DOI 10.18551/rjoas.2019-11.02

PLANNING FOR RESULT OF “SOCIAL FORESTRY EXPLOITATION PERMIT” SCHEME IN TULUNGAGUNG REGENCY OF INDONESIA

Putri Dicky Fernanda*, Mindarti Lely Indah, Shobaruddin Muhammad

Faculty of Administrative Science, University of Brawijaya, Indonesia

*E-mail: vernandapcy@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research discusses planning for result of “Social Forestry Exploitation Permit” Scheme (IPHPS) in Tulungagung Regency. The problem arises because the implementation of this scheme still not fully runs from its appearance in 2016. Planning for result of *IPHPS* in Tulungagung Regency is expected that it can give any description of impact, result, output and *IPHPS* scheme positive changes of this scheme. This research is classified as descriptive research through qualitative approach. The analysis result showed that *IPHPS* scheme in Tulungagung Regency could work if forestry institutional capacity building was carried out and work plan identification was comprehensively and completely carried out.

KEY WORDS

Planning for result, social forestry, *IPHPS* scheme, public service.

Social Forestry Exploitation Permit” Scheme (*IPHPS*) is a new scheme of social forestry practice in which the Government provides legal access to communities to manage forest areas in the working area of Perhutani, in hopes of improving the welfare of the community, reducing deforestation and overcoming the inequality of forest governance. Nationally, the achievement target of *IPHPS* at the end of year 2018 is still under target of 14,607.90 Ha where the national target is 12.7 million Ha (Zakaria, 2018:6). According to Zakaria (2018:5-6) licensing and funding on this scheme still require improvement because it requires a long chain and far from the word conducive. This then affected the implementation of *IPHPS* in the region, one of them in Tulungagung Regency. Based on data from technical executive Unit (UPT) of forest management Area IV of Tulungagung Regency (2019) said that 1,518.38 Ha of critical land in Tulungagung district which has been approved by the Government to enter the *IPHPS* scheme, but until This is still not able to run because there are problems that are government errors in the granting of permits and group unpreparedness because it has no good planning. This group's unpreparedness is characterized by limited funds, no initiative of the community and is highly dependent on the companion and does not reach an agreement with Perhutani.

Based on the problem, the planning for the results is needed in *IPHPS* scheme in Tulungagung Regency. According to UNDP (2008) Planning for results can help know what to do, help in reducing and managing the crisis as well as ensuring the implementation goes smoothly, increasing focus on priorities and leading to the use of time and efficient resources, and helps determine the goals and outcomes you want. Therefore, planning for the results can help to give an overview of the impact, outcome, output and positive changes in the *IPHPS* scheme in Tulungagung Regency.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this research, there are several concepts which form framework of thinking, namely, planning for result, social forestry and *IPHPS* Scheme. Related to the planning for the results, UNDP (2009:21-78) stated that there are five steps to be done i.e. starting the planning, stakeholder's engagement, the planning exercise, finalizing the results framework and preparing to operationalize. Then the objective of social forestry is to reduce the poverty of forest-dependent communities (Blaikie: 2006), access the legal community of Forests (Maryudi: 2012) and to improve the condition of the forest (Gilmour: 2016). Furthermore,

the IPHPS scheme based on the Regulation of Ministry of Environment and Forestry No. 39/2017 on social forestry in the work area of Perum Perhutani.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

The type of this research is descriptive with qualitative approach. Mardalis (1999:26) defines a descriptive study aimed at describing the current conditions, and a qualitative approach is performed with the recording of a fact-sighting view. The researchers are key instruments and data collection techniques are done through observation, interviews and documentation, while data analysis is done using data analysis Model Creswell (2014).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In starting the planning stage, there were two things done by the stakeholder: discussing the problem record and making the work plan. The problem record contained any information about serious challenge to face. In the problem record, forestry development in Tulungagung Regency was caused by tenure conflict and illegal logging. Based on the data from Blitar *KPH* (2019) it was found that 179,13 Ha forest area was still in strata B tenure conflict category and 1,536 trees logged. Therefore, the challenge which was necessarily done was institutional capacity building with empowerment. According to Fahrudin (2010:2), institutional capacity building with empowerment covers individual capacity building (community), institutional capacity (organization and behavior values) and networking capacity with other institutions as well as interaction with broader system. In this case, the forest village community classified as undeveloped community had to be assisted so that they could be more independent and participate actively to the potential owned. Then, the success of forest village community empowerment program was not only measured by the manager's success or program facilitator, but also it had to be admitted by the community that the success happened because of their own effort.

The problem record is useful in making a clear work plan with an efficient schedule and budget. The work plan contains the outline of the activities, schedules and resources needed. IPHPS work plan in Tulungagung District still does not cover the full time, activities and resources needed in the planning process to monitoring and involvement of forestry professionals in the planning process.

Stakeholder's inadequate involvement was one of the most common reasons that the program was failed; the stakeholder, therefore, had to be actively encouraged starting from the planning to the evaluation stage. Stakeholder had to be always involved and had such an active participation at every opportunity in a balanced manner that it could decrease group dominance and tension (UNDP, 2009:25). On the *IPHPS* scheme in Tulungagung Regency, there were four types of stakeholder, namely:

1. Stakeholder group I was woman either a housewife or a teenager, who had a little influence on the planning process, but had an important role in the success of the activity if they were active to participate. This stakeholder needed a special emphasis to make sure that their interest was protected and their group voice was heard;
2. Stakeholder group II was forest village community, Blitar *KPH*, Tulungagung Regency *UPT* Forest Management Area IV and Mangkubumi *LSM PPLH*, which was the main stakeholder and had influence on the program sustainability and built partnership;
3. Stakeholder group III was an academician and a forestry observer who did not play the main role in the whole process, not as intended benefit receiver and only had a little influence on either the success or the failure of the program;
4. Stakeholder group IV was local businessmen who did not play an important role but had a significant influence because they had informal relationship with the regional holder of power and supportive resources with the result that to get this stakeholder's support, the communication had to be able to built.

Of all four stakeholders above, the strongest dominance which could influence the success and the failure of the *IPHPS* scheme in Tulungagung Regency was stakeholder

group II, especially Blitar *KPH* which was the state enterprise agency and owned an authority to the production forest management in part of Tulungagung Regency region. Blitar *KPH*'s authority as a forest management based on the Government Regulation No. 72/2010 on State-Owned Enterprise Company caused the birth of regulation on *IPHPS* as a form of the State-Owned Enterprise Company's failure in the forest management. This matter caused the State-Owned Enterprise Company's support to *IPHPS* scheme was only for the formality to the regulation with the result that it had an impact on the occurrence of obstacle to *IPHPS* implementation, especially in Tulungagung Regency. For example, there was the occurrence of two different licensing on the same land, that was "Wonodadi Lestari" *KTH* of Tenggararjo Village proposed land about 705,53 Ha for the *IPHPS* scheme, while Blitar *KPH* proposed the partnership permit with *PTPN X* for the sugar cane plantation.

In this stage, stakeholder had to do problem analysis and find out the situation comprehensively before developing target and goal of the program planning. The problem analysis had an important role in developing clear understanding more deeply about the cause and obstacle which underlay them, determining the problem complexity and the relationship among several contributory factors, determining how the problem affected a group, determining short term, middle term and long term intervention as well as the sustainable solution, identifying the necessary partnership and assessing the stakeholder's role who were involved and necessary resources. The problem analysis was put into the problem tree model for the purpose of studying the root cause, the main impact, and good solution design (UNDP, 2009:32-34). The following was a figure of the deforestation problem analysis and the forest tenure in Tulungagung Regency:

Figure 1 – Problem Analysis of Deforestation and Imbalance in Land Tenure in Tulungagung Regency (Source: Adapted from UNDP, 2009: 39)

The problem analysis about the reason Tulungagung Regency joined to participate in *IPHPS* scheme was that there was the occurrence of deforestation in the form of deforested area which was about 10.034 Ha and potentially deforested about 871 Ha. Besides, there was imbalance in the forest tenure which resulted in the occurrence of tenure conflict. Deforestation and imbalance in forest tenure happened because the government policy in the forest management was more economically oriented than ecologically and

socially oriented. This policy was born because the human's anthropocentric mind set which focused on selfishness and considered human the most important creature in the entire ecosystem order. As a result, human's sustainability became the top priority and everything available on earth was sources to meet human's needs and desire.

The problem analysis above was then made in the form of the result map. The result map was made to comprehend any assumption used to design a problem. In making the result map, the stakeholder had to record any assumption, risk and undesirable result from the risk happened and then it could help to obtain the desired result (UNDP, 2009:49-52). The following was the result map of deforestation and forest tenure in Tulungagung Regency:

Figure 2 – Result Map of Deforestation and Imbalance in Forest Tenure in Tulungagung Regency
(Source: Adapted from UNDP, 2009:47)

In making the result map, then the thing done was creating a positive result in which every problem identified was rewritten as the result and positive impact. On the result map about deforestation and imbalance in land tenure in Tulungagung Regency, it was found that there were four results which could be done to overcome the problem which had been analyzed in figure 1, those were (1) giving forest acreage certainty and legal access of forest management. Legal certainty giving to the forest zone would strengthen the forest zone legality and right certainty of all parties to the forest zone with the result that it did not emerge social conflict which had an impact on community's economy and forest ecology; (2) environment and forest awareness socialization helped to increase community's participation about the importance of forest for life, with the result that community did forestry activity control for forest function sustainability; (3) synergy of all parties, control tightening of

environment and forest permit as well as violation sanction giving could help in pressing down number of violations and maintain wood availability in forest; (4) making a strong and well-directed policy which was able to give any solution of the root of the problem which could help to give forest function balance economically, ecologically and socially. In this case, *IPHPS* scheme was expected could help to overcome the forest problem in Tulungagung Regency.

In this stage, stakeholder started to change the result map into the result framework. The result framework was written in the form of table. In this case, stakeholder had to understand, support and be aware of implication of all elements in the result framework. The following was a table about the result framework of *IPHPS* scheme in Tulungagung Regency:

Table 1 – Result Framework of *IPHPS* Scheme in Tulungagung Regency

Result	Impact	-Increase in community's prosperity -Balance between environment with social dynamics and community's culture
	Outcome	-Decreasing poverty -Decreasing access right of forest land conflict -Building social independence and forest village community's economy -Realizing economic equity -Decreasing deforestation and climate change
	Output	-Deforested area became productive area -Increase in forest village community's income -Decrease in number of violations to the forest -Forest village community had knowledge and experience in managing forest resources sustainably
	Activity	-Forest staple plant cultivation about 50%, that was <i>paraserianthes falcataria</i> commonly known as <i>sengon</i> tree -Multipurpose plant cultivation about 30%, that was durian fruit and avocado -Annual plant cultivation about 20%, that was corn -The cultivation crops was sold to the State-Owned Enterprises or private enterprises through <i>KTH</i> -Intensive socialization and mentorship by facilitator
Indicator (measure of progress)	Impact	- Community's spiritual and material needs were met - Forest resources was able to give positive contribution to social and cultural life, community's economy, and stay sustainable
	Outcome	-Increase in family consumption, school registration number, health visit and decrease in unemployment number -Decrease in tenure conflict number -Increase in community's knowledge and awareness of socioeconomic potential owned by the village -Decrease in imbalance in land tenure between community with government and company -The amount of land preserve increased -The number of natural disaster decreased
	Output	-Plant cultivation could live and grow well -Measure of household income obtained from the presence of <i>IPHPS</i> and before the presence of <i>IPHPS</i> -Decrease in illegal logging -Increase in community's skill in managing forest resources and doing negotiation with outside parties
	Main target to output production	-Active participation among stakeholders to achieve mutual agreement -Shared commitment with justice principle -Could build solid institution
Base		Monitoring and evaluation reality data
Target		Illegal forest management for 35 years and could give positive contribution to economy, society and ecology.
Means of Verification		Reality data in the field could be found out when the program implementation had been carried out
Risk		-Occurrence of community's misperception about legal access of forest management -Forest village community's resources could not manage the forest sustainably -Mentorship and control were not intensively done -There were diseases on plants or natural disaster which resulted in crop failure -Stakeholder could not maintain the shared commitment

Source: Adapted from UNDP (2009:54).

In the result framework there were six indicators analyzed to show a measure of result accomplishment, those were indicator, base, target, means of verification, and risk. In the result indicator there were four indicators; those were impact referring to a big description, which was a development basic goal, outcome referring to actual change of development condition resulted from output, and output was the activity development result of short term activity and described an action to obtain the desired result. The progress indicator was a measure of progress of each result indicator. Basic indicator was evaluation basic data and monitoring. Target indicator was a program period or a time span. A means of verification was implementation reality data in the field, while risk was probability data which could inhibit the result accomplishment (UNDP, 2009:56).

This stage was a final stage of the result planning, in which the result framework which had been made, the strategy was arranged afterwards to find out how the result framework would be implemented and strengthened by the target and the goal. This stage required three keys so that the result framework could be implemented, namely building the communication, accountability and incentive or sanction (UNDP, 2009:76-78).

In the *IPHPS* scheme in Tulungagung Regency, the way of building communication was not effective yet. This matter was indicated by the *KPH* Blitar's support which was only for the formality to fulfill the rule of p.39/2017. Understanding of program goal and detailed things which had to be carried out by *KTH* as program main actor had not clearly delivered yet with the result that the understanding of *IPHPS* was only for positive things obtained, not impact which had to be endured. For example, it was about tax and *KTH*'s responsibility for the forest management. Moreover, communication was not done in a two-way communication and each stakeholder also still defended their ego and personal interest with the result that the mutual agreement was not achieved yet. This matter caused *IPHPS* planning in Tulungagung Regency was still in a stagnate stage.

Accountability in *IPHPS* scheme in Tulungagung Regency was carried out by all stakeholders involved, especially by the main stakeholder. The development and success of *IPHPS* became shared responsibility starting from the planning stage to the evaluation stage. To obtain the expected accountability, it had to be supported by information transparency and trust among stakeholders obtained from communication building. Incentive and sanction were the final stage in preparing the operationalization of the result framework. Discussion among stakeholders on incentive arrangement of each stakeholder and administrative sanction on *IPHPS* scheme violation would encourage the result framework implementation. Ideas from each stakeholder from every process either planning or evaluation had to be heard and documented as a part of implementation planning.

CONCLUSION

This research concluded that the result planning for *IPHPS* scheme in Tulungagung Regency could be carried out with expected result, on condition that (1) Institutional capacity building through empowerment and comprehensive and complete work plan identification; (2) Active involvement of entire stakeholders of all types from the planning stage to the evaluation stage and there was no dominance at every stakeholder; (3) Root of the problem the and main problem finding, and impact resulted with the result that it could answer the reason *IPHS* was a solution to the problem described in the result map; (4) Result framework was a measure which was achieved and could help any progress of general activity process; (5) To prepare operationalization, then it required effective communication among stakeholders with the result that accountability and stakeholder's incentive arrangement could run well.

REFERENCES

1. Creswell, J.W. 2012. Research Design Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Mixed. Cetakan ke-2. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.

2. Blaikie, P. 2006. Is Small Really Beautiful ? Community Based Natural Resource Management in Malawi and Bostawa. World development.
3. Fahrudin. Adi. 2010. Pemberdayaan Partisipasi dan Penguatan Kapasitas Masyarakat. Bandung: Humaniora.
4. Gilmour, D. 2016. 40 Years of Community Based Forestry : a Reviewer of Extent and Effectiveness. Rome: FAO.
5. Mardalis. 1999. Metode Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Proposal. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
6. Maryudi, A. 2012. Back to Basic: Considerations in Evaluating The Outcomes of Community Forestry. Forest Policy and Economics.
7. UNDP. 2009. Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. USA: UNDP.
8. UNDP. 2008. Programme and Operations and Procedures. Retrieved from <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide>.