- The Jakarta Post. 2012a. *Gov't Helps Small Timber Product Firms Get SVLK Certification*. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/08/03/govt-helps-small-timber-product-firms-get-svlk-certification.html> (Accessed 10 September 2012).
- The Jakarta Post. 2012b. *EU Postpones Approval of RI Timber Products*. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/09/26/eu-postpones-approval-ri-timber-products.html> (Accessed 24 October 2012).
- The Jakarta Post. 2012c. *Govt to Counter Negative Campaign on CPO*. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/04/14/govt-counter-negative-campaign-cpo.html> (Accessed 5 September 2012).
- The Jakarta Post. 2012d. *Stamps to Spread the Word on Endangered Birds*. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/07/26/stamps-spread-word-endangered-birds.html> (Accessed 5 September 2012).
- UN-REDD. 2012. *Indonesia. UN-REDD Country Brief*. <http://www.fao.org/climatechange/unredd/53078/en/idn/> (Accessed 24 October 2012).
- Winkel, G. 2007. *Waldnaturschutzpolitik in Deutschland. Bestandsaufnahmen, Analysen und Entwurf einer Story-Line*. Remagen-Oberwinter (Dr. Kessel). Freiburger Schriften zur Forst-und Umweltpolitik 13, 561 p.

## **Annex 1. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

AMAN	Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara or Indigenous Peoples' Alliance of the Archipelago
APHI	Asosiasi Pengusaha Hutan Indonesia or Association of Indonesian Forest Concessionaires
Apindo	Asosiasi Pengusaha Indonesia or of Indonesian Enterprises Association
Asmindo	Asosiasi Industri Permebelan dan Kerajinan Indonesia or Indonesian Furniture Industry and Handicraft Association
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CGI	Consultative Group on Indonesia
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GAPKI	Gabungan Pengusaha Kelapa Sawit Indonesia or Indonesian Palm Oil Association
IFR	International Forest Regime
IFRC	International Forest Regime Complex
ISPO	Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
MoF	Ministry of Forestry
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PEFC	Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
RSPO	Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SMEs	Small and Medium scale Enterprises
SVLK	Sistem Verifikasi Legalitas Kayu or Timber Legality Verification System
UKP4	Unit Kerja Presiden Bidang Pengawasan dan Pengendalian Pembangunan or Presidential Working Unit for Supervision and Development Control
VPA	Voluntary Partnership Agreements
WTO	World Trade Organization
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature