DEFORESTATION POLICY GOVERNANCE IN INDONESIA

Ahmad Fitra Yuza[1]
Halimah Abdul Manaf [2]
Zainal[3]

[1,3]Universitas Islam Riau
Jl. Kaharuddin Nst No.113, Simpang Tiga, Kec. Bukit Raya, Kota Pekanbaru, Riau 28284,
Indonesia

[2]University Utara Malaysia
06010, Sintok Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia

Correspondence email: fitra.ip@soc.uir.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Deforestation threatens national security and is a disaster caused by natural and human factors. Natural factors, namely the dry season resulting in forest fires and the human factor, which takes over the function of forests to become plantations and illegal logging. This paper uses a literature study with the theory of policy governance. The research method is a qualitative descriptive method. In-depth interviews obtained the data collection techniques. The study results show that accountability in the management and protection of forests in Indonesia has not run optimally due to overlapping policies, and legal certainty relating to forests or land use in Indonesia still needs to be clarified, so law enforcement is weakened. There need to be more quality resources in enforcement. Weak participation can also be seen from the policies implemented by the Indonesian government that has yet to involve the involvement of local communities to avoid or reduce the rate of deforestation. While in terms of transparency carried out by the Indonesian government, one of which is through the SLVT policy to realize transparent government administration in forest management, which has shown results, although improvement efforts are still being made so that transparency criteria can be met to the fullest.

Keywords: Deforestation; Governance; Public Policy

ABSTRAK

Deforestasi merupakan salah satu ancaman keamanan dan bencana nasional yang disebabkan oleh factor alam dan manusia. Faktor alam yaitu musim kemarau sehingga terjadi kebakaran hutan dan factor manusia yang mengambil alih fungsi hutan menjadi perkebunan dan penebangan liar. Tulisan ini menggunakan studi literatur dengan teori tata kelola kebijakan. Metode penelitian adalah metode deskriptif kualitatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukan bahwa akuntabilitas dalam pengelolaan dan perlindungan hutan di Indonesia belum berjalan dengan maksimal akibat terjadinya tumpang tindih kebijakan dan kepastian hukum yang berkaitan dengan hutan ataupun penggunaan lahan di Indonesia masih ambigu sehingga penegakan hukum melemah dan kurangnya sumber daya yang berkualitas dalam penegakannya. Partisipasi yang lemah juga terlihat dari kebijakan yang diimplementasikan oleh pemerintah Indonesia belum mampu melibatkan keterlibatan masyarakat lokal untuk menghindari ataupun mengurangi laju deforestasi yang terjadi. Sementara dalam hal transparansi dilakukan oleh pemerintah Indonesia salah satunya melalui kebijakan SLVT untuk mewujudkan penyelenggaraan pemerintahan yang transparan dalam pengelolaan hutan sudah memperlihatkan hasil meskipun upaya perbaikan masih terus dilakukan agar kriteria transparansi dapat terpenuhi maksimal.

Kata kunci: Kerusakan Hutan; Tata Kelola Pemerintahan; Kebijakan Publik.

BACKGROUND

In 2019, Indonesia was ranked 9th in the world as one of the countries with forest resources, with 94.1 million hectares or 50.1% of the total land area. Indonesia also represents 44% of the Southeast Asian region (Suwarno & Hein, 2015). Indonesia's forests stretch from the island of Sumatra to

Papua. In 2009 Indonesia's forest area reached 46.33% of Indonesia's land area or around 88.17 million hectares, with forests on the island of Papua 38.72% or around 34.13 million hectares of Indonesia's total forest area (Rauf et al., 2020).

Forests are essential to humans, but due to economic and political change pressures, Indonesia's forests are recorded as having the second highest rate of deforestation in the world. Deforestation also threatens the loss of biodiversity and shakes the ground, which can cause landslides. Deforestation can be defined as conservation forest areas officially recognized as unofficial forest areas (Duyvenbode, 2018). According to Geist and Lambin, deforestation can be caused by several factors, such as economic factors, expansion of infrastructure institutions, or timber harvesting (Korwa, 2020).

Forestry governance procedures and bureaucracy based on the principles of transparency, participation, accountability, and coordination will provide more excellent room for improving the forestry sector in Indonesia and reducing deforestation rates (Zamhasari & Gafar,

2021). Since 2000, one of Indonesia's most significant drivers of deforestation has been converting rainforest land to monoculture oil palm plantations. Other factors are also included, such as paper making, logging, and mining. In 2014 more than 10 million hectares of forest land were converted to oil palm plantations. Forest and land fires are also significant factors in deforestation in Indonesia, which occurs yearly. In 2015, Indonesia experienced fire forest consequences that changed the function of forests and peatlands to plantations (oil palm) (Septianingrum, 2018). Severe forest fires in Sumatra and Kalimantan have caused thousands of people to experience respiratory problems. Smoke from forest and land fires also reach abroad. For example, in Riau Province, 2014, the area of forest fires was 6,301.10 ha higher than the land and forest fires in 2012 and 2013, which were 1,060 and 1,077.5 ha (Rauf et al., 2020).

To find out some of the triggering factors for deforestation in Indonesia can be seen in the following table. (Kemen G Austin et al., 2019) :

Table.1 Area (ha) and proportion (%) of national deforestation 2001-2016 caused by each trigger category.

Drivers	Area (ha)	Proportion (%)
Oil palm plantation	2,080,978	23%
Timber plantation	1,261,028	14%
Large scale plantation	616,208	7%
Meadows/shrubs	1,840,884	20%
Small scale farming	1,361,784	15%
Small-scale mixed plantation	662,418	7%
Logging road	357,391	4%
Secondary forest	554,617	6%
Mining	219,987	2%
Fishpond	71,717	1%
Other	157,619	2%

Based on the table above, it is estimated that oil palm plantations drove the most considerable deforestation at around 23%. In contrast, expanding timber and other large-scale plantations resulted in 14% and 7% of national deforestation, respectively. Forest conservation for grassland/bush is the second largest cause of deforestation, with a percentage of 20%. This is also because 2003, 2007, 2014, and 2016 were dry seasons with a surge in fire activity. Whereas expansion of small-scale agriculture and mixed cropping accounts for 22% of national deforestation. Flight paths followed by secondary forest recombination created 10% of national deforestation, but for 2001-2005 flight paths fell from an average of 9% to 3% in 2011-2016. The final drivers of deforestation are mining and fishponds and other activities, contributing to 5% of national deforestation. Policies issued by the government in the past have also been a driver of deforestation in Indonesia, which legalized logging activities to increase income and employment. Apart from that, the Forestry Law also provides land use permits for agriculture, plantations such as oil palm, and mining, which indirectly reduce the function of forests. So that with these activities' deforestation cannot be avoided because the government needs foreign exchange from forest resources.

Analysis of BAPPENAS in 2010 related fundamental problems in the Indonesian forestry sector shows that poor governance, spatial planning that is not synchronized between the center and the regions, unclear rights tenure, and weak capacity in forest management (including law enforcement) are fundamental problems in forest management in Indonesia that lead to the destruction of forest resources (Silvanita et al., 2015).

The program run by the government to address deforestation occurring in Indonesia is REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation), a mechanism to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The REDD program is intended to reduce emissions from deforestation and activities that cause forest degradation. The Indonesian government has also established an FMU (Forest Management Unit) allowed in Government Regulation 2007 concerning Forest Management and Preparation of Forest Management Plans and Forest Utilization. However, the Ministry of Forestry and District Governments primarily focus on forest control from timber companies originating from commercial forest resources so that deforested receive attention.

This financial gain through REDD+ activities has motivated the central government to reform the forestry sector and the FMU system. Since February 2014, more than 64% of the forest area has been categorized for KPH management, or 84 million ha, including 183 protection forest units (24 million ha); and 437 production forests (60 million ha). (Bae et al., 2014).

The role of FMUs in implementing REDD+ is stated in Government Regulation No. 6 of 2007. Meanwhile, according to the Cancun Agreement (CA) (Atkinson, 2014), the FMU has a role that must develop things following namely: 1) National strategy or action plan; 2) National forest reference

emission leveled forest reference level; 3) Strong national forest monitoring and transparent system; 4) System to provide insecurity information.

The KPH system is carried out to improve better forestry policy governance through decentralization so that every region in Indonesia has its own KPH to manage forest deforestation in its territory. However, the implementation of REDD+ in Indonesia has not run as effectively as expected, and this is due to several weaknesses in its implementation, one of which is the inaccuracy of deforestation rate data.

The Indonesian government claims it has successfully reduced the deforestation rate, while the REDD+ monitor found that the deforestation rate doubles yearly. Overall, it can be seen from the graph that the rate of deforestation marked by the loss of primary forest cover in Indonesia increased from more than 0.2 million per hectare in 2001 to just under 0.6 million per hectare in 2007 and continued to increase by around 0.8 million per hectare in 2012. The two central island regions, Sumatra and Kalimantan, gradually increased. The deforestation rate in Sumatra increased slowly from 0.1 million per hectare in 2011 to 0.4 million per hectare in 2012 despite a decline in 2003. Kalimantan started from just under 0.1 million per hectare to more than 0.3 million per hectare in 2012. Deforestation rates in other regions such as Papua, Sulawesi, Maluku, Java and Bali, Nusa Tenggara remained relatively stable (below 0.1 million per hectare) during the indicated period between 2001 and 2012 (Korwa, 2020).

Meanwhile, between 2017 and 2018, according to estimates by the Indonesian government, the rate of deforestation decreased by 40,000 hectares. Although Indonesia experienced a reduction in deforestation of around 40% in 2018 from 2001-2016, rates in East Kalimantan, Maluku, and West Papua increased by more than 30% compared to 2017. This illustrates that the deforestation rate increased in 2018 for the seven provinces with the highest deforestation rates in Indonesia. From these data, Indonesia's deforestation rate is still high even though the REDD+ program has been implemented since 2009.

Because the governance concept of forest destruction policy is necessarily carried out to understand and manage the interrelationships between social systems and ecosystems, therefore, in managing a good environment and avoiding deforestation, Sonny Often argues that there is a close relationship between good governance and sound environmental management (Kasana, 2020).

Policy and forest governance will help to make natural resources successful and sustainable and protect environmental quality because good governance will influence and determine good environmental management, which can prove the quality of the governance.

This research seeks to explain how the government can implement policies to reduce deforestation based on this premise.

METHOD

The method used in this study is to use a qualitative descriptive method according to the research problem. This

research will be carried out using a qualitative method approach with descriptive research types, namely research types that aim to analyze a phenomenon in depth (Agus Salim, 2001). In this study, objective conditions encountered in the field will be used based on data relating to the problem of Forest Degradation Policy Governance in Indonesia.

According to Yin (Fires, 2019), a qualitative method is a method that combines several sources of evidence, such as open interviews, documents and policies, and group interviews, suitable for answering research questions because this method allows researchers to collect information and details that are closely related to the research objectives. Furthermore, data collection techniques obtained by in-depth interviews and analysis of policies and documents are used to strengthen understanding and facts about the phenomenon of damage problems by using the principle of data triangulation. Data triangulation is also used to prevent invalid information about a phenomenon that can come from various data sources.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to GFI (Agung et al., 2014), several principles are used in policy governance to damage the excellent forest: accountability, transparency, participation, and legal certainty.

Accountability

Accountability in the management of forests is how the Indonesian government carries out accountability in terms of forest management that can fulfill the wishes of the people in every policy they implement. Indonesia, which adheres to a decentralized system, distributes government affairs from the center to the regional level, including forest management, meaning that deforestation begins and is developed at the national level but is carried out at the provincial, district, and city levels. Areas classified as state forests are controlled and managed by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, while areas classified as non-forest are controlled and managed by governors and district heads/mayors. Local governments have the authority to issue land use permits, such as for plantations and mining use, while village governments are responsible for eliminating companies investing in their villages.

The Forest Management Unit (KPH) is also responsible for forest management as an additional form of forest administration, where the central government regulates the conditions. In contrast, the management is carried out by local legal entities. The accountability carried out by the Indonesian government in forest management relates to one institution and another to realize good forest governance for the sustainability of forest functions.

Estimates of the most considerable deforestation in Indonesia are driven by oil palm plantations, around 23% nationally. Oil palm plantations resulted in an average of 586 ha of deforestation over five years; in 1995-2000, it decreased from a high of 788 ha to its lowest level, and from 2000-2005, it increased again to 616 ha and 585 kha respectively during 2005- 2010 and 2010-2015. The forest loss category was

dominated by secondary forests (94.9%) rather than primary forests (5.1%). In addition, the proportion of new plantations also caused deforestation, which was initially 53.9% during 1995-2000 to 18.0% during 2010-2015. Meanwhile, the proportion of plantations originating from non-forest land increased, especially for agricultural land, from 22.1% in 1995-2000 to 37.9% in 2010-2015.

Based on these data, the rate of deforestation has not been optimally managed by the Indonesian government. Meanwhile, those responsible for forest and supervision of peatland forests consist of several national-level agencies, namely the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK), the Ministry of Public Works (KemenPU), the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (ESDM), the National Land Agency (BPN) and the Ministry of Agriculture (Ministry of Agriculture). Accountability in forest management that is carried out from the national to regional level often overlaps due to the lack of cross-ministerial coordination at the national to regional level, so that in building relationships around the forest and land governance and sharing information, it becomes ineffective at all levels.

This lack of coordination causes the implementation of laws and policies to run differently than expected. For example, regulations regarding palm oil as one of the main sectors contributing to deforestation in Indonesia are under the authority of the Ministry of Agriculture and not the authority of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. While oil palm companies monitored by the Ministry of Environment

and Forestry must make long-term plans within ten years, the Ministry of Agriculture does not require companies to make such long-term plans. Inconsistency and lack of coordination like this are obstacles to implementing accountability for forest management to avoid deforestation. Besides that, the high rate of deforestation is due to a corrupt political and economic system, which views natural resources, especially forests, as a source of income that can be exploited for political gain and personal gain (Hadiyan & Pambudi, 2017).

In addressing deforestation in Indonesia, the government is participating in the REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) program, a mechanism to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Since 2005, the idea of a global REDD+ mechanism has gained considerable momentum, including in Indonesia. (Agung et al., 2014)

In 2011, the Government of Indonesia, through the National REDD+ Task Force (Satgas REDD+), finalized the Indonesian National Strategy for REDD+ (Stranas REDD+), which will be used as a guideline for the implementation of REDD+ in Indonesia. Even though the National Strategy for REDD+ has a national approach, the goal is to be implemented at the regional level. Meanwhile, the Government of Indonesia also issued Presidential Regulation No. 61 of 2011 concerning the National Action Plan for Reducing Greenhouse Gases (GHG).

This regulation aims to reduce national emissions by 26% by 2020; forestry and peatlands contribute 67% of the target. However, in practice, there still needs to be

more clarity about coordination and accountability. At the national level, the REDD+ Task Force, DNPI, and the Ministry of Finance must be more explicit about who can regulate and make any decisions regarding REDD+. Each agency claims to have the mandate to regulate REDD+, resolved by establishing a REDD+ Managing Agency. So accountability for carrying out policies on forest management in Indonesia still overlaps, and there needs to be more coordination among the institutions concerned.

In addition, the REDD+ program developed at the national level often needs to be implemented at the regional level. With the existence of REDD+, each province is expected to carry out REDD+ planning, including districts for reducing greenhouse gas emissions supervised by Bappenas and implemented by the Regional Development Planning Agency. However, this accountability is only given to a few regions that have developed REDD+ plans. Then the Government of Indonesia seeks to transfer the accountability for further authority to the village level by expanding the area of social forestry schemes where local communities also influence decisions related to forest management because the village government is the government that is closest to the community which can provide positive things in the management of natural resources to the people.

Decentralization in forest management has resulted in overlapping accountability between the national and provincial governments. This overlapping authority also allows local governments to issue plantation permits covering more than 4Mha of forest land to investors without presenting them to the Ministry of Environment and Forestry as an official release. For example, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) succeeded in a high-profile case involving a district head in Riau Province, who was jailed for 11 years for violating regulations and accepting bribes in granting oil palm concessions (Duyvenbode, 2018). This proves that local governments took advantage of decentralized forest management policies and used them for their benefit.

Legal certainty

Legal certainty in forest management governance principles is applied so that if there is a violation case, there is a juridical regulation to guarantee certainty that the law is a rule that must be obeyed.

Failure enforcement the law in the field of forestry sourced from no regular management forest does not give certainty in the law. The main problem in the management of area forests is that provisions about the state of the area forest boundaries still need to be arranged definitively, so it does not guarantee that the law truly limits area forests. Such things will become a problem and become a limiting factor implementation of enforcement law (Ifrani, 2015).

Laws applied in management in Indonesia still overlap with one another, where the District Governments have quite a lot of authority over land use decisions in their territories, and it is not uncommon for their actions to contradict or overrule the

intentions of the National Government. For example, when the National Government can designate a forest area as protected, local authorities can issue permits to operate within the area and then lead to land clearing in the protected forest area (Enrici & Hubacek, 2016).

Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning the Province Government has been passed. It is intended to reallocate authority over land use from the district government to the province and finally to the central government. If implemented, this law has the potential to significantly impact forest governance, especially in permits that conflict with the authority of the central government; district governments can no longer issue them. However, this law has yet to be implemented in the field, so until now, the district government still maintains its authority over forest land use.

The rate of deforestation is also affected by the issuance of permits because most of the deforestation in each type of permit has a different land cover than expected. Government licensing agencies grant permits for specific land use types, including oil palm plantations, timber plantations, and selective logging activities. However, there is often a discrepancy between land cover and permit allocation in Indonesia, where independent smallholders occupy at least 33% of permits from oil palm and timber plantations.

Through land tenure and management permits, many political elites use their authority to accept bribes from other land use interests, and it is not uncommon for companies or individuals who wish to operate in certain areas to provide payments as bribes or tributes to local governments. Even though cases like this may have become a habit, they are still declared illegal according to law and need to be questioned where the legal certainty is. An example of this type of encroachment that sometimes occurs when the agricultural land used by palm oil companies is adjacent to a protected area and they are not carrying out REDD+ activities, but there is almost no action from the local authorities. Encroachment that occurs begins on a small scale by companies and individuals or small groups, but when not stopped by the authorities, it can spread to thousands of hectares.

Undeniably, the management of the forestry sector is used as a business field for corruption. It was also followed by the mining sector, contributing to deforestation; only 40% of the 10,000 registered mining companies were clean and had clear business permits. Revenues related to forest resources and official projects related to forest use make it an attractive sector for corruptors. It is estimated that between 2007 and 2011, seven billion USD was lost due to corruption in the forestry sector and illegal activities in Indonesia. This proves that Indonesia's legal certainty in the forest management sector is still weak, so various types of corruption occur at various levels of forest governance.

In addition, industrial practices that are harmful to the environment, such as slash-and-burn agriculture, are allowed with no law enforcement from the government because it wants to maintain this vital engine for Indonesia's financial well-being.

Weak law enforcement related to forest management in Indonesia can also be seen from the lack of sanctions for violators. Legal sanctions for violating forestry regulations in Indonesia do not exist or are too weak to enforce them. Even in some cases where there was a clear and identifiable violation by the licensee, the license was initially withdrawn but re-issued. This is evidenced by the fact that the Minister of Forestry is responsible for official forest land but is not authorized to impose sanctions if another sector issues a permit on the official forest.

So legal certainty in enforcing forest protection and land use has historically been ambiguous, and there need to be more quality resources in enforcement. Meanwhile, strengthening legal certainty is one of the most efficient steps to tackle deforestation by preventing forest fires, peatlands and land clearing. Weak enforcement of environmental regulations, underfunded regulations, and a shortage of law enforcement staff have resulted in widespread environmental deforestation as the Indonesian government prioritizes economic development over environmental management.

Participation

Participation related to forest management is defined as the participation of a person or group of people in any process of planning or implementing forest management policies. Muttaqin (Lenhardt, 2020) states that community involvement in state forest management has been limited. While large-scale entities have historically dominated state forest management in

Indonesia through logging and plantation permits…, forest-based community management (CBFM) only accounts for 1% of the total production area and forest protection. Lack of engagement with local communities is also a significant constraint for implementing deforestation management measures in Indonesia. This is because, at the time of drafting the regulations and legislation, forestry still has sectoral interests that limit space for the community to get justice and prioritize the interests of the owners of significant capital (Talumepa, 2020).

According to McDermott and Schreckenberg (Supratman et al., 2016), community forestry (CF) is where local communities have power or influence over forest management, including access rules and product disposition.

Some state forests are under the KPH system after the central government implements a commitment to implement KPH nationally. At the management level forest, the existence of KPH ensures he knows the potency forest, the changes that occur, and the condition benefit-dependent society _ source power forest (E. Suwarno, 2015). According to Law 23 of 2014, the power to control natural resources was transferred, originally the district's authority to become the province's authority. This FMU-related policy includes a CF scheme to be managed under the FMU system. Thus, CF can no longer refer to delegating power to local communities. Depending on the political bureaucracy in play at all levels of government, local CF management authority can be decentralized through certain institutions.

In addition, there needs to be more alignment of national and district-level goals with village-level goals, which hinders engagement with legal and policy measures at the local level (Supratman et al., 2016). Village heads involved in village-level intergovernmental fiscal transfers found that while these funds provided environmental and livelihood benefits, the funds needed to be aligned with village objectives. The distribution of benefits is uneven due to the limited number of farmers selected to participate in the tree planting project, the lack of alignment of village plans, and the lack of substantive participation. However, REDD+ stakeholders have been working to make improvements in terms of community participation through a further emphasis on community consultation. The REDD+ development process is expected to provide opportunities to strengthen the involvement of indigenous and local communities in managing forest resources and making decisions.

The increase in the rate of deforestation related to community participation occurs because not all communities prioritize deforestation or have complete information for conservation and reforestation. Communities think they will carry out activities that can provide direct economic benefits to their households, such as agro-forestation or planting timber trees to improve their quality of life.

Based on the discussion above, the policies implemented in forest protection and management by the Indonesian government have not been able to involve the involvement of local communities to avoid or reduce the rate of deforestation.

Moreover, local people still depend significantly on forest resources for their livelihoods. Therefore, the need for improvements made by the Government of Indonesia in forest governance related to participation, especially in building good communication with the community and sharing information about the benefits of conservation and reforestation for local communities at the village level.

Transparency

In terms of forest management, transparency is needed both in making forestry sector policies and in implementing these policies.

There is a myriad of governance issues that affect the rate of deforestation in Indonesia, especially in terms of transparency such as weak shared commitment to maintain the sustainability of forests is a matter of substantial because commitment is often violated, the desire to fulfill individual or group interests becomes more critical than forest sustainability (Juniors, 2022).

Transparency could be seen through the openness of institutions authorized in forest management between one institution and another. For example, the existing data needs to be more consistent regarding data reporting. The Ministry of Environment (KLH) reports that forest cover in Papua is around 60 Mha, while the Ministry of Finance measures around 44.2 Mha. Only now, different levels of government (District, Provincial, and National) worked with different maps, which often presented conflicting

information, including data held by the private sector.

Transparency in forest management is one of the efforts of the central government in providing and opening access to information at every stage in the utilization, protection, and distribution of forest products so that they still pay attention to the principle of sustainability of forest functions behind the process of utilizing and distributing these forest products. Several transparency criteria can analyze policies related to forest protection and management carried out by the Government of Indonesia, including information accessibility, transparency in the policy process, permits in the use and circulation, and guidelines for public services. In this case, the author takes the example of transparency related to timber circulation in Indonesia.

From 2001-2016 the rate of deforestation caused by timber plantations was recorded at around 14% with an area of 1,261,028 ha, with the type of permits estimated at around 58%. (KG Austin et al., 2017). While The Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) 2009 implemented the System Legality Verification Timber (SLVT) policy in the Minister of Forestry Regulation No.38/Menhut-II/2009 as one of the improvements in forest governance, significantly reducing the rate of deforestation that occurs in terms of utilization and distribution of wood in Indonesia.

Indonesia implements SLVT in addition to eradicating illegal logging and illegal timber circulation, which can trigger deforestation and increase economic growth through trade in legal timber products abroad. However, the effectiveness of SLVT in efforts to support improved forest governance cannot be analyzed because, since the implementation of the SLVT policy in 2009, the Indonesian government still needs to conduct a policy evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the SLVT.

Before the implementation of SLVT, access to information related to forest management through timber plantations was assessed as not running perfectly, and there needed to be more information regarding policy documents, sources of raw materials, and management unit performance. In contrast, the timber chain of custody information was unavailable. In addition, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry has published a website that is used to convey information, especially regarding timber plantations but is considered yet to be informative, as well as openness in the process of policy, licensing, and administration. Then in terms of service, no guidelines become a reference for the government and the community in public services. At the same time, the guidelines for public services regarding the delivery of information are essential because these guidelines will increase public understanding of what information can and cannot be accessed.

After implementing the SLVT policy, several changes or improvements have occurred related to transparency, so this policy can successfully support improvements to the principle of transparency in forest governance, especially regarding the use, protection and distribution of timber forest products. This

increase in transparency is due to easy access to information and openness in the process of policies, permits, and other administrative requirements. However, several cases of illegal timber are still being distributed by irresponsible parties. However, implementing this policy also has drawbacks, especially in terms of public service guidelines which still need to be considered complete because they have not fully regulated the mechanism and dissemination of information related to SLVT policies and programs/timber utilization and distribution to the public.

This shows the efforts made by the central government in administering transparent governance, especially in terms of forest management, bearing in mind that the rate of deforestation in Indonesia, which continues to increase, has started to show results. However, improvement efforts will continue to be made so that transparency criteria can be met to the fullest so that governance of forest that pays attention to the principle of sustainability and the continuity of forest functions is carried out as expected.

CONCLUSION

Policy governance damage Forests in Indonesia can be seen through several principles, namely:

A lack of coordination between institutions both at the central and regional levels concerned, as well as overlapping regulations and policies as a result of the policies of each regime changing due to the politicization of land use permits forming various extractive activities so that actors involved in forest management mostly take personal advantage.

Legal certainty relating to forests and land use has historically been ambiguous and needs more qualified resources to enforce them.

Participation which is still considered weak shows that the policies implemented by the Indonesian government have yet to be able to involve the involvement of local communities to avoid or reduce the rate of deforestation that occurs.

SLVT policy by the central government in administering transparent governance, especially related to forest management, has started to show results. However, improvement efforts are still being made to meet transparency criteria fully.

REFERENCE

Agung, P., Galudra, G., Noordwijk, M. Van, & Maryani, R. (2014). Reform or reversal: the impact of REDD + readiness on forest governance in Indonesia Reform or reversal: the impact of REDD + readiness on forest governance in Indonesia. *Climate Policy*, *0* (0), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2014.941317

Atkinson, CL. (2014). Deforestation and transboundary haze in Indonesia: Path dependence and elite influences. *Environment and Urbanization ASIA*, *5* (2), 253–267. https://doi.org/10.1177/0975425315577905

Austin, KG, Mosnier, A., Pirker, J., McCallum, I., Fritz, S., & Kasibhatla, PS (2017). Shifting patterns of oil palm driven deforestation in Indonesia and implications for zero-deforestation commitments. *Land Use Policy*, *69*

(Sep.), 41–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.08.036

Austin, Kemen G., Schwantes, A., Gu, Y., & Kasibhatla, PS (2019). What causes deforestation in Indonesia? *Environmental Research Letters*, *14* (2). https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaf6db

Bae, JS, Kim, Y., Fisher, L., Moeliono, M., & Deshazo, J. (2014). Society & Natural Resources: An Promises and Perils of Decentralized Forest Governance: The Case of Indonesia's Forest Management Units in Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+). *Society and Natural Resources*, *December*, 37–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2014.945061

Duyvenbode, B. Van. (2018). *Measuring Deforestation in Indonesia - A Comparison of Data and Methods.*

Enrici, A., & Hubacek, K. (2016). Business as usual in Indonesia: Governance factors affecting the acceleration of the deforestation rate after the introduction of REDD+. *Energy, Ecology and Environment*, *1* (4), 183–196. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40974-016-0037-4

Fires, B. (2019). *Beyond Fires and Deforestation: Tackling Land Subsidence in Peatland Areas, a Case Study from.* d, 11–13.

Hadiyan, Y., & Pambudi, H. (2017). Understanding and Building Approaches to Solving Deforestation and Forest Degradation in the Regions of Sumatra and Kalimantan. *Proceedings of Biology Education Conference*, *14*, 166–69. https://blog.cifor.org

Ifrani. (2015). Disharmony of Forest Area Governance Arrangements in Indonesia. *Laws*, *14* (7), 87–100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2015.1044943%0Ahttp://dx.doi.

org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.581%0Ahttps://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2547ebf4-bd21-46e8-88e9-f53c1b3b927f/language-en%0Ahttp://europa.eu/.%0Ahttp://www.leg.state.vt

Junior, GR (2022). DEFORESTATION VS FOREST REFORESTATION IN INDONESIA (In the Light of the Encyclical Laudato Si'). *Fides et Ratio* . http://ejournal-stfxambon.id/index.php/FeR/article/view/74

Kasana, P. & N. (2020). Good Environmental Governance In Indonesia (Perspective Of Environmental Protection And Management). *The Indonesian Journal Of International Clinical Legal Education*, *2* (1), 43–56. https://doi.org/10.15294/ijicle.v2i1.37328

Korwa, JR. (2020). The Role of the Indonesian Government in Implementing REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) Program Under Former President Yudhoyono MANDALA: *Journal of International Relations*, 1–2.

Lenhardt, A. (2020). *Barriers to prevent deforestation and degradation of Indonesia's tropical rainforests and peatlands.* https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/20.500.12413/15654

Lisdiyono, E. (2018). Legal idealism and implementation: An analysis of the gap between environmental policy and the local regulation in Indonesia. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, *21* (Special issue), 2018.

Margono, BA, Turubanova, S., Zhuravleva, I., Potapov, P., Tyukavina, A., Baccini, A., Goetz, S., & Hansen, MC (2012). Mapping and monitoring deforestation and forest degradation in Sumatra (Indonesia) using Landsat time series data sets from 1990 to 2010. *Environmental Research Letters*, *7* (3), 2000–2010.

https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/7/3/034010

Maxton-Lee, B. (2018). Material Realities: Why Indonesian Deforestation Persists and Conservation Fails. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, *48* (3), 419–444. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2017.1402204

M Silvanita, K., Santosa, MH, & Hariadi, S. (2015). *Sustainable Forest Management Policy Analysis* .

Rahmadanty, E., Handayani, IGAKR, & Najicha, FU (2021). Forest Management Unit Development Policy in Indonesia: A Breakthrough in Creating Sustainable Forest Management. *Laws* , *13* (2), 264–283. https://doi.org/10.25123/vej.1422

Rauf, R., Prayuda, R., & Rahman, K. (2020). Civil Society's Participatory Models: A Policy of Preventing Land and Forest Fire in Indonesia. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, *14* (3), 1030–1046.

Ruysschaert, D., & Hufty, M. (2020). Building an effective coalition to improve forest policy: Lessons from the coastal Tripa peat swamp rainforest, Sumatra, Indonesia. *Land Use Policy*, *99* (April 2017), 103359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.04.034

Sahide, MA., Supratman, S., Maryudi, A., Kim, Y.-S., & Giessen, L. (2016). Decentralization policy as recentralization strategy: forest management units and community forestry in Indonesia. *18* (1), 78–95.

Saputra, E. (2019). Beyond fires and deforestation: Tackling land subsidence in peatland areas, A case study from Riau, Indonesia. *Land*, *8* (5), 11–13. https://doi.org/10.3390/land8050076

Septianingrum, R. (2018). The Impact of Forest Fires in Indonesia in 2015 on People's Lives. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, *1* (82), 129–137.

Supratman, S., Maryudi, A., & Giessen, L. (2016). Decentralization policy as recentralization strategy: forest management units and community forestry in Indonesia 1. *International Forestry Review*, *18* (1), 78–95.

Susanto, E., Lestari, N., Hapsari, M., & Krisdiyatmiko, K. (2018). Driving factors of Deforestation in Indonesia: A case of Central Kalimantan. *Journal of Governance Studies*, *9* (4). https://doi.org/10.18196/jgp.9490

Suwarno, A., & Hein, L. (2015). Governance, Decentralization and Deforestation: The Case of Central Kalimantan Province, Indonesia. *Journal of International Agriculture*, *August*.

Suwarno, E. (2015). Can Kph Improve Indonesian Forest Governance? *Wahana Forestra: Journal of Forestry*, *10* (2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.31849/forestra.v10i2.226

Talumepa, J.B. (2020). Legal Studies on Forest Governance in Indonesia. *Lex Et Societatis* , *8* (4), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.35796/les.v8i4.30907

Zamhasari, Z., & Gafar, T. Fahrul. (2021). Strategic Policy and Local Wisdom on Forest and Land Management in Riau Province. *Jdp (Journal of Government Dynamics)*, *4* (2), 62–69. https://doi.org/10.36341/jdp.v4i2.2097