JAVA CASE STUDY

REPORT ON PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION & SELF-ASSESSMENT

BACKGROUND	**1**
OBJECTIVES	**1**
STAKEHOLDRES INVOLVED	**1**
METHODS	**2**
IMPLEMENTATION	**4**
WORKSHOP PROCESSES	**5**
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	**6**
LESSON LEARNT	**47**
CONCLUSION	**47**
FACT SHEETS	**48**

BACKGROUND

The Levelling the Playing Field (LPF) project took place between 2004 and 2007 involving collaboration between the UGM Faculty of Forestry, the state-owned forestry company Perum Perhutani, CIFOR and CIRAD. The LPF project aimed to encourage the implementation of Collaborative Forest Management (*Pengelolaan Hutan Bersama Masyarakat* (PHBM) in the four villages of Surajaya and Glandang in the Pemalang forest management unit (KPH) and Tanggel and Gempol in the Randublatung forest management unit. Project activities took place in four stages:

Stage 1 (2004-2005)	Baseline data studies
Stage 2 (2005-2006)	Development and empowerment of LMDH (Forest Village Community Organisations or *Lembaga Masyarakat Desa Hutan*) institutions
Stage 3 (2005-2006)	Participatory planning on forest resources management
Stage 4 (2006-2007)	Evaluations of forest resources sustainability
Stage 5 (2007)	Implementation of forest resources management based on participatory planning

A participatory approach was used throughout implementation of the LPF project to actively involve all stakeholders in forest resources management. This approach would allow effective communication, coordination and collaboration between stakeholders involved in PHBM implementation, and therefore the success of forest resources management would not be the sole responsibility of Perhutani and LMDHs, but a shared responsibility involving all members of forest village community.

The LPF project acted as facilitator and mediator for all parties involved in PHBM implementation, and applied various methods in encouraging PHBM implementation at the village level. Expected outcomes of LPF project implementation were: 1) improved natural resources management, human resources and institutional capacity of forest village community, 2) a capacity to develop schemes for preparing participatory forest management planning, 3) a capacity to implement forest management based on participatory planning, 4) a capacity to develop schemes for participatory evaluations of sustainable forest resources, and 5) a capacity to evaluate forest resources sustainability in a participatory manner.

The performance of the LPF project was participatory evaluated by project's stakeholders in its final year of implementation. Evaluations were considered essential for identifying the results and lesson learnt of LPF project implementation between 2004 and 2007. LPF performance evaluations took place at the village level and at project level. Village level performance evaluation was involved all village stakeholders in forest management, while project level performance evaluation involved the project team member.

OBJECTIVES

The aims of LPF project performance evaluations were:

- To identify LPF outcomes and impacts;
- To recognise the successes of methods developed by the LPF project and determine what improvements were necessary
- To generate lessons learnt for all parties who wish to develop multistakeholder approaches

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

LPF project performance evaluations involved all stakeholders in LPF project activities between 2004 and 2007, including those involved in village-level PHBM implementation, such as LMDHs, forest farmer groups (KTH), community figures/leaders, village governments, village-level PHBM communication forums (FK-PHBM), government forestry and environment offices, family welfare organisation groups (PKK), village representative assemblies (BPD), and Perhutani officers (foremen, technicians and field supervisors).

<u>Forest Village Community Organisations (LMDH)</u>
Forest village communities (MDH) are those living in or around forests. Their geographical proximity

to forests means they interact with them both directly and indirectly. Forest village communities not only interact with forests but feel the direct impacts of any forest management undertaken. They include forest farmers associated in forest farmer groups (KTH) in every forest block or sub-block. LMDHs are umbrella institutions for forest village communities involved in forest management, and for community members not involved in groups, but have direct interaction.

Village Governments
Village governments have the authority to determine policies in their administrative regions and the social influence to organise village communities. Commonly, in forest villages the village apparatus, usually known as a "*pamong*", is a highly influential figure who acts as an example to other community members.

Village-level of PHBM Communication Forums
PHBM communication forums (FK-PHBM) are village institutions that represent the interests of forest village communities in providing input relating to PHBM program implementation. FK-PHBM function to: a) coordinate with LMDHs in forest management implementation, and b) communicate information relating to forest management in PHBM implementation. Their tasks are to guide, supervise and evaluate LMDH and KTH forest management.

Family Welfare Organisation Groups (PKK)
PKKs are village women's associations aimed at empowering women through activities to improve skills, welfare, unity and health.

Village Representative Assemblies (BPD)
BPDs are institutions tasked with overseeing the performance of village governments in planning and ratifying Village Government Work Plans and implementing village development activities.

Perum Perhutani
Perum Perhutani has government authority to manage Java's state forests. Perhutani has direct involvement both as manager and recipient of economic benefits from forest product production. The Perhutani officers involved included foremen, technicians and field supervisors.

Related Government Institutions/Offices
Offices/institutions involved in forest resources management included the Forestry Office, the Agriculture Office, the Industry, Trade and Cooperatives Office, the Livestock Office and other related institutions.

METHODS

A. Principles, Criteria and Indicators

The principles, criteria and indicators used in LPF project performance evaluations were as follows:

Principle 1. Empowerment

Criterion
1.1. LMDH members are committed to making shared decisions
Indicators
1.1.1. LMDH members elect organisers through democratic processes
1.1.2. Transparency in LMDH decision-making processes
1.1.3. Shared decisions on benefits and funds are announced equitably and across the board

Criterion
1.2. Community representatives make proposals on environmentally friendly livelihoods, act in accordance with environmentally friendly priorities and learn from experience
Indicators
1.2.1. LMDH managers learn from experiences gained beforehand in environmentally friendly natural resources management
1.2.2. Communities prioritise environmentally friendly activities

1.2.3. Communities use participatory processes in making proposals and submitting them to donors or partners

Principle 2. Environmental Mediation

Criterion
2.1. The role of natural resources in relation to community livelihoods is understood and followed up by researchers and key actors
Indicators
2.1.1. Communities appreciate human interaction with natural resources as a knowledge form
2.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM agree and act in accordance with developments in natural resources conditions and livelihoods
2.1.3. Some community members secure additional incomes from partnerships with companies or other parties

Criterion
2.2. Need for intervention from key actors identified
Indicators
2.2.1. Stakeholders involved in PHBM require the involvement of other stakeholders in natural resources management.
2.2.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play an active role in LPF activities

Criterion
2.3. Key actors including group representatives carry out negotiations and agree on common long-term goals
Indicators
2.3.1. A consensus exists regarding a shared vision (village vision)
2.3.2. Villagers aware of the shared vision (village vision)
2.3.3. Villagers committed to acting in accordance with the shared vision (village vision)

Criterion
2.4. Room for negotiation is institutionalised
Indicators
2.4.1. A negotiation forum developed and used as a means for stakeholders to meet and discuss common problems
2.4.2. Decisions made by stakeholders in this negotiation forum
2.4.3. Improvements or new agreements arise from decisions made

Principle 3. Reinforcement (strengthening networks)

Criterion
3.1. Third parties connected with key actors indicate contracts for environmentally friendly products
Indicators
3.1.1. Partnerships and new agreements in environmentally friendly natural resources management made
3.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play a part in the development of environmentally friendly products and services
3.1.3. Outside parties express interest in collaborating in environmentally friendly natural resources management

Criterion
3.2. Researchers communicate with and influence development actors (village heads, etc.) using simple simulation approaches
Indicators
3.2.1. LPF uses and teaches methods and teaching aids (simulation) to stakeholders involved in PHBM
3.2.2. Stakeholders understand and recognise the use of methods and teaching aids (simulations)
3.2.3. PHBM stakeholders' perceptions are influenced by methods and teaching aids (simulations)

B. Evaluation Methods

LPF project performance evaluations involved assigning values to each of the indicators established for the evaluation. This was done qualitatively by assigning symbols based on conditions and developments in each village. Evaluations were comprehensive and involved a time-based approach **before** and **after** LPF project implementation. Comparing these two periods would provide illustrations of the LPF project's role in encouraging PHBM implementation in each village.

The symbols for evaluating LPF project performance used the growth phases of a tree from seed to bearing fruit or productive tree; however in our analysis these symbols converted into scoring system from 1 to 5, where seed is 1 and productive tree is 5. The idea behind this choice was to make it easier for participants since such symbols were already familiar to them. The values assigned to indicators were as follows:

1 (seed) = meaning potential was already there
2 (sprouting) = meaning initiatives were ready to be implemented
3 (young tree) = meaning implementation was in its early stages
4 (tree starting to bear fruit) = meaning implementation was already underway
5 (productive tree) = meaning implementation was already having an impact and showing results

All stakeholders involved in implementing LPF project activities made their evaluations based on the roles they played. Their evaluations for each indicator were based on analyses of what they had experienced or felt and of the impacts from their involvement in the LPF project.

IMPLEMENTATION

Performance evaluations were made in workshops using the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) method. FGDs allowed performance evaluations to be conducted comprehensively by all stakeholders involved in LPF project activities. Groups were set up in the FGDs from the institutions involved in PHBM implementation in each of the villages.

The LPF project performance evaluation workshops were held at the village level with participants comprising representatives from the LMDH, FK-PHBM, and village government, forest farmers, PKK, BPD, the Forestry Office, the Environment Office as well as foremen, technicians and field supervisors from Perhutani. Workshops were held on separate occasions the four villages with participants in each one divided into 3 groups.

Surajaya Village
Group 1: LMDH
Group 2: Village Government, PKK, forest farmers, FK-PHBM and the Environment Office
Group 3: Perhutani

Glandang Village
Group 1: LMDH
Group 2: Village Government, PKK and forest farmers
Group 3: Perhutani

Tanggel Village
Group 1: LMDH
Group 2: Village Government, FK-PHBM and community figures
Group 3: Perhutani

Gempol Village
Group 1: LMDH
Group 2: Village Government, forest farmers and FK-PHBM
Group 3: Perhutani

Each group involved do the performance evaluations using indicators prepared beforehand by the LPF project. Each of the discussion groups elected its own facilitator, notes taker and presenter. Each group's discussion processes were assisted by facilitators from the LPF project who helped

discussion groups understand the indicators and LPF project performance evaluation methods.

In addition to performance evaluations from stakeholders involved in LPF activities, LPF team members also assessed LPF project performance in the four villages in order to provide input on the processes undertaken and to look at local dynamics and characteristics from a researcher's viewpoint and provide lessons learnt for making improvements in the future.

WORKSHOP PROCESSES

LPF project performance evaluation workshops were held at the village level in order to secure detailed illustrations of the LPF project's role in encouraging PHBM implementation in each village. The village workshops were held on the following dates:

- Surajaya Village on 14 December 2007
- Glandang Village on 15 December 2007
- Tanggel Village on 8 January 2008
- Gempol Village on 7 January 2008

Workshop participants were representatives of village institutions and are detailed in Tables 1 to 4 below.

Table 1. Workshop participants in Surajaya Village by sex and institution

Institutions	No. of participants	
	Male	Female
FK-PHBM	1	
LMDH	12	
Environment office	1	
Village government	1	
Perhutani	5	
PKK		3
Total	20	3

Table 2. Workshop participants in Glandang Village by sex and institution

Institutions	No. of participants	
	Male	Female
LMDH	13	
Forest farmers	7	
PKK		2
Perhutani	5	
Total	25	2

Table 3. Workshop participants in Tanggel Village by sex and institution

Institutions	No. of participants	
	Male	Female
Village government	3	1
FK-PHBM	1	1
NGO	1	2
Perhutani	6	1
LMDH	5	2
Forest farmers	1	
Total	17	7

Table 4. Workshop participants in Gempol Village by sex and institution

Institutions	No. of participants	
	Male	Female
FK-PHBM	2	
Village government	3	
NGO	1	2
Perhutani	5	1
LMDH	3	1
Forest farmers	1	
Total	15	4

The workshops involved a series of activities including:

1) Relaying workshop aims, so participants would understand the intentions and goals behind presenting the workshop
2) Overview of occurrences in the LPF project in each village between 2004 and 2007, intended to help participants remember the LPF project activities that had taken place
3) Explanation of the principles, criteria and indicators method, intended to elucidate participants on the principles, criteria and indicators used for evaluating LPF project performance
4) Explanation of how to evaluate indicators used in LPF project performance evaluations
5) Small group discussions for identifying and evaluating LPF project performance in regard to each indicator
6) Submission of LPF project performance evaluation outcomes from each group, so they would know the outcomes of each other's LPF project performance evaluations.

An LPF team performance evaluation workshop was held in Jogja on 31 January 2008. The list of criteria and indicators used for this self-assessment differed slightly with 1 additional criterion and 6 additional indicators for Principle 3 – Reinforcement (strengthening networks). These were as follows:

Criterion
3.3. Related institutions publish or communicate environmental management approaches and methods
Indicators
3.3.1. Journals written from LPF concepts and case studies
3.3.2. Papers presented at international and national conferences
3.3.3. Books and guidelines published
3.3.4. LPF approaches and cases used in lectures
3.3.5. Communication media produced (websites, brochures, bulletins, newspapers)
3.3.6. Guidance/policy briefs made

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In the village workshops, 23 indicators were used to evaluate LPF project performance, 13 were evaluated by looking at conditions **now** (following assistance from the LPF project) and conditions **before** (the initial situation, prior to LPF project intervention), 1 indicator looked at conditions prior to LPF project assistance and 9 others were for evaluating current post project conditions. The LPF Project Team performance evaluations added a further 6 indicators for evaluating current conditions. These additional indicators were only evaluated by the LPF Project Team. Evaluations differentiated between current and previous conditions because not all indicators were appropriate for evaluating both.

Village workshop participants were divided into the institutions they represented. It was clear there were 2 groups constituting key stakeholders in forest management, i.e. LMDHs and Perhutani. These were the main stakeholders involved directly in LPF project activities.

Participants in the LMDH groups comprised LMDH organisers and members, most of whom were forest farmers. They were the main stakeholders directly involved in LPF activities. Perhutani representatives were company employees from both the local village and forest management unit (KPH) levels, familiar with or directly involved in LPF activities. Other participants, meanwhile, were put together in a separate group comprising stakeholders involved either directly or indirectly in LPF activities, including representatives from village governments, PHBM communication forums and PKKs.

The same was true for the LPF Project Team evaluations; where the team was divided into 2 groups, one from Randublatung Subdistrict for the villages of Tanggel and Gempol, and the other from Pemalang Subdistrict for Surajaya and Glandang villages. When the Randublatung team gave its performance evaluations, the Pemalang team acted as facilitator, and vice-versa.

Analyses of stakeholders and LPF Team performance evaluations for every indicator in every village are detailed below.

A. Results of Performance Evaluation at Surajaya Village

* = Village Government, PKK, forest farmers, FK-PHBM and the Environment Office

	LMDH	Perhutani	Others*	Analysis
	I.1.1.1 LMDH members elect organisers through democratic processes			
Now	5 → Every group/ KTH established through a process of deliberation	3 → There is democracy for example in establishing and electing work group organisers (sugarcane, nurseries, *sengon* planting)	2 → Efforts being made towards democratic processes	For this indicator the Perhutani and LMDH groups' reasons had the same basis, and said the LMDH was already using democratic processes. The only difference was level of democracy perceived by each group. This is because, for example, the LMDH as direct practitioner knows more than Perhutani which could only base its evaluation on what it saw. The other group had a different reason, seeing democratic processes only as initiatives with no implementation as yet. At **before** situation, Perhutani and village government groups' evaluations score were the same, but the LMDH and Perhutani groups gave the same reasons. This was due to each group's subjectivity.
Before	5 → When the LMDH was established, management was determined through deliberation	1 → LMDH managers selected through deliberations but limited only to the village apparatus and BPD	1 → No potential for democracy	
	I.1.1.2. Transparency in LMDH decision-making processes			
Now	4 → Every LMDH decision made transparently through deliberation	3 → Decision making already open to members	2 → Efforts being made to be completely transparent	For this indicator different evaluations were due to different views on the level of transparency in decision making process, but it shown changes.
Before	3 → Though the LMDH had just been established, it strived for transparency in all its decision making	1 → Transparency limited only to managers	1 → Not completely transparent	
	I.1.1.3. Shared decisions on benefits and funds are announced equitably and across the board			
Now	5 → All that the LMDH secures can be felt by most community members	4 → Already runs in accordance with LMDH bylaws, examples: sharing timber production and sharing sugar cane	4 → LMDH, communities and village government already receiving benefits	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity, however it shown changes and progress at village level.

Before	2 → Insufficient knowledge, no funds	n.a. → None as yet	1 → LMDH newly established and institutionally weak	
	I.1.2.1. LMDH managers learn from experiences gained beforehand in environmentally friendly natural resources management			
Now	4 → LMDH managers' experiences yet to be applied fully	3 → There is socialization on forest management and forest security (sand excavation, timber theft)	3 → Based on existing experience – some training and extensions activities	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity, in particular the significant increment of LMDH and Perhutani shown their interaction in natural resources as key stakeholders.
Before	1 → LMDH managers' experiences yet to be applied fully	n.a. → None at the time	2 → Initiatives to develop in line with existing experiences	
	I.1.2.2. Communities prioritise environmentally friendly activities			
Now	3 → Communities tend to undertake environmentally friendly activities	4 → Communities aware of forest functions	4 → Community awareness levels beginning to improve	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated but shown significant changes in community behaviour.
Before	1 → Some communities still carried out environmentally unfriendly activities such as sand excavation	2 → Planting initiatives among communities	1 → Community awareness levels were beginning to improve	
	I.1.2.3. Communities use participatory processes in making proposals and submitting them to donors or partners			
Now	5 → Proposals submitted are already participatory	3 → LMDH, Perhutani and investors are collaborating in some blocks	3 →Some communities have already submitted proposals to donors or partner	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity, but shown significant changes in community behaviour.
Before	3 → Proposals submitted still individual rather than participatory	n.a. → None at the time	2 → Communities had initiatives to submit proposals to donors or partners	
	I.2.1.1. Communities appreciate human interaction with natural resources as a knowledge form			
Now	3 → Natural resources degradation being reduced	3 → Communities beginning to understand, but not fully as yet	4 → Communities are now sufficiently familiar with the various forms of information from related parties	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This is significant changes of community behaviour and good impact for the project.
Before	1 → Natural resources still being damaged	1 → Limited awareness	1 → Communities yet to understand benefits and risks to natural resources	

	I.2.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM agree and act in accordance with developments in natural resources conditions and livelihoods			
Now	5 → Already following up on agreements	4 → Communities already understand and livelihoods appropriate to the characteristics of the forest village region where villagers are dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods	4 → All stakeholders feel the impacts of natural resources degradation, so act in accordance with natural resources developments. Communities are striving to conserve natural resources	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity.
Before	3 → Agreements already made – agreements for common interests	3 → Already there, but in the early stages	4 → Not all stakeholders felt the impacts of damage to natural resources and acted accordingly, but there were initiatives to conserve natural resources	
	I.2.1.3 Some community members secure additional incomes from partnerships with companies or other parties			
Now	5 → Some villagers' incomes have increased	5 → Additional income from intercropping, collaborative sugarcane, kapok and timber production	4 → Communities' incomes have increased due to collaboration with third parties	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity.
	I.2.2.1. Stakeholders involved in PHBM require the involvement of other stakeholders in natural resources management			
Before	1 → The potential for involvement of other parties had yet to be considered	1 → There were already initiatives to coordinate with other parties. Examples: collaboration on cattle fattening and corn cultivation	3 → Before LPF arrived other parties already involved in natural resources management	LMDH and Perhutani groups gave the same evaluation, albeit for different reasons, while the other group gave a different evaluation despite stating the same reason as Perhutani.
	I.2.2.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play an active role in LPF activities			
Now	5 → LMDH takes part in every LPF activity	5 → All stakeholders are actively involved, and LPF is having a positive impact	5 → With PHBM practitioners having an active role, communities can feel the results of LPF activities. Examples: microfinance training, cooperatives, facilitation training etc	All evaluations the same and for the same reasons. This is because stakeholders in Surajaya Village saw were familiar with and took part in all LPF processes.
	I.2.3.1. A consensus exists regarding a shared vision (village vision)			

Now	5 → There is consensus between the village government, LMDH, PHBM communication forum and Perhutani	3 → Yes there is consensus	4 → With socialization to communities the village vision is working as proven by village programs in balance with the village vision	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity.
Before	1 → There was potential	1 →	2 → There was a village vision initiative but had yet to be implemented	
	I.2.3.2. Villagers aware of the shared vision (village vision)			
Now	4 → Many community members (70%) are now aware	3 → Still in the early stages	3 → Not all communities know the village vision	Different evaluations and reasons given by all groups, due to the different subjectivity felt by each group.
	I.2.3.3. Villagers are committed to acting in accordance with the shared vision (village vision)			
Now	3 → Every activity implemented strives to adapt to the vision	3 → Many community members taking part in PHBM in accordance with the existing program	4 → Village programs adapted to achieve the village vision	The LMDH and other group gave different evaluations despite having the same reasons. This related to the impacts felt by each group. Meanwhile the Perhutani group gave the same evaluation as the LMDH group, but the reason given was inapplicable to the indicator. This was probably due to a lack of understanding as to what was meant by a shared vision.
	I.2.4.1. A negotiation forum developed and used as a means for stakeholders to meet and discuss common problems			
Now	5 → Successes always secured through a negotiation forum	3 → There are processes for discussing problems together	4 → Whenever there is a problem or a new program it is always discussed with the parties involved	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity.
Before	3 → Every problem was discussed through a negotiation forum	1 → None	2 → Communities had the initiative to resolve problems in a deliberation forum	
	I.2.4.2. Decisions made by stakeholders in this negotiation forum			
Now	5 → Decision outcomes already followed up on	4 → Already beginning to have consensus	5 → Stakeholders have formed a partnership to implement decision outcomes together	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity.

Before	3 → Decisions yet to be followed up on fully	1 → None as yet	2 → Not every decision implemented fully but there were initiatives in accordance with commitment	
	I.2.4.3. Improvements or new agreements arise from decisions made			
Now	5 → There are changes/improvements from decisions made	4 → There are improvement/new agreement processes. Example: determining rules for cropping patterns	4 → Decision outcomes deemed lacking still need to be improved	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity.
Before	1 → Potential to improve agreements	1 → None at the time	3 → All inappropriate decisions were always changed	
	I.3.1.1. Partnerships and new agreements in environmentally friendly natural resources management made* Yes or No			
Now	5 → There are work partners	4 → Collaboration with UD planting *sengon*. Sugarcane cultivation with PT Sumberharjo and kapok cultivation with investors	5 → There is a environmentally friendly management partnership involving all stakeholders	Evaluations given differed despite the same reasons being stated. This was due to each group's subjectivity.
	I.3.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play a part in the development of environmentally friendly products and services			
Now	3 → Stakeholders yet to play a major role	5 → Many fields are worked with other parties and their produce is utilised by communities surrounding the forest without damaging the environment	4 → LMDH involvement in management and development of products and services is already environmentally friendly. Examples: production and sale of bokhasi fertilizer.	Different evaluations and reasons from all groups were due to the different impacts felt.
	I.3.1.3. Outside parties express interest in collaborating in environmentally friendly natural resources management			
Now	3 → Use of chemical fertilizers decreasing	5 → Outside parties already collaborating in natural resources management	5 → Investors interested in natural resources management	The other and Perhutani groups gave the same evaluations with different reasons, while the LMDH group gave a reason irrelevant to the indicator.
Before	1 → Still used chemical fertilizers	1 → None at the time	3 → There was some collaboration, but not particularly open	

	I.3.2.1. LPF uses and teaches methods and teaching aids (simulation) to stakeholders involved in PHBM *** Yes or No**			
Now	5 → Yes. Always use teaching aids	5 → Yes. Parties involved in PHBM feel knowledge has increased in terms of organization and institutionalization (facilitation training, administration training)	5 → Yes. Communities can already use the methods taught (simulation)	All evaluations the same and for the same reasons. This is because stakeholders in Surajaya Village saw were familiar with and took part in all LPF processes.
	I.3.2.2. Stakeholders understand and recognise the use of methods and teaching aids (simulations)			
Now	5 → Understand fully with teaching aids	5 → Many LMDH members understand the methods used	5 → Communities comprehend the methods and teaching aids and are implementing them	The values and reasons given were the same, because the same impacts had been felt.
	I.3.2.3. PHBM stakeholders' perceptions are influenced by methods and teaching aids (simulations) *** Yes or No**			
Now	5 → Yes. It is easy to understand with teaching aids	5 → Yes. Communities are following the methods taught by LPF with successes	4 → Yes. The methods are understandable	The LMDH and Perhutani groups gave the same evaluations, whereas the other group's was different. However, all groups gave the same reason. This was due to each group's subjectivity.

B. Results of Performance Evaluation at Glandang Village

* = Village Government, PKK and forest farmers

	LMDH	**Perhutani**	**Others***	**Analysis**
	I.1.1.1 LMDH members elect organisers through democratic processes			
Now	3 → Several activities beginning in relation to organisational processes. Example: hamlet level coordinators	4 → LMDH organisation and membership established through restructuring	4 → LMDH organisers already elected by members; as stipulated in bylaws. Other example is forest farmer group and forest farmers/hamlet partner coordinator established	Participants' understanding of this indicator was influenced by their knowledge and involvement in the LMDH. For instance, the other group's reason was limited to election of hamlet level coordinators, and the LMDH's reason was realised in its bylaws, whereas Perhutani stressed that the process occurred with organisational restructuring. The reasons
Before	1 → There was potential but	3 → Initial stages of	1 → Yet to be established	

	had yet to be carried out optimally	democracy already underway, but not yet fully operational		expressed show how these things are thought of as democratic processes, as this indicator is fundamental to institutions. The LPF project had yet to undertake any activities. The other group considered it a trigger for activities despite realizing that it had potential, and democratisation was in its early stages and not yet optimal. This shows optimism from Perhutani towards this indicator. Whereas LMDH had yet to do anything as it had yet to be established.
	I.1.1.2. Transparency in LMDH decision-making processes			
Now	4 → LMDH internal decision-making processes already transparent. Example: Produce sharing allocation	4 → Decision making already working. Example: - referendums in decision-making processes on the use of empty/fallow land	5 → Shared commitments made	Evaluations show that this indicator has already emerged in the LMDH. Types of implementation varied, and included produce sharing allocation, decisions in relation to use of fallow land, or building shared commitments as was the case in the LMDH evaluation. The evaluation levels chosen indicate some successes. These outcomes show evaluations beginning to vary. The other group gave no evaluation, because the newly-formed LMDH had yet to make any decisions. This was different to Perhutani's evaluation, which was convinced that the LMDH organisers had been elected transparently. The LMDH evaluation still only indicated potential since the LMDH had only just been established.
Before	n.a. → When LPF arrived LMDH had only just formed its management so there was no decision making.	4 → LMDH organisers elected transparently through voting	1 → Newly established	
	I.1.1.3. Shared decisions on benefits and funds are announced equitably and across the board			
Now	5 → Benefits obtained (training, sugarcane planting /harvesting) Funds: Materials/finances decided together fairly and across the board.	5 → Decisions already made fairly and evenly. Examples: payments for labour and sharing sugarcane produce (stipulated in statutes and bylaws)	4 → Collaboration agreement already drafted	Evaluations of this indicator show examples of decisions running fairly and across the board. The other group, for instance, suggests implementation has already secured results in the form of training activities and materials. The Perhutani group was certain it was already carried out in payments processes, while LMDH stated that the indicator was already
Before	n.a. → When LPF arrived it	1 → There was a desire to	1 → No collaboration	

	had yet to look at decisions on funds and benefits (LMDH organisation only just established).	carry out work stages into the future		underway based on the existence of a collaboration document. This indicator could not be evaluated by the other group, since it had yet to experience LPF intervention, whereas Perhutani and LMDH realised that this indicator had yet to be developed.
	I.1.2.1. LMDH managers learn from experiences gained beforehand in environmentally friendly natural resources management			
Now	4 → Already undertaken by LMDH (KTH) in planting trees, using organic fertilizer, land management using traditional tools (mattocks)	5 → Efforts already underway to involve KTHs in decision making (in sugarcane planting activities)	4 → Reduced damage to the environment and forest resources. Community awareness in PHBM. Examples: the appearance of new water springs	Evaluation of this indicator is at the level between a tree starting to bear fruit and a productive tree. This indicates an increasing awareness of learning from experiences both physical work and participatory processes, and improving environmental quality. Two groups (other group and LMDH) gave the same evaluations due to experience and awareness that potential had yet to be developed, and because of the forest degradation that had occurred. Perhutani, on the other hand, looked more at individuals or forest farmers' work in natural resources management.
Before	1 → The potential was there but had yet to be implemented	3 → Members and organisers already made efforts to hold deliberations on natural resources management activities	1 → Forest degradation	
	I.1.2.2. Communities prioritise environmentally friendly activities			
Now	5 → The number of socialization meetings with LMDH and LPF has meant communities becoming aware of priority environmentally friendly activities (no longer any encroachment).	4 → Planting activities in the field/region starting to become environmentally friendly.	4 → Forest degradation decreasing, community awareness to develop forests	Evaluations of this indicator suggest awareness towards implementation, with socialisation on environmental awareness, forest planting and an increasing awareness to develop forests. Evaluations for this indicator relayed different conditions, particularly in respect to potential and the dominant role of Perhutani in forest resources management.
Before	1 → There was potential for encroachment (stealing timber and taking over forest land)	3 → Establishment of KTHs that prioritized forest resources management (planting)	1 → No understanding of the benefits and functions of forests	
	I.1.2.3. Communities use participatory processes in making proposals and submitting them to donors or partners			

Now	5 → Already provides various results / following help from LPF. Examples: planting *sengon* in collaboration with CIFOR and sugarcane with PG	5 → Communities can now make proposals in a participatory manner with third parties	3 → Communities can now make proposals. Examples: submissions on assistance for a *musholla*, a primary school and livestock.	Communities are now becoming increasingly adept at making and submitting proposals to interested parties both individually and with LPF project facilitation. This capacity has made communities more creative and capable of utilising existing opportunities to develop the village. Before LPF arrived, the Glandang community had begun to seek funding sources for improving the village economy. Many initiatives had begun to emerge and the community was just learning to experiment in submitting their ideas. Despite being in their fledgling stage, efforts were being made to fulfil village development needs.
Before	3 → Communities had the potential to make new proposals through the village (bridge and dam construction, sugarcane planting) but results were still very simple	2 → Proposals were already submitted at the individual level but not in a participatory manner at the group level	2 → No documentation of communities making proposals	
	I.2.1.1. Communities appreciate human interaction with natural resources as a knowledge form			
Now	5 → Communities are becoming aware of the need for afforestation activities in community forests	4 → Communities are already involved, are aware and are planning for the future	4 → Humans need forests and forests needs humans	Communities are becoming increasingly aware of the mutually beneficial interaction between the two. This has led to awareness to develop forests on both private and state forest land. This is because communities know their expectations and ambitions for the forest and their welfare. Experience and current conditions play an important part in developing this awareness. An understanding of the interaction between the two was beginning to appear in the minds of community members. Actions and movements at the time were very much affected by fear and suspicion among stakeholders.
Before	1 → Only some villagers understood	3 → Some villagers already had limited awareness	2 → Still just an initiative	
	I.2.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM agree and act in accordance with developments in natural resources conditions and livelihoods			
Now	4 → Forest farmers becoming increasingly involved in PHBM	4 → Agreements followed up by making MoU/collaboration agreements with third parties, which are now	4 → Perhutani, LMDH, forest farmers, KTH and investors all helping each other	The three groups gave the same evaluation for this indicator, saying stakeholders are becoming increasingly involved and are helping each other. Various forms of

		underway		collaboration have commenced. Examples are Perhutani and LMDH involvement in the preparation and implementation of participatory planning, as well as collaboration with third parties in planting *sengon*. In the early stages, the potential had yet to be managed fully and there was no collaboration between stakeholders. Though still embryonic in nature, involvement did begin to appear when the LMDH was established on the initiative of Perhutani.
Before	1 → PHBM tended to be inappropriate to natural resources and livelihoods	3 → Already involved in PHBM with the establishment of the LMDH	1 → There was potential, but no collaboration	
	I.2.1.3 Some community members secure additional incomes from partnerships with companies or other parties			
Now	5 → LPF assistance maximal, sugarcane production through collaboration with PG now being shared	4 → Benefits already being felt. Example: sugarcane planting	5 → Intercropping produce being shared with fallow land being used to plant sugarcane	Community incomes began to increase with forest management opening up for more inside stakeholder involvement. The most immediate examples are sharing sugarcane planting and utilising land below forest stands. Communities have begun to acknowledge there are benefits from their involvement.
	I.2.2.1. Stakeholders involved in PHBM require the involvement of other stakeholders in natural resources management			
Before	1 → The potential was there but still had a long way to go	3 → Required other party involvement, but yet to be organized properly	2 → There were initiatives to collaborate with other stakeholders to rehabilitate degraded forest (Perhutani etc.) but we were unsure how to channel them	Before the LPF project arrived the potential and desire to collaborate was already there, but the prevailing distrust meant relations were bad. Further, the means/media for developing stakeholder collaboration were not there. These two factors left all parties working alone with their own interests and needs.
	I.2.2.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play an active role in LPF activities			
Now	5 → Already underway (LMDH, regional government) and developing/having a positive impact. Examples: changing thought patterns and environmental awareness.	5 → Already play an active role and take part in PHBM activities	5 → Those playing an active role are LMDH, KTH and Perhutani. The village government and the PHBM communication forum are not so active	Involvement is an important part of LPF activities. Multistakeholder activities open space for communication and negotiation in implementing activities. Those involved play an active part in all processes undertaken, which are useful as means for sharing knowledge, insight and experiences. They are also an inlet for communication and transparency.

	I.2.3.1. A consensus exists regarding a shared vision (village vision) *** If no, move on to I.2.4.1.**			
Now	4 → Though underway, still in the process	3 → Several institutions already involved in implementing the vision	4 → Consensus from Glandang Village stakeholders	Glandang Village has a shared vision currently in the community-level socialization and internalization stage. Several strategies for attaining the vision are already underway through integrated development involving related institutions and stakeholders. The vision has become a common ambition in village development and binds the diverse stakeholders in the village. When the potential was there, there was yet to be an idea of developing a shared agreement for the village. Each party worked for its own institution looking neither at overall interests and needs, nor long-term objectives.
Before	1 → The potential was there, but was not working yet	1 → The desire to make a shared agreement was laid down in statutes and bylaws	1 → None at the time	
	I.2.3.2. Villagers aware of the shared vision (village vision)			
Now	5 → 1. Most community members know 2. Many elements of communities invited to take part in its implementation	2 → Included in members' books	4 → Socialisation in Glandang Village's 8 neighbourhoods, socialisation in hamlet management blocks the majority of which are partner members	Communities continue to undertake long-term and short-term activities, either aimed directly at forest farmers in management blocks or at villagers in general, so that communities always remember and know their village vision. The village vision has become something for the villagers to achieve now, and into the future.
	I.2.3.3. Villagers are committed to acting in accordance with the shared vision (village vision)			
Now	5 → Frequent socialisation and training (LMDH and LPF) has resulted in awareness to commit to the vision	3 → Only some villagers know about and implement it	4 → Community awareness	Communities are in the process of acting in accordance with, and being committed to the vision, which contains a holistic awareness of what will be done. It is essential to maintain unanimity in building the vision and to act together to ensure the vision remains an ambition and will always be a guide.
	I.2.4.1. A negotiation forum developed and used as a means for stakeholders to meet and discuss common problems			
Now	4 → Already undertaken by LMDH and Perhutani.	5 → Agreements reached are applied in their activities	5 → Already in place. Example: Routine	The variety of evaluations and reasons shows that negotiation forums have not only begun

	Examples: joint patrols and socialisation in forest farmer blocks.		meetings/evaluations	formally in the form of routine meetings and evaluations, but also in the implementation of activities, for instance joint patrols and socialisation to forest farmers. Further, these forums continue to be upheld by stakeholders, particularly LMDH and Perhutani. There was little or no negotiation in the past. Though there were agreements, stakeholders would rarely adhere to them.
Before	3 → Parties acted alone	4 → Deliberations held to achieve consensus in resolving problems	1 → None at the time	
	I.2.4.2. Decisions made by stakeholders in this negotiation forum			
Now	5 → Development decisions can be agreed together in forums (Perhutani + LMDH), communities + village government	4 → Due to decisions, some things are carried out, some things are not	4 → Already underway each party contributes to / is involved in decision making	Shared decisions result from forums as each party is involved and contributes. These decisions mean roles and responsibilities are distributed evenly. The lack of communication and coordination meant differences in status between stakeholders.
Before	3 → There was guidance, but each party operated alone	4 → Yes, already undertaken in accordance with shared decisions	1 → None at the time	
	I.2.4.3. Improvements or new agreements arise from decisions made			
Now	5 → All already underway and having a positive effect (human and natural resources)	4 → Some agreements can already be implemented in accordance with objectives laid out	4 → KTH revitalised in block 68	Evaluations related more to stakeholders' involvement in the process, and revisions to various decisions due to them being inappropriate, or due to a need for improvement, or for a new agreement to be made. This was due to new realisations emerging from reviews of conditions on the ground or to decisions being changed because they were inapplicable to actual conditions. Initially, communities were reluctant to negotiate with other parties they considered higher than themselves. They were starting to learn about the system despite having no guidance or others willing to help increase their knowledge.
Before	1 → Newly established, still introducing a program and system.	2 → KTH restructured, but results failed to meet expectations	1 → Had never experienced it	
	I.3.1.1. Partnerships and new agreements in environmentally friendly natural resources management made *** Yes or No**			

Now	5 → Yes. Collaboration with CIFOR + UGM, planting *sengon*, sugarcane (PG) + produce	3 → Yes. Collaboration in planting not only involves Perhutani and LMDH but other stakeholders as well	3 → Yes. Organic fertilizer used in collaborative planting with investors 2. Filler crops now added to *sengon* monocultures	Partnerships continue to develop between LMDH and parties besides Perhutani. Examples are collaboration between LMDH, PT AAPC and PKHR UGM to plant *sengon* and PT Sumberharjo to plant sugarcane. These partnerships indicate that communities are starting to develop various form of environmentally friendly natural resources management that improve their welfare.
	I.3.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play a part in the development of environmentally friendly products and services			
Now	4 → Product and services development already underway. Examples: organic fertiliser production (bokasi), rice mill can be utilised	3 → Being implemented but not yet in its entirety	4 → Organic fertilizer used in some planting areas through collaboration between Perum Perhutani, LMDH and investors.	The development of environmentally friendly products and services has become part of communities' businesses and is now starting to show results. They are continuing to develop selected businesses such as producing organic fertilizer and collaborating in crop development.
	I.3.1.3. Outside parties express interest in collaborating in environmentally friendly natural resources management			
Now	5 → PT. AAPC *sengon* crop yet to be harvested but already underway, (some trees s old + planted)	4 → Already being implemented but results not optimal as yet	3 → Proven with 2 investors collaborating in LMDH forest blocks in Glandang Village in 2007	Interest from outside parties has shown results for communities. Examples are collaboration between LMDH, Perhutani and PT AAPC, as well as collaboration between LMDH, Perhutani and PKHR UGM. Some information and publications have helped build interest from outside parties in aspects such as institutionalisation and participatory planning. LMDH already had the potential, but its organisation was still lacking. The need for development and collaboration with other parties had yet to be considered or undertaken in full.
Before	1 → Potential there, but yet to be realized	2 → Already undertaken with no success	2 → Ideas were there	
	I.3.2.1. LPF uses and teaches methods and teaching aids (simulation) to stakeholders involved in PHBM *** Yes or No**			
Now	5 → Yes. Teaching aids used in meetings with LPF. We	3 → Yes. Already undertaken Examples :	4 → Yes. Training conducted:	The methods and teaching aids are always used in meetings and stakeholder training. The

	use metacards to write our opinions down.	1. Outbound 2. Facilitator training	1. Outbound 2. Institutionalisation 3. Management 4. Facilitation	aim is to simplify things and accelerate participants' understanding of the materials presented either in the form of games or training.
	I.3.2.2. Stakeholders understand and recognise the use of methods and teaching aids (simulations)			
Now	5 → The teaching aids method makes it possible to give opinions directly / makes it easier for participants to have opinions	3 → Yet to understand fully	5 → Results already being felt	Some stakeholders are beginning to appreciate and understand the use of LPF Project tools and methods as something new, yet quite understandable. This is because they allow stakeholders to voice opinions easily and without fear. Nevertheless, some still fail to understand due to their lack of involvement in the process.
	I.3.2.3. PHBM stakeholders' perceptions are influenced by methods and teaching aids (simulations) *** Yes or No**			
Now	5 → Yes. Teaching aids are highly influential and help make things more effective and efficient	3 → Yes. Already undertaken and applied • making village maps makes it easier to identify data on village potential • outbound • increasing collaboration in organisations • metacards facilitate expression of opinions	4 → Yes. Easy to follow, easy to accept and elaborate upon	These evaluations show similar understanding; the use of tools and teaching aids is useful in helping processes become more efficient and effective. They also make materials easy to understand. Some methods have their strengths and others have their weaknesses, but all helped support the processes being carried out.

C. Results of Performance Evaluation at Tanggel Village

* = Village Government, FK-PHBM and community figures

	LMDH	**Perhutani**	**Others***	**Analysis**
	I.1.1.1 LMDH members elect organisers through democratic processes			
Now	4 → Following LPF, the group has become aware of good methods of	5 → Selection already involves all community figures or representatives	2 → Already involves more members, there are improvements in the system	The three groups gave different evaluations of the democratization occurring in the selection of organisers. Nevertheless, all three groups

	organization		and community understanding of LMDH is increasing	recognized more democratic processes occurring in LMDH despite it not having an election since it was formed. The only changes or replacements have occurred in sections within LMDH. Participants' observations on democratic organiser election processes were based on these occurrences. The growing involvement of community representatives in LMDH organisation is an indication of democratic processes being underway. When LPF entered Tanggel Village the LMDH had only just been established, so the three groups recognized that organization and democratization processes were still lacking in the selection of organisers. The involvement of village institutions in a joint forum was not followed up at lower levels, so the democratization process ceased with those involved at the time of selection.
Before	3 → Communities had some understanding. Managers were assigned through deliberation by community representatives	3 → Elections were already democratic but not productive because only managers and some community figures knew about them	1 → The organisation had only just been formed, membership was unclear and organisational structure was incomplete	
	I.1.1.2. Transparency in LMDH decision-making processes			
Now	4 → All stakeholders at the village level care about and are involved in decision making	4 → There is transparency but not involving all hamlets	3 → Developments to improve administration and financial reports once every 3 months from the LMDH.	Transparency is a developing issue in institutions in Tanggel Village and all stakeholders recognise there is improved transparency in LMDH decision-making processes. This was because administration is becoming more orderly and stakeholders are becoming involved in decision making. Prior to LPF Project intervention, villagers representing the LMDH, PHBM communication forum and village government accepted that the LMDH decision making process had lacked transparency. Meanwhile Perhutani recognised that transparency was beginning to emerge but was not widespread throughout the community.
Before	2 → Decisions made only by organisers	3 → Decision making already involved all organisers and members, but not the whole community	2 → Already relatively open, but yet to involve many people.	
	I.1.1.3. Shared decisions on benefits and funds are announced equitably and across the board			
Now	4 → Funds are limited, they are distributed, but not	5 → Funds used in accordance with agreements	3 → Financial controls	The three groups gave different evaluations regarding management of benefits and funds

	evenly to all parts of Tanggel Village (Tanggel covers a large area)	and benefits felt throughout the whole community	already in place	by institutions in Tanggel Village. Perhutani said that usage is usually in line with agreements since it has undertaken sharing with the community through the LMDH and tried to make sharing allocation agreements with the LMDH. Meanwhile, the LMDH felt the size of Tanggel Village was a constraint to the equitable distribution of benefits throughout the whole community. Prior to LPF intervention in the community, there was a lack of equity in relation to benefits and funds. This was because organisers lacked knowledge of how to run the organisation. Perhutani had given pointers on equitable utilisation, but these did not constitute shared agreements, so community members did not follow them.
Before	3 → Organisers had insufficient knowledge to distribute fairly and evenly	3 → Use of funds already in line with agreements but only felt by organisers and some members	2 → Benefits, but uneven	
	I.1.2.1. LMDH managers learn from experiences gained beforehand in environmentally friendly natural resources management			
Now	4 → Consensus to manage natural resources properly, to prevent fires and timber theft	4 → Communities beginning to realise the functions of afforestation and forests. They are beginning to plant and reforest their locales	3 → Organisers improving control mechanisms for activities that had previously failed	Communities and Perhutani judged community awareness of environmentally friendly forest management to be improving, both at an individual and group level. LMDH activities supporting environmentally friendly natural resources management are increasing and improvements are made in the event of any failure. The three groups felt that LMDH activities initially showed no support for environmentally friendly natural resources management as LMDH organisers were yet to understand its function and its activities had no planning. Perhutani, meanwhile, felt that community initiatives to improve forest management were already emerging, but many constraints prevented their implementation.
Before	2 → LMDH and PHBM were still new to the community, which was unaware of their functions in forest management activities	3 → Communities had initiatives, but were yet to carry them out. They were already thinking about improving forest management.	1 → No planning as yet	
	I.1.2.2. Communities prioritise environmentally friendly activities			
Now	4 → Communities becoming increasing aware of the need	3 → Initially afforestation took place, but now many	4 → Communities have already planted 20 Ha of	Tanggel villagers felt that community activities prioritising environmental friendliness are on

	to develop forests and are planting teak and mahogany on their land	trees have disappeared	community forest. The watershed has been planted with tree crops such as teak and mahogany.	the rise. This is apparent in communities' tendency to plant tree crops on their land or develop community forests and conservation lands. Meanwhile, Perhutani felt that communities tend to pay less heed to environmentally friendly activities; according to Perhutani, initially communities would undertake afforestation activities, but recently damage to state forests and timber theft have become frequent occurrences. The role of communities in environmentally friendly priority activities is still lacking; limited only to intercropping activities on state forest land. Meanwhile, Perhutani felt that a local figure had had a dominant role in motivating communities to undertake an afforestation drive, hence the highest evaluation being given by Perhutani. When LPF intervention arrived, the local figure who had succeeded in mobilising the community was no longer around, so the situation turned around.
Before	2 → Forest farmer groups already played a part in planting teak	5 → A local figure had motivated communities to begin planting trees along roadsides	2 → Communities already involved in fighting forest fires	
	I.1.2.3. Communities use participatory processes in making proposals and submitting them to donors or partners			
Now	4 → Community has submitted proposals for funds to regional government, Perhutani and a private company (for subsidised fertilizers).	3 → Have submitted proposals, but unsuccessfully. Examples: requests for assistance with oranges submitted to Perum Perhutani and CIFOR.	4 → Submissions to other institutions for religious activities and village infrastructure development. Assistance received step by step	Community institutions have submitted proposals to partners or donors. Some have been successful, while others have failed. According to the village government, there is routine internal aid to meet infrastructure and human resources development needs. Aid for economic and environmental development is still very limited. Prior to LPF intervention, proposals submitted by the community never bore fruit. Submissions were routine activities for funds used by the government for community infrastructure improvements. Community initiatives to submit proposals were already there, but were never implemented.
Before	3 → Proposals made for a road, bridge and mosque	2 → Initiatives but no implementation	2 → Proposals submitted, but no realisation within the community	
	I.2.1.1. Communities appreciate human interaction with natural resources as a knowledge form			

Now	4 → Communities know about natural resources, functions, management and impacts resulting from their management	4 → Communities becoming aware of the functions and benefits of natural resources	4 → Forest rehabilitation on community land	All groups responded that community interaction with nature has become community knowledge, manifested in community actions to rehabilitate fields on critical land. The three groups assigned the same value, i.e. tree starting to bear fruit. The three groups judged that community interaction with nature was not understood as knowledge, because communities were yet to understand the importance of natural resources, were yet to utilise them to their full potential, and due to the destructive behaviour remaining from earlier pillaging of natural resources. Both Perhutani and communities realised the situation was still unstable
Before	2 → Communities did not fully understand the importance of natural resources, some still prioritised personal needs	2 → Communities aware of the natural resources in the village, but were unable to utilise them to their full potential	1 → No community awareness to undertake planting	
	I.2.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM agree and act in accordance with developments in natural resources conditions and livelihoods			
Now	3 → Communities realise that forest degradation will ultimately impact upon themselves, so stakeholders support tree planting efforts on their private land	3 → Communities have begun to agree and act in accordance with environmental principles	3 → Communities already feeling benefits, forest farmers allocated seedlings and crop treatments. Productive community-managed cattle fattening in every hamlet.	All groups considered stakeholder forest conservation agreements paying attention to community welfare are on the increase. They have not reached an optimum level as yet, but stakeholder agreements and actions are paying more heed to natural resources conservation. The three groups gave the same evaluation. Indications of this are apparent in PHBM activities always being connected to forest community livelihoods, such as fattening livestock, and assistance to support successes in farming and forestry. Initial conditions showed that support from other parties was an important factor in determining the direction of actions and agreements of stakeholders implementing PHBM. Conditions had yet to take shape, with timber theft, initiatives in their early stages and potential yet to develop.
Before	2 → Communities were aware of the need for forest conservation, but timber theft, forest fires and cutting back still occurred in forest management blocks	2 → Communities had already begun to show initiative, but there were no agreements	1 → Potential already there with communities utilizing forest land.	
	I.2.1.3 Some community members secure additional incomes from partnerships with companies or other parties			
Now	5 → Community incomes	5 → Good partnerships with	4 → Communities can	Collaboration with other parties has become

	increasing from collaboration with other parties in activities such as clearing, loosening soil, intercropping, corn planting etc.	Perum Perhutani and third parties on things such as LMDH crops and planting corn in forest blocks.	already feel the benefits of partnerships with CV Java Mitra Sejahtera, which provides loans for seedlings and medicines	increasingly open following PHBM. This has meant communities feel increased economic benefits. Some forest management activities involving other parties have begun, including working with companies developing agricultural products. Community involvement in forest management is also continuing to increase.
	I.2.2.1. Stakeholders involved in PHBM require the involvement of other stakeholders in natural resources management			
Before	3 → Other parties already involved, but unaware of their involvement.	5 → There was collaboration that was later undertaken with other parties	2 → Forest management in Tanggel Village still required manpower from forest farmers to improve degraded forest.	The village government recognised that prior to LPF a lot of help was needed from other parties to support proper implementation within the community. The severely degraded forest in Tanggel Village meant the Tanggel BKPH applied a policy to contract labourers on a daily basis. This led to a reduced numbers of forest farmers undertaking intercropping activities. Meanwhile, Perhutani felt there had been collaboration with other parties from the outset. Forest farmers on the other hand were not aware they had been involved in any forest management and failed to realise the significant role they themselves had played.
	I.2.2.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play an active role in LPF activities			
Now	4 → All stakeholders involved in PHBM actively involved in LPF activities.	4 → Stakeholders actively involved in LPF activities through meetings and real activities.	4 → Already involves all parties in Tanggel Village: Perum Perhutani, village government, PHBM communication forum, LMDH, the religious group, youth association and women's group.	Stakeholders deemed to have been actively involved in LPF activities up until now. Representatives from each institution are an indicator that stakeholders involved in PHBM took an active role in LPF activities.
Before	3 →	3 →	4 →	
	I.2.3.1. A consensus exists regarding a shared vision (village vision)			

Now	4 → There is consensus on a village vision	3 → The vision was made collaboratively, but has only reached the agreement stage	4 → All stakeholders involved in creating a shared vision	All groups acknowledged there was agreement on a shared vision during the LPF project. Perhutani felt the vision was made by involving all stakeholders, but only as far as making the agreement. Villagers, meanwhile, felt the vision had been made together with the involvement of all stakeholders and was a common consensus. The three groups said there had never been a shared vision in Tanggel Village. Perhutani felt the idea had been there, but had never been realised within the community. The idea to make a shared vision arose in a Perhutani scenario for improving PHBM implementation.
Before	1 → There was no will to develop a village vision.	2 → There were ideas, but they had yet to come to fruition	1 → There was no shared village vision	
	I.2.3.2. Villagers aware of the shared vision (village vision)			
Now	3 → Not all community members know about the vision	3 → Only a small number of villagers know about the village vision	4 → The community knows about the vision as it involves representatives from every institution in the village	Involving community representatives in building a shared agreement on a village vision does not guarantee the whole community will be aware of that vision. LMDH and Perhutani acknowledged that only some and not all villagers knew about the village vision. The village government, meanwhile, felt that institutions' representatives had done their job in disseminating the shared vision.
	I.2.3.3. Villagers are committed to acting in accordance with the shared vision (village vision)			
Now	2 → Quality of village human resources still lacking so knowledge is limited	3 → Some communities have undertaken activities in accordance with the village vision	4 → Awareness in the community to plant fallow fields on private land. This shows the community is committed to acting in accordance with the shared vision	The shared vision is not always the basis for action in the management and utilisation of forest resources. Human resources limitations in understanding and undertaking forest management are a constraint to implementing the shared vision. Perhutani and the village government recognized that communities are becoming increasingly aware of actions being based on the vision. Such actions include planting on fallow land.
	I.2.4.1. A negotiation forum developed and used as a means for stakeholders to meet and discuss common problems			

Now	4 → There is a negotiation forum for reaching agreements including cattle grazing, orange planting, forest management patterns and forest management planning	2 → There is no negotiation forum	4 → A forum has been formed for resolving produce sharing allocation issues, social and religious problems. The village level PHBM communication forum is already operating	According to Perhutani a community negotiation forum has yet to be formed or is not functioning optimally. Forums are limited only to people coming to make agreements, but there is no permanent medium for stakeholders to hold discussions. Community representatives, meanwhile, said that negotiation forums are always developing in the community and that stakeholders are also involved in reaching agreements in PHBM implementation.
Before	2 → Solutions to problems were always decided by the chairman of the organisation	2 → There was no negotiation forum	2 → The village government held meetings, but these did not involve all stakeholders	The initial situation shows there was no forum for stakeholder discussion and negotiation. Decisions had been made by elites or a small number of organisers, so communities never felt policies had come from their own suggestions.
	I.2.4.2. Decisions made by stakeholders in this negotiation forum			
Now	4 → Communities more aware of importance and benefits of deliberation	n.a. →	5 → Stakeholders and the overall community are feeling the benefits	Tanggel Village community representatives said that stakeholder decisions were made in a negotiation forum, while Perhutani felt there were no decisions due to the absence of a negotiation forum.
Before	3 → Communities were clearing paths for democracy but were yet to understand it.	n.a. →	3 → Decisions sometimes made by elites alone, but sometimes decided together	Decisions in negotiation forums were sometimes controlled by elites, and sometimes involved stakeholders. Communities were making efforts at negotiation, but were yet to completely understand what negotiation means. Meanwhile, Perhutani felt that no efforts were made because there had never been a negotiation forum in the community.
	I.2.4.3. Improvements or new agreements arise from decisions made			
Now	3 → Communities are willing to make decisions to improve	n.a. →	5 → Decisions made always involves many stakeholders	Community members always strive to renegotiate decisions they consider

	on decisions they feel to be inappropriate			inappropriate or decisions made though non-transparent processes. A negotiation forum is an appropriate medium for making improvements to systems and new agreements. Initially, communities were still entrenched in the idea that the heads of institutions had more right to make decisions. This meant decisions were never altered or improved upon. There were no negotiations, even though many parties attended meetings.
Before	2 → Communities already had the initiative to change decisions, but no changes were made	n.a. →	1 → Meetings already involved many people, but decisions were made by group leadership	
	I.3.1.1. Partnerships and new agreements in environmentally friendly natural resources management made* Yes or No			
Now	4 → There are partnerships and new agreements in environmentally friendly natural resources management, so communities are willing to carry out forest management	2 → There are only initiatives and agreements, but no implementation as yet	4 → There is collaboration with the forestry office on the Gerhan program and with PT Java Mitra Sejahtera in planting corn	Community representatives in the LMDH, forest farmers, the PHBM communication forum and the village government recognised there are new forest management agreements and third parties are becoming involved in supporting these efforts. Perhutani, felt that only agreements are being made in the forum, but there is no implementation.
	I.3.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play a part in the development of environmentally friendly products and services			
Now	3 → Communities and LMDH participate in activities such as forest planting, clearing, loosening soil etc.	4 → Communities beginning to play a part in forest management inside and outside state forests	4 → Communities beginning to utilise land below forest stands for planting elephant grass. Utilisation of community forest land also starting to develop	Perhutani, LMDH and village government recognised that stakeholders are playing an increasing role in developing environmentally friendly products and services. Community efforts can be seen from their involvement in clearing, loosening soil, utilising land below forest stands and planting community forests in Tanggel Village.
	I.3.1.3. Outside parties express interest in collaborating in environmentally friendly natural resources management			
Now	4 → Some parties are interested in providing assistance in procuring fertilizer, planting teak trees on privately-owned land, collaborating in planting corn on forest land and selling	3 → There is agreement on cropping patterns, land sanitation, land preparation by communities themselves, but partnership collaboration was cancelled	4 → Efforts to empower natural resources and increase community knowledge through collaborative planting of corn, kapok and castor beans in forest blocks in Tanggel	The latest condition shows communities are becoming more capable at striving towards institutional independence by collaborating with third parties. Offers are coming from third parties to collaborate in supporting environmentally friendly forest management efforts both inside and outside state forests.

	yield		Village.	These stakeholders include the forestry office, corn and kapok companies and local businessmen offering outlets for selling produce from intercropping. All stakeholders acknowledged that prior to LPF project intervention there had never been any offers of collaboration from outsiders. Collaboration offers had always failed to come to fruition or had never had any clear follow up.
Before	3 → There was collaboration planting oranges, hybrid coconut, corn and mango, but never any follow up	2 → Outside parties had never offered to work with the community	1 → There was a PMDH program in the 1980s but it failed.	
	I.3.2.1. LPF uses and teaches methods and teaching aids (simulation) to stakeholders involved in PHBM *** Yes or No**			
Now	4 → Yes. The LPF project has taught various methods including: outbound, tug-o-war, socialisation etc.	4 → Yes. Every activity carried out makes use of teaching aids	5 → Yes. Methods and tools used in meetings have generated many decisions and discussions on community needs including the shared vision for Tanggel Village.	Participants appreciated LPF methods and simulation tools in its efforts to transfer knowledge to stakeholders involved in PHBM. The methods and simulations were recognised as helping communities discover their needs, resolve problems and establish a shared vision.
	I.3.2.2. Stakeholders understand and recognise the use of methods and teaching aids (simulations)			
Now	4 → Participants know and appreciate the benefits and functions of LPF team methods and teaching aids	4 → Visual aids help villagers and participants understand materials presented by facilitators	5 → Methods developed by LPF have inspired initiatives and an enthusiasm to move forward	Stakeholders recognise that the methods and teaching aids developed by LPF in supporting forest management are essential for presenting materials. They have become effective aids to understanding issues and materials and have inspired initiatives and an enthusiasm to move forward.
	I.3.2.3. PHBM stakeholders' perceptions are influenced by methods and teaching aids (simulations) *** Yes or No**			
Now	4 → Yes. Participants' understanding and ways of looking at things are influenced by the methods as they are easy for participants to understand	5 → Yes. Methods and teaching aids facilitate understanding and form perceptions	4 → Yes. Institutions starting to use methods developed by LPF by involving stakeholders in decision making	The three groups acknowledged that the perceptions of stakeholders involved in PHBM have been influenced by the methods and teaching aids developed by LPF. Communities are using some of them for things outside forest management, such as village decision making. Decisions that had previously only involved a few people or even only one person are beginning to use the stakeholder method.

D. Results of Performance Evaluation at Gempol Village

* = Village Government, forest farmers and FK-PHBM

	LMDH	Perhutani	Others*	Analysis
	I.1.1.1 LMDH members elect organisers through democratic processes			
Now	5 → Organisers are elected directly, with representatives from every hamlet	5 → Management elected through a proper process involving all community members	5 → Organiser elections held directly involving all hamlets in Gempol Village.	For this indicator all stakeholders stated that following the LPF Project, organizers are elected democratically in Gempol Village. There are direct elections through representatives in each hamlet and proper procedures involving all communities. At that time not many villagers knew about LMDH organiser elections. They neither knew the function of forming the LMDH, nor its intentions and objectives. Gempol villagers did not know about PHBM, so when Perum Perhutani tried to implement it by forming the LMDH in Gempol Village, organisers were selected by the village head.
Before	1 → Organisers were not elected directly but appointed by the village head. At the time the intentions and objectives of PHBM and forming the LMDH were unknown	3 → There was some, but not complete democracy in electing organisers	1 → Organisers were not elected directly but appointed by the village head. At the time, communities did not understand the function of forming the LMDH	
	I.1.1.2. Transparency in LMDH decision-making processes			
Now	4 → There is a process for stakeholders to deliberate. Openness required to prevent misunderstandings	5 → Activities are planned well in advance and deliberated upon with LMDH organizers and members as well as other members of the community	4 → Every activity is deliberated upon beforehand and decisions are always made by deliberation. Deliberations involve discussions with all stakeholders so decisions are acceptable to all	After LPF arrived transparency became an important part of decision making in Gempol Village, so all decisions involve deliberations in preparing plans long before activities take place. These deliberations involve all stakeholders so communities are happy to accept every decision. Before LPF arrived decisions were made only by the chairman and core management. Community members were not involved and had no routine meetings. There was no transparency.
Before	1 → No transparency, no routine meetings	3 → There was some transparency but not all elements in the community were involved. Transparency limited only to LMDH members and organisers	1 → Decisions made by the LMDH chair and a few core organisers	
	I.1.1.3. Shared decisions on benefits and funds are announced equitably and across the board			

Now	4 → Decisions suit strategic plans agreed by all stakeholders (Perhutani, LMDH, village figures, village government and youth association)	5 → Proper communication and professionalism put to the fore in decision making	4 → Benefits and funds not yet distributed evenly because membership cards have yet to be distributed to all members	At the time finances were managed by the chair, and their utilisation was not decided on beforehand through stakeholder deliberations. Only the chair, organisers and some community members could feel their benefits.
Before	2 → Only some community members (organisers and village government) felt benefits and knew about such decisions. There was no clarity regarding use of funds	3 → Transparency and communication limited to LMDH organisers and members without involving many stakeholders	1 → Finances only managed by the chair with no other parties involved	
	I.1.2.1. LMDH managers learn from experiences gained beforehand in environmentally friendly natural resources management			
Now	5 → Organisers always learning and changing in order to attain targets set through shared decisions, ascertaining positives from processes undertaken	5 → Intensive assistance already undertaken and many stakeholders are already involved	4 → There have been changes between the old and new organisers. Now every decision is deliberated upon beforehand	How organisers are learning from their previous experiences in natural resources management is apparent from their desire to learn and change in order to achieve objectives agreed upon together and to take the positives from processes undertaken. The incumbents are not repeating the same mistakes made by previous organisers; decision-making processes now involve deliberations to achieve consensus, which was not the case in the past. This learning process is also supported by intensive assistance and involves many stakeholders. At that time organisers did not learn from experience, but followed decisions made by influential people. There were no deliberations to achieve consensus in decision making processes and no intensive assistance to help organisers learn.
Before	2 → Organisers only followed decisions from influential people in the community. Villagers were starting to understand the meaning of natural resources	1 → No intensive assistance	1 → Decisions never deliberated upon beforehand	
	I.1.2.2. Communities prioritise environmentally friendly activities			
Now	3 → Community environmental awareness beginning to improve	3 → Communities familiar with activities inside and outside state forests, but they	5 → Communities have undertaken planting activities on state forest and	After the LPF Project, community environmental awareness began to increase; indications being planting activities on state

		are still in their early stages. Villagers have planted teak trees on their land	community forest land and on roadsides	and community forest land. Communities are familiar with activities inside and outside state forests, and have planted teak trees on their land. The community lacked awareness to carry out environmentally friendly activities. Though there were initiatives, there was no implementation. Communities would plant if there was aid or a project from outsiders. The poor forest management conditions were a result of the post timber theft situation.
Before	2 → Many community members unaware of environmentally friendly activities.	2 → Communities had initiatives, but they were not implemented. Communities would plant if there was aid or a project from outsiders. The post timber theft situation had a negative effect on management	2 → Communities had begun planting in forest blocks	
I.1.2.3. Communities use participatory processes in making proposals and submitting them to donors or partners				
Now	2 → Communities still lack initiative in discovering new ideas	1 → Not ready to undertake management in spite of there being initiatives. LMDH already has its own capital so feels there is no need to submit proposals to donors	2 → Proposals already submitted for utilising tree stumps, but have yet to be agreed	A lack of initiative in proposing new ideas and a feeling of already owning substantial capital from sharing produce are the reasons underlying the community's lack of interest in collaborating with other parties. Before LPF, geographical constraints were an obstacle to progress, as were finding new ideas that might be suitable for collaboration with other parties.
Before	2 → Communities still lacked initiative in discovering new ideas	1 → Gempol Village's geographical isolation and lack of information made it difficult to progress	1 → No proposals were submitted to outside parties	
I.2.1.1. Communities appreciate human interaction with natural resources as a knowledge form				
Now	4 → From experience, communities can learn from the environment (for instance selecting tree species that suit soil conditions in Gempol Village)	5 → Communities' comprehension of human interaction with forests influences behaviour.	4 → Communities involved in Perhutani activities, planting in community forests and activities to curb erosion	Communities already understand human interaction with natural resources as a form of knowledge and this is even reflected in their behaviour and activities, both individually and in collaboration with other parties, such as involvement in reforestation activities with Perum Perhutani to prevent erosion. At the time there was already some understanding, only there was no medium for honing this understanding and realising it in behaviour. Timber theft was also a common occurrence.
Before	3 → No learning	3 → Communities understood but not completely	1 → Frequent timber theft	
I.2.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM agree and act in accordance with developments in natural resources conditions and				

	livelihoods			
Now	5 → By adapting to existing natural conditions, communities are securing additional produce (making use of environmentally friendly potential)	5 → PHBM concepts agreed and coordinated in team work	4 → There is clear allocation in the community. Productive enterprises developed include cattle fattening and planting *porang* (Amorphophalus sp.) below forest stands	Gempol Villagers understand PHBM concepts and have assigned roles and responsibilities to realise them. Communities are even able to adapt themselves to natural resources developments when seeking income. There were no properly coordinated activities and processes only worked in certain circles (organisers).
Before	3 → The process was only carried out in certain circles	1 → Activities were not well coordinated.	1 → None at the time	
	I.2.1.3 Some community members secure additional incomes from partnerships with companies or other parties			
Now	5 → Work opportunities increasing. It is easier to communicate with Perum Perhutani	5 → Incomes increasing from sharing produce, partnerships and additional job opportunities	4 → Additional income from fire wood, charcoal, waste wood (stumps) and intercropping	Easier communication with Perum Perhutani has had a positive effect on the community economy and increased income. Some communities are collaborating with other parties (businessmen, traders) through the utilisation of fire wood, charcoal, waste wood, and through intercropping. This has opened up job opportunities to the community.
	I.2.2.1. Stakeholders involved in PHBM require the involvement of other stakeholders in natural resources management			
Before	1 → Other parties from outside the village were uninterested in being involved in PHBM	4 → Still required the involvement of other parties	1 → Fields had only been managed by Perhutani alone with no other parties involved	The failure of some earlier programs has made Perhutani, as the holder of authority over forest management become more open, providing opportunities to other parties to help PHBM continuity.
	I.2.2.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play an active role in LPF activities			
Now	5 → All activities have direction, a lot of knowledge has been secured (i.e. administration, meetings facilitated by LPF, cooperatives development etc.)	5 → Stakeholders actively involved in activities presented by LPF	5 → Stakeholders actively involved in LPF activities	All stakeholders actively involved in LPF activities.
	I.2.3.1. A consensus exists regarding a shared vision (village vision)			

Now	5 → Communities have the spirit to move forward	5 → Already able to make a village vision together through help from LPF	4 → Already agreed and recognized by the village community	Through LPF, communities have been facilitated in preparing a village vision. Preparations were carried out in a participatory manner, and outcomes were agreed and acknowledged by all village communities.
Before	1 → A vision and mission had yet to be formulated	1 → There was no consensus on a shared vision	1 → There was no shared vision in Gempol Village	No vision had been prepared since there had been no initiatives from the community.
	I.2.3.2. Villagers aware of the shared vision (village vision)			
Now	5 → Communities want to be involved in every LMDH activity	5 → Villagers already know about it because community representatives took part in preparing the vision and disseminating it to the community	4 → Most community members know about the shared vision	The shared vision was prepared by involving many parties in Gempol Village, community representatives took part and disseminated it to the general community. Most community members know about the shared vision. This is apparent from their involvement in village development activities with the LMDH.
	I.2.3.3. Villagers are committed to acting in accordance with the shared vision (village vision)			
Now	5 → Gempol villagers want to change their fate and progress by improving roads and continuing with forest conservation activities	4 → Not all community members committed to act in accordance with the vision	4 → The vision has become the foundation for village development	The community wants to progress, and initiatives to position the shared vision as the foundation for village development have inspired most, but not all Gempol villagers to act in accordance with the shared vision.
	I.2.4.1. A negotiation forum developed and used as a means for stakeholders to meet and discuss common problems			
Now	5 → The community is increasingly compact. No clashes between institutions	1 → There is no permanent forum for resolving problems, though there are negotiations between stakeholders	5 → A negotiation forum is up and running in deliberations on road surfacing and illiteracy eradication. The forum has also been used to decide on an action plan	There is no negotiation forum by name as such. However, in Gempol Village every problem is discussed through deliberation to find consensus with all parties involved. The issue of transparency had yet to become important, hence the absence of a negotiation forum, though ideas for one did exist.
Before	3 → There was no transparency in solving problems	n.a. →	2 → No negotiation forums established, but there were initiatives for doing so	

	I.2.4.2. Decisions made by stakeholders in this negotiation forum			
Now	5 → Activities already implemented	n.a →	4 → Decision already made on road surfacing	Forums involving many stakeholders have become a medium for determining shared decisions and are even manifested in activities in the village.
Before	2 → Group decisions only involved some organisers. Not all of them were involved in decision-making deliberations	n.a. →	2 → Produced decisions but was far from perfect	Decisions were not made in forums that involved many parties, but through the policies of those in power.
	I.2.4.3. Improvements or new agreements arise from decisions made			
Now	4 → Decisions considered unfair to those involved in forest management are being improved in forums initiated by the LMDH. The forum to discuss increasing forest farmers' welfare for instance.	n.a →	4 → New agreements on allocation sharing and funds for forest farmers.	Decisions felt unfair to those involved in forest management are being improved in forums initiated by the LMDH. The forum to discuss increasing forest farmers' welfare for instance. At that time there were no improvements to decisions unfair to those involved as there were neither means nor efforts to do so.
Before	1 → There were no meetings or agreements	n.a →	1 → None at the time	
	I.3.1.1. Partnerships and new agreements in environmentally friendly natural resources management made* Yes or No			
Now	5 → Household incomes from forest resources management are rising with increased intercropping in forest blocks, planting and utilisation of spices)	3 → Following LPF assistance, communities increasingly aware of benefits of planting trees and realise that forests are beneficial to the community	3 → Management of fallow riverside land to plant tree crops such as *gempol* and *sonokeling*	New agreements in environmentally friendly natural resources management are always coming about, along with a better system of partnerships.
	I.3.1.2. Stakeholders involved in PHBM play a part in the development of environmentally friendly products and services			
Now	5 → Communities already enjoying outcomes such as credit union services, cattle fattening, changed cropping patterns and intensification of	4 → Some communities are feeling the benefits of environmentally friendly forest resources management. For instance: utilising community forests,	5 → Utilisation of waste wood unused by Perhutani	The utilisation of non production wood (tree stumps and roots, firewood and charcoal), development of cooperatives, and the establishment of new land management systems such as changing cropping patterns have all been agreed by stakeholders through

	spices.	firewood and charcoal		deliberations.
	I.3.1.3. Outside parties express interest in collaborating in environmentally friendly natural resources management			
Now	1 → Potential is there, but cannot be implemented as yet due to a lack of adequate facilities	4 → Some partners request environmentally friendly products (LPF, Balitro, TFT, Balitnas through activities including certification, construction of biotechnology stoves)	4 → Marketing chairs made from waste teak wood, firewood and charcoal.	Some outside parties have shown interest in the condition of the forest/land and environmentally friendly products, but there has yet to be any implementation in Gempol Village due to problems with inadequate facilities and geographical isolation. Some outside parties were interested in the condition of the forest/land and environmentally friendly products, but there has yet to be any implementation in Gempol Village due to problems of inadequate facilities and geographical isolation.
Before	1 → Potential was there, but could not be implemented due to a lack of adequate facilities	n.a. →	2 → Outsiders were already expressing an interest	
	I.3.2.1. LPF uses and teaches methods and teaching aids (simulation) to stakeholders involved in PHBM *** Yes or No**			
Now	5 → Tools make it easy to understand a concept or something that should be done. These tools include teaching aids, banners etc.	4 → Stakeholders already involved in every activity that uses simulation methods	5 → The methods the LPF team uses are easy to accept and understand	LPF always used teaching aids in facilitation and taught them to stakeholders through its training programs.
	I.3.2.2. Stakeholders understand and recognise the use of methods and teaching aids (simulations)			
Now	5 → All stakeholders recognise the benefits of the teaching aids, because they were all involved in meetings held by the LPF team	3 → The methods are in the comprehension stage and are very hard to implement.	5 → Stakeholders involved in LPF activities comprehend and acknowledge the methods taught by the LPF team	Stakeholders comprehend and acknowledge the benefits of the methods and teaching aids, though some find them difficult to implement.
	I.3.2.3. PHBM stakeholders' perceptions are influenced by methods and teaching aids (simulations) *** Yes or No**			
Now	5 → Yes. Some methods or simulations are being tried in village meetings, such as the positioning of chairs during meetings	4 → Yes. Community thought patterns, communication and behaviour have been influenced by the methods developed by the LPF team, through making t-shirts, other communication media as well	4 → Yes. With the teaching aids participants find it easier to comprehend materials	Community thought patterns, communication and behaviour have been influenced by the methods developed by the LPF team. Stakeholders in Gempol Village have tried to develop the methods and simulations in village meetings, for instance, positioning of chairs in meetings. The use of methods and teaching

		as village and KPH meeting forums		aids helps stakeholders to understand materials.

E. Results of Performance Evaluation by LPF team members

	SURAJAYA	GLANDANG	TANGGEL	GEMPOL
I.1.1.1 LMDH members elect organisers through democratic processes				
Now	4 → Apparent from some processes undertaken, such as restructuring, improving bylaws and holding routine meetings	5 → Restructuring carried out through a democratic process; evaluations held as reference points for democratic elections of organisers, and LMDH activity coordinators elected democratically	3 → Openness to organiser candidates in a restructuring process undertaken in a multistakeholder forum. This constitutes a lesson for the village government	4 → Organiser candidates announce their visions and missions, rules of play in organiser elections are established participatorily, and direct elections involve the community
Before	2 → A reasonable understanding of democracy, but it had yet to be implemented	1 → LMDH set up hurriedly; with Perum Perhutani and village government appointing organisers	1 → System of appointment	1 → System of appointment
Analysis: In contrast to the other three villages, there were already initiatives to implement democratic elections or organisers in Surajaya, but demographic constraints; an expansive administrative area and the distance between hamlets made multistakeholder involvement difficult. There have been significant advances in Gempol and Glandang villages where re-election processes (restructuring) for LMDH organisers have taken place, with implementation more democratic than it had been previously.				
I.1.1.2 Transparency in LMDH decision-making processes				
Now	4 → Decisions made collaboratively (there is transparency)	5 → LMDH decision making always involves all members (not limited only to organisers)	4 → Information on accountability reports, finances, activity planning and benefit sharing allocation open to all stakeholders. This indicates efforts being made towards transparency	3 → Changes occurring in stages, including irregular accountability reports, and planning prior to activities being carried out. Other details are not reported to the community in order to avoid conflict. Supervision more often undertaken by the village PHBM communication forum
Before	3 → Decisions made by organisers	1 → No transparency	1 → No transparency or mechanisms for decision making	1 → Transparency limited only to some organisers (chair and secretary)

Analysis: Initially, in all villages decision making took place only at the organiser level. Now there are improvements with decision-making processes beginning to involve other parties; particularly in Tanggel Village where there is open access to information on every decision made.				
I.1.1.3 Shared decisions on benefits and funds are announced equitably and across the board				
Now	5 → Participatory calculations / planning up to benefit sharing (collaborative sugarcane and *sengon* planting for instance)	5 → The process is apparent in sugarcane cultivation and *sengon* planting	4 → Benefit sharing initiatives already exist, but are yet to be equitable and even. An example is the allocation of social funds for education, funerals etc. Perhutani involved in arranging allocation for LMDH	4 → Benefits and funds distributed across the board, but allocation considered inequitable. Benefit sharing allocation determined by Perhutani with a 5% allocation for forest farmers
Before	1 → There were neither joint decisions nor discussions	1 → None at the time	1 → Benefit sharing allocation only for incentives to organisers and village government (for village development)	1 → Benefit sharing allocation only for incentives to organisers and village development
Analysis: Initially, there was no communication for reaching joint decisions in any of the villages. Further, benefits were allocated only to organisers and village governments. Now the benefits of the PHBM program are better understood; communities are gradually receiving benefit allocations.				
I.1.2.1 LMDH managers learn from experiences gained beforehand in environmentally friendly natural resources management				
Now	5 → Organisers have learned from their experiences and are now using organic fertiliser and reducing sand excavation	5 → Have learned from experiences in involvement in planting and maintenance in forest management. Changing plant spacing and cropping patterns	3 → Learning from experiences and undertaking activities including planting empty blocks, intercropping, developing community forests and weirs, organising daily rates for forest farmers on Perhutani land, and reducing uncontrolled grazing	4 → Tree crops being planted on bare riverside land; greater access to land for intercropping; grazing restricted to certain locations, and community forests being enlarged
Before	2 → There was awareness from the beginning (local wisdom) to utilise land below forest stands	2 → There were initiatives, but no implementation	1 → A propensity for timber theft, a monopoly on the utilisation of tree stumps, and forest farmers employed only as planting labourers meant little involvement in natural resources management. There was also uncontrolled grazing	3 → Community local wisdom prevented pillaging from forest management blocks. Community forest development was beginning, and buried logs were dug up to fulfil needs for timber
Analysis: LMDH organisers have knowledge of environmentally friendly forest development, and progress has been made with the LPF assistance process.				

I.1.2.2 Communities prioritise environmentally friendly activities				
Now	5 → Collaboration planting *sengon*; use of organic fertiliser; utilisation of fallow land and land below forest stands	5 → *Sengon* planting with organic fertiliser	3 → Community forest development and planting of fruit trees; LMDH involves its members in forest patrols; cattle rearing without uncontrolled grazing; utilisation of land below forest stands	4 → Empty riverside land used for planting tree crops; grazing locations; reduced timber theft; intercropping; and successful crop competitions between forest farmers
Before	2 → There were already environmentally friendly non forestry activities, but many activities damaged forests	1 → Fallow land yet to be managed; no awareness to undertake environmentally friendly activities	1 → A lot of fallow land (500ha). Involvement only in daily contract work	3 → There were already grazing and intercropping locations; timber theft still prevalent
Analysis: Communities are undertaking environmentally friendly productive enterprises, particularly with support from outside parties investing in kapok and *sengon* planting, which makes communities more motivated.				
I.1.2.3 Communities use participatory processes in making proposals and submitting them to donors or partners				
Now	5 → Participatory proposals made; collaboration agreed for planting *sengon* and sugarcane	5 → Participatory proposals made and submitted to Perhutani, PUKK, PG Sumberharjo (planting sugarcane), PT AAPC (Accor) and PKHR UGM (planting *sengon*)	3 → Proposals made, but neither participatory nor successful as yet. Group proposals made for particular needs	2 → Community yet to make proposals as benefits received are sufficient to cover all activities, and access to the village is difficult. Village proposal made only as a project formality
Before	3 → Proposals had been submitted, but not agreed. They were not prepared participatorily	3 → The village made and submitted proposals, but they were not participatory	1 → Project-based, but not participatory proposals made	1 → Proposals made by village government as formalities for government projects. Processes were not participatory
Analysis: High levels of creativity in developing community enterprises, particularly in Surajaya and Glandang villages where outsiders are involved as investors. In other villages, substantial earnings from benefit sharing result in less initiative to develop productive enterprises.				
I.2.1.1 Communities appreciate human interaction with natural resources as a knowledge form				
Now	4 → Reduced illegal logging and illegal sand mining as a result of improved community knowledge and awareness (the number of sand miners and mining sites have fallen)	5 → There is a slogan in the community 'Forests need people and people need forests'. Villagers realise that there have been water shortages, higher temperatures and stronger winds since the forest was	3 → Comprehension of human interaction with natural resources with the development of community forests and intercropping.	4 → Tree crops planted on empty riverside land and community forests being developed

		degraded		
Before	2 → Negative interaction with nature (in a conservation context)	2 → They knew about human interaction with natural resources, but it was not implemented	1 → Only at a needs fulfilment stage	2 → Local wisdom did not allow villagers to extract wood from the local forest, so they took it from a forest in Ngawi
Analysis: Initially, almost all villages had some understanding of the importance of human interaction with natural resources. As the process went on, understanding and awareness grew as is apparent from illegal logging figures and a fall in the number of illegal sand excavation sites in Surajaya Village. In Gempol and Tanggel villages the development of community forests and planting on empty riverside land are signs of real implementation.				
I.2.1.2 Stakeholders involved in PHBM agree and act in accordance with developments in natural resources conditions and livelihoods				
Now	5 → Livelihood source has changed from timber extraction to utilisation of land below forest stands (planting physic nut, kapok etc.)	5 → Accelerated cropping to fill empty and fallow land; earnings and job opportunities secured from planting; planting below forest stands adjusted to market demand; and a nursery enterprise	3 → Cattle fattening as a productive enterprise; the LMDH organises daily contract work for its members including scrub clearance, establishing teak demo plots and involvement in intercropping	4 → Development of productive cattle rearing enterprises; management and marketing of firewood and charcoal; and many forest farmers involved in intercropping
Before	2 → In one hamlet the main occupation was illegal timber extraction because villagers did not understand PHBM	1 → Not yet, PHBM had just arrived	1 → Stakeholders never met, there were never any agreements	1 → No stakeholder agreements to act in accordance with developments in natural resources conditions
Analysis: There were no meetings or agreements for stakeholders to act in accordance with developments in natural resources conditions in the four villages due to a lack of understanding about PHBM. Conditions changed with increased awareness and agreements to act according to natural resources conditions, including the development of productive enterprises.				
I.2.1.3 Some community members secure additional incomes from partnerships with companies or other parties				
Now	5 → Increased income from collaborative sugarcane and kapok planting, *sengon* nurseries and intercropping	5 → Secure additional income from planting sugarcane, intercropping and *sengon* nurseries	5 → Timber sharing allocation, daily wages (crop clearance, forest maintenance); collaboration with PT JMS to plant corn	5 → Timber production benefit sharing with Perhutani, which allocates ≥ 60% for community interests
Analysis: Community earnings have increased from the development of enterprises (sugarcane, kapok, *sengon* etc.) with outside investors coming in to develop businesses in the villages.				
I.2.2.1 Stakeholders involved in PHBM require the involvement of other stakeholders in natural resources management				
Before	4 → Stakeholders felt they knew nothing so needed	5 → Stakeholders felt there was a great need for involvement of	5 → Statement from Perhutani as to the need for other parties	5 → There were statements from the community about the need for

	outsiders to be involved	other parties (statement from LMDH and Perhutani)	to be involved. Communities required outside involvement	intervention
Analysis: All villages required involvement from other parties in natural resources management.				
I.2.2.2 Stakeholders involved in PHBM play an active role in LPF activities				
Now	5 → Stakeholders involved in LPF activities (in all processes)	5 → Involved in all LPF processes	5 → Stakeholders involved in LPF activities & there is follow up on processes	5 → All stakeholders actively involved in LPF processes
Analysis: In all villages, parties involved in the PHBM program are actively involved and reap benefits from all LPF activities.				
I.2.3.1 A consensus exists regarding a shared vision (village vision)				
Now	Yes 5 → There are shared agreements / a common vision	Yes 5 → Written village vision prepared participatorily	Yes 5 → Common vision developed, formulated and agreed upon	Yes 5 → Common vision developed by all stakeholders
Before	1 → None at the time	1 → None at the time	1 → None	1 → None
Analysis: Consensus to have and prepare village visions.				
I.2.3.2 Villagers aware of the shared vision (village vision)				
Now	Yes 4 → Known about, but yet to touch all layers of the community fully	Yes 4 → Not yet overall, however the publication of calendars, flyers and leaflets is expected to help all community members become aware	Yes 4 → Not all community members know about the village vision despite efforts to transfer information through socialisation activities and an information centre	Yes 4 → Already known about – efforts being made to socialise it through leaflets and calendars
Analysis: The village visions have yet to be socialised completely in all hamlets. The development of an information centre and LMDH and PHBM flyers and calendars is expected to help with disseminating the village visions.				
I.2.3.3 Villagers committed to acting in accordance with the shared vision (village vision)				
Now	Yes 4 → Activity strategies planned from the common vision	Yes 4 → Still conflicting roles between the LMDH and village government, so not all villagers are committed to the village vision. The village government is	Yes 3 → The community has yet to know all the details, though acts in accordance with the vision. Community members involved in formulating the vision show	Yes 3 → Not all communities members show commitment

		still not committed to acting in accordance with the village vision. Neither the LMDH nor the old village head have explained the village vision to his successor	commitment	
Analysis: Villagers and village governments are not yet fully committed to applying their village visions to village development as not all layers of communities know about them.				
I.2.4.1 A negotiation forum developed and used as a means for stakeholders to meet and discuss common problems				
Now	Yes 4 → An incidental forum has been developed for stakeholder negotiations	Yes 5 → There are 2 kinds of forum: routine and incidental to discuss common problems, such as negotiations on planning, benefit sharing allocation and *sengon* planting technicalities	Yes 4 → Incidental needs-based forums exist. Initiatives originated from the LMDH or PHBM communication forum	Yes 4 → Incidental negotiation forums with initiatives originating from the LMDH or PHBM communication forum
Before	2 → Initiative already there	1 → None at the time	1 → None at the time	1 → None at the time
Analysis: Originally there were no negotiation forums in any of the villages, but now forums have been set up for resolving any problems and issues that might arise. These, however, remain incidental.				
I.2.4.2 Decisions made by stakeholders in this negotiation forum				
Now	5 → Decisions have been made through quite dynamic discussions in these forums	5 → All decisions made jointly by stakeholders in these forums	5 → All decisions relating to benefit sharing allocation, planning, forming cooperatives and evaluations made through these forums	5 → All decisions made in negotiation forums
Before	1 → No forum	1 → None at the time	1 → No agreements / decisions	1 → None at the time
Analysis: All stakeholders agreed that decisions were made in negotiation forums developed from empowerment processes conducted by LPF since such forums used not to exist.				
I.2.4.3 Improvements or new agreements arise from decisions made				
Now	5 → Collaboration agreement addendum; organisation restructuring; improvements to statutes and bylaws; new agreements on land (forest	5 → Additional forest management blocks through decisions made during negotiations; written agreements on collaborative sugarcane and	5 → Improvements and agreements on revitalising the role of the PHBM communication forum, benefit reallocation and cattle fattening	5 → New agreements made through deliberations

	management blocks)	*sengon* cultivation; changes to statutes and bylaws	management mechanisms	
Before	1 → None	1 → None at the time	1 → Never had	1 → None at the time
Analysis: Currently, decisions in negotiation forums are followed up with improvements made to policies and rules associated with PHBM operations. Significant changes have resulted as a result of the LPF process.				
I.3.1.1 Partnerships and new agreements in environmentally friendly natural resources management made				
Now	Yes 5 → Collaboration on sugarcane and planting *sengon*, castor beans and *porong*, as well as producing organic fertiliser	Yes 5 → Collaboration with outside parties planting *sengon* and *mindi*, and growing sugarcane	Yes 4 → Agreements on crop spacing and cropping patterns on forest land; partnerships with investors on crops planted below forest stands	Yes 5 → New agreement on management of bare riverside land
Analysis: New natural resources management partnerships formed, with Perhutani and LMDH as well as outside investors.				
I.3.1.2 Stakeholders involved in PHBM play a part in the development of environmentally friendly products and services				
Now	5 → Development of organic fertiliser; sugarcane and *sengon* planting uses organic fertiliser; waste-free dried banana production	4 → Using organic fertiliser	4 → Stakeholders taking roles in developing community forests; utilising land below forest stands; involvement in management	3 → Not fully - waste wood processing, cattle fattening, management of bare riverside land
Analysis: Stakeholder involvement in developing environmentally friendly enterprises going well in almost all villages.				
I.3.1.3 Outside parties express interest in collaborating in environmentally friendly natural resources management				
Now	5 → Investors include: UD Taruna Tani (*sengon*), UD Sumber Harjo (sugarcane) and PT Sukun Kudus (kapok)	5 → Collaboration with outside parties: PKHR UGM, PT AAPC Indonesia, PG Sumber Harjo	3 → Collaboration with JMS. Earlier collaboration on an orange micro project failed because the LMDH was not prepared to be liable for risks. Offers for cattle fattening	1 → None as yet due to sufficient capital and an absence of empty land. The community feels no need for outsiders
Before	3 → Sugarcane collaboration on private land	1 → None at the time	1 → None at the time	1 → None at the time
Analysis: Outside parties' participation in the PHBM program is working thanks to their faith in the ability of the LMDHs, particularly in Glandang and Surajaya villages. In Gempol there have been no changes as the village has no dependence on outside involvement or capital, while the LMDH in Tanggel has yet to reach its maximum potential in developing productive enterprises.				

I.3.2.1 LPF uses and teaches methods and teaching aids (simulation) to stakeholders involved in PHBM				
Now	Yes 5 → Utilising methods used by LPF including facilitation methods and FGDs	Yes 5 → Using them in facilitation processes, meetings, teaching them through training to stakeholders involved in PHBM	Yes 5 → Useful for delivering materials in FGDs, training, workshops, OMTs etc.	Yes 5 → LPF Facilitation methods and teaching aids are used in all processes
Analysis: Stakeholders feel they need to be familiar with and practice attractive methods in delivering messages and in PHBM program discussions.				
I.3.2.2 Stakeholders understand and recognise the use of methods and teaching aids (simulations)				
Now	5 → Stakeholders recognise and are even using them	5 → Stakeholders understand and use the methods and simulations taught by LPF. Already have 2 local facilitators	4 → Recognise their uses and feel their benefits	4 → Stakeholders understand them but not all meetings utilise the methods taught
Analysis: The methods and teaching aids are very easy for all stakeholders to copy and develop, and are considered helpful in supporting the PHBM program and LMDH institutional activities.				
I.3.2.3 PHBM stakeholders' perceptions are influenced by methods and teaching aids (simulations)				
Now	Yes 5 → Stakeholders apply the methods and simulations in meetings	Yes 4 → The methods and teaching aids constitute new innovations for teaching materials; stakeholders already use the LPF methods and simulations; they are used to help stakeholders understand problems, are easy to understand and are new and interesting	Yes 5 → Methods and teaching aids being used by Perhutani; technology used in documenting activities	Yes 4 → Not all are using them. Perhutani, for instance, has yet to be influenced by the methods and teaching aids
Analysis: In all villages the introduction of methods and teaching aids during the LPF process is deemed beneficial and supportive to village activities; though in the case of Gempol, creating something new and changing things requires further adaptation than in the other three villages.				

For Criteria 3.3 – performance evaluation did for overall Java case study

I.3.3.1 Journals written from LPF concepts and case studies	
4	The Java case study generated 3 papers which were presented at 2 international conferences; and published in the LPF edition of Jurnal Hutan Rakyat

I.3.3.2	**Papers presented at international and national conferences**
5	The Java case study generated 3 papers which were presented at 2 international conferences
I.3.3.3	**Books and guidelines published**
5	The book entitled *Panduan Pemberdayaan Lembaga Masyarakat Desa Hutan* (A Guide to Empowering Forest Village Community Organisations) is being published to support LMDH empowerment processes throughout Java. Flyers also being made profiling PHBM and the LMDHs in the four villages are expected to help with socialisation of the PHBM program. Calendars produced will hopefully be effective media for socialisation and have a positive impact from LPF activities
I.3.3.4	**LPF approaches and cases used in lectures**
5	Methods and approaches developed by LPF have been adopted in curricula and practicals in the UGM Faculty of Forestry for the subjects 1) Community Participation and Empowerment, and 2) Community Forest Management
I.3.3.5	**Communication media produced (websites, brochures, bulletins, newspapers)**
4	Information media targeting local communities includes flyers profiling LMDHs in four villages, PHBM flyers and calendars. A website has been set up for reaching a wider audience
I.3.3.6	**Guidance/policy briefs made**
4	PHBM Plus has adopted LPF approaches and Perhutani has stated it will adopt methods used by LPF, as well as policies to manage land / blocks in Glandang Village

LESSONS LEARNED

The initial assumptions that the communities were highly dependent on forests for their livelihoods, the sustainability of the PHBM program depended greatly on the capacity of communities to be involved directly in forest management, and the absence of fair collaboration in the PHBM program became the basis for project frameworks throughout the intervention process. These were related directly to community hopes of involvement in forest management.

Outcomes and lessons learned during the process were from bringing about forest conservation and community welfare through participatory forest management. These achievements were apparent through:

- The establishment of partnerships and equal roles as well as mutual trust among LMDHs, Perhutani and other stakeholders in collaborative forest management;
- LMDHs as community institutions having the institutional capacity to function well;
- The presence of LMDH secretariats, PHBM information centres and LMDH organiser uniforms means village communities become more familiar with LMDH roles in the PHBM program;
- Membership management, the intensity of communication between members and organisers, and the intensity of LMDH activities on the ground have increased the responsibility and participation of their members in forest management activities;
- Collaboration in productive economic enterprises opens opportunities for LMDHs to increase earnings from forest management activities, which either directly or otherwise impact upon their members;
- LMDH forest management and human resources capacities have improved both individually and collectively as part of an institution;
- Negotiation processes were developing continually during collaborative forest management particularly between LMDHs and Perhutani; and
- The stirring of an independent spirit in managing institutions was one achievement of LPF project assistance.

CONCLUSION

The approaches, methods and processes undertaken by the LPF project have had positive results and impacts on community conditions. This is apparent from LPF performance evaluation results, which show developments from initial conditions prior to LPF involvement and current conditions following LPF project involvement in the four villages – measured in 3 principles: empowerment, environmental mediation and strengthening networks.

It can be seen from the results of LPF project performance evaluations that the methods used in multistakeholder facilitation motivated communities to become actively involved in every activity, built the organisational management and forest resources management capacities of communities and related parties, and aroused a desire in the communities to become actively involved in the management of forest resources.

Community empowerment in the PHBM program through the LPF project constituted a shared learning process for all parties involved. Hopefully therefore, these approaches, process developments and LPF project methods can encourage sustainable forest resources management in the future and provide a positive and sustainable impact for the communities.

Village Fact Sheets

Surajaya Village

Characteristic	Initial situation (Baseline)	Analysis following participatory evaluation
Location	Surajaya Village immediately borders Paduraksa Suburb to the north, Bantarbolang Subdistrict to the south, Banjar Mulya village to the west and Pegongsoran Village to the east. The village covers an area of 570.26 ha, with LMDH Surajaya management blocks covering 1,483.9 ha.	
Stakeholders involved	Stakeholders involved: LMDH, forest farmer groups, PHBM communication forum, village government and Perhutani. There was no clear designation of forest resources management roles in Surajaya Village. Conditions: 1. There was no consensus on villagers' membership in the LMDH, or the status of forest farmer groups. 2. No internal rules had been established regulating relationships between organisers and members, or between members themselves. 3. Roles and functions of institutions within PHBM yet to work properly	Stakeholders involved in PHBM: LMDH, forest farmer groups, PHBM communication forums, village government and Perhutani. Roles of stakeholders involved: 1) Forest Village Community Organisations Forest village communities (MDH) are those living in or around forests. Their geographical proximity to forests means they interact with them both directly and indirectly. Forest village communities not only interact with forests but feel the direct impacts of any forest management undertaken. They include forest farmers associated in forest farmer groups (KTH) in every forest block or sub-block. LMDHs are umbrella institutions for forest village communities involved in forest management, and for community members not involved in groups, but have direct interaction. 2) Village governments Village governments have the authority to determine policies in their administrative regions and the social influence to organise village communities. Commonly, in forest villages the village apparatus, usually known as a "*pamong*", is a highly influential figure who acts as an example to other community members. 3) Village PHBM communication forums PHBM communication forums are village institutions that represent the interests of forest village communities in providing input relating to PHBM program implementation. PHBM communication forums function to: a) coordinate with LMDHs in forest management implementation, and b) communicate information relating to forest management in PHBM implementation. Their tasks are to guide, supervise and evaluate LMDH and KTH forest management. 4) Perum Perhutani Perum Perhutani has government authority to manage Java's state forests. Perhutani has direct involvement both as manager and recipient of economic benefits from forest product production. The Perhutani officers involved included foremen, technicians and field supervisors. Conditions: LMDH: clarification of roles, rights and responsibilities of LMDH members in draft revision of LMDH Surajaya bylaws. KTHs: Proof of membership identity (membership cards and books) LMDH internal rules and bylaws revised on 17 February 2007
Type of resource	Types of natural resources in Surajaya Village include: ▪ State forest: lumber, firewood, animal feed, teak leaves, farming land, medicinal plants, rocks, sand etc.	Improvements to conditions : State forest → planting on bare land, controlling sand and rock excavation, reduced incidences of timber theft.

	▪ Rice paddies, dry vegetable fields, sugarcane plantations, ▪ Livestock: cows, buffalo, goats ▪ Natural water springs and a river	
Stakeholders with forest management rights	Perhutani deemed to have full rights and ownership over forest management	Certainty that forest management can be successful with the involvement of many stakeholders, with Perhutani and the LMDH as main actors
Rights over benefit sharing	In 2004 the benefit sharing ratio between Perhutani and LMDH was 75:25 with Perhutani securing the larger share.	Benefit sharing patterns based on the following collaboration agreement models: 1. Collaboration agreement to plant *sengon* between Perum Perhutani, the Pemalang forest farmer group, UD. Taruna Tani and LMDH Wanajaya Benefit sharing determined as follows: First Party : 40% Second Party : 35% Third Party : 25% 2. Collaboration agreement to plant *sengon* between Perum Perhutani, the Pemalang forest farmer group and LMDH Wanajaya Benefit sharing determined as follows: First Party : 40% Second Party : 60%
Community income source	Income originating from natural resources / forest resources: 1. Management of fresh water sources 2. Forest (timber forest products, benefit sharing, intercropping, contract work) 3. Farming (rice paddies and dry fields) 4. Sugarcane plantations 5. Livestock 6. Sand and rocks Community income sources: 1. Farming sector : 24.78 % 2. Forest : 8.33 % 3. Farm labour : 8 % 4. Migrant work : 21 % 5. Livestock : 2.65 % 6. Trading : 16.06 % 7. Services : 14.76 % 8. Retired : 3.86 %	Income originating from natural resources / forest resources: 1. Management of fresh water sources 2. Forest (timber forest products, benefit sharing, intercropping, contract work) 3. Farming rice paddies and dry fields 4. Sugarcane plantations 5. Livestock 6. Sand and rocks Community income sources: 1. Farming sector 2. Forest 3. Farm labour 4. Migrant work 5. Livestock 6. Trading 7. Services 8. Retired Percentages not presented here because the LPF project did not conduct a livelihood study in the final year of the project
Management objectives and party determining objectives	Forest management objective: Develop community involvement in forest security Objective set by Perhutani Pemalang forest management unit	Forest management objectives: 1. Conserve forest and increase community welfare in Surajaya Village 2. Strive to conserve fresh water sources, prevent erosion and flooding 3. Protect wildlife around village management blocks 4. Resolve community social and economic problems through village forest management blocks 5. Campaign for an equitable benefit sharing system within PHBM 6. Strive to establish a recreation forest within the village forest management block Objectives set by LMDH Wanajaya and agreed by Perhutani Pemalang forest management unit

Collaboration preparations such as multistakeholder forums	There were no multistakeholder forums or media for forums	Forums set up collaboratively by the LMDH and Perhutani, examples being for evaluation and joint patrolling
Incentives for local community	Local community incentives: 1. Use of land for intercropping 2. Benefit sharing in 2004 in the form of village facilities development	Local community incentives: 1. Use of land for intercropping now orderly and coordinated by forest farmer groups and LMDH 2. Benefit sharing every year in the form of village facilities development 3. Share for forest farmers in accordance with LMDH rules 4. Funds from management of LMDH enterprises; nurseries and bokhasi fertiliser production 5. Increased capacity for some community members as a result of training
Level of social capital (community capacity to speak with one voice, negotiate and manage)	Capacity still at an early stage, yet to receive optimum attention from parties considered higher in position. Processes yet to originate from shared decisions and risk liability	Genuine dialogue and negotiation processes and forest management involvement implemented by Perhutani, LMDH and third parties. Capacity already applied in the involvement of stakeholders particularly the LMDH in processes carried out
Support from outsiders	Support already there from Perhutani, related government offices and third parties, but still minimal in a forest management framework	Increasing and more optimal support manifested in the involvement of local and regional investors in forest management

Glandang Village

Characteristic	Initial situation (Baseline)	Analysis following participatory evaluation
Location	The geographic location of Glandang is 8 52'30" – 7 20'11" south and 109 17'30" – 109 40'30" east. It borders the villages of Kejene to the west, Bantarbolang to the east, Sambeng in the south and Kuta to the north. Glandang Village covers an area of 648.58 ha and has forest management blocks covering 702 ha.	
Stakeholders involved	Stakeholders involved in PHBM: Forest farmer groups, LMDH, Perhutani, village PHBM communication forum, village legislative assembly and village government Roles of stakeholders involved: 1. Forest farmer groups carried out work on the ground and undertook contract work with Perhutani. 2. LMDH acted as coordinating institution for forest farmers and Perhutani partners in PHBM 3. No stakeholder collaboration 4. Some positions determined by elites in village social institutions	Stakeholders involved: Forest farmer groups, LMDH, Perhutani and village government Stakeholders involved have the following roles: 1. In accordance with LMDH bylaws, proof of membership involves database, book and membership cards in all management blocks 2. Members have a sense of belonging and responsibility in forest management 3. Forest farmers willing to be involved in planting activities Membership administration more orderly; membership books and cards are beneficial for crosschecking land ownership and its potential
Type or resource	Types of natural resources in Glandang Village: ▪ River (sand and rocks), weirs (irrigation works), wells, fresh water springs ▪ Rice paddies and plantations (small plots owned and produce used for consumption)	Resources that have an impact or potential impact: ▪ Forest with timber and non timber forest products (animal feed, teak leaves, contract work land) ▪ Community prepares participatory forest management planning for timber and non timber forest products (intercropping and planting below forest stands) ▪ Preparation of Annual Technical Plans (*Rencana Teknis Tahunan* (RTT) for forest management. ▪ Collaborative *sengon* planting established between LMDH

	▪ Forest (firewood, timber, fruits and land)	and other parties (PT AAPC, Perhutani, PKHR)
Stakeholders with forest management rights	Perhutani deemed to have full rights and ownership over forest management	Certainty that forest management can be successful with the involvement of many stakeholders, with Perhutani and the LMDH as main actors
Rights over benefit sharing	The Glandang LMDH was newly established In 2004 the benefit sharing ratio between Perhutani and LMDH was 75:25 with Perhutani securing the larger share.	1. Collaboration agreement to plant *sengon* between Perum Perhutani Pemalang forest management unit and LMDH Karya Lestari Benefit sharing determined as follows: First Party : 40% Second Party : 60% 2. Collaboration agreement to plant *sengon* between Perum Perhutani Pemalang forest management unit, PT Accor Indonesia and LMDH Karya Lestari. Benefit sharing determined as follows: First Party : 40% Second Party : 30% Third Party : 30% 3. Collaboration agreement to plant *sengon* between Perum Perhutani Pemalang forest management unit, PKHR – UGM and LMDH Karya Lestari Benefit sharing determined as follows: First Party : 40% Second Party : 30% Third Party : 30%
Community income sources	Income originating from natural resources: 1. Farming (plantations and rice paddies) 2. River (sand excavation) 3. Livestock 4. Forest Community income sources : 1. Farming (farming and farm labour): 60 % 2. Services: 14% 3. Livestock: 6% 4. Forest (timber and firewood, land): 4% 5. Migrant work: 16 %	Income originating from natural resources: 1. Farming (plantations and rice paddies) 2. Forest (sharing, land, intercropping, manpower). 3. River 4. Planting sugarcane Community income sources: 1. Farming 2. Services 3. Livestock 4. Forest (sharing, contract work land, intercropping and manpower). 5. Migrant work 6. Government project development (P2MBG, PUKK) Percentages not presented here because the LPF project did not conduct a livelihood study in the final year of the project
Management objectives and parties involved	Forest management objective: Develop community involvement in forest security Objective set by Perhutani Pemalang forest management unit	Forest management objectives: 1. Restore forest conservation and ecosystem balance 2. Increase community welfare by utilizing land and space for intercropping during and/or after contract period 3. Secure timber and non timber forest products (animal feed, firewood and teak leaves) from village forest management blocks 4. Secure shared benefits in line with contribution towards management of village forest management blocks 5. Create forest product-based business opportunities (timber and non timber). 6. Establish Gunung Wangi recreation forest 7. Conserve sources of fresh water Management objectives set by LMDH Karya lestari Glandang Village and agreed by Perhutani Pemalang forest management unit
Collaboration preparations such as	There were no multistakeholder forums, all parties acted alone	Evaluation and negotiation forums set up collaboratively by the LMDH and Perhutani

multistakeholder forums		
Incentives for local community	Local community incentives: 1. Use of contract work land for intercropping 2. Farmers secure income from making crop markers	Local community incentives: 1. Use of contract work land for intercropping now orderly and coordinated by forest farmer groups and LMDH 2. Benefit sharing secured in 2007 from planting sugarcane 3. Share for forest farmers in accordance with LMDH rules 4. Funds from management of LMDH enterprises; nurseries and for farmers that become labourers 5. Increased capacity for some community members as a result of technical and non technical training
Level of social capital (community capacity to speak with one voice, negotiate and manage)	Capacity still at an early stage, yet to receive optimum attention from parties. Processes yet to originate from shared decisions and risk liability	Dialogue and negotiation processes and active involvement in forest management established. Capacity already applied in the involvement of stakeholders particularly the LMDH in negotiation processes in collaboration with other parties
Support from outsiders	Support already there from related government offices, but still minimal in a forest management framework	Increasing and more optimal support manifested in the involvement of local and regional investors in forest management, as well as utilisation of fallow land

Tanggel Village

Characteristic	Initial situation	Analysis following participatory evaluation
Location	Located in Randublatung Subdistrict. Borders the forest management units of Ngangkrang to the north, Jambu to the south, Temanjang to the east, and Temureng to the west. The village covers an area of 3,265.38 Ha, and has a forest management area of 2,560.18. Rain-fed paddy fields cover 283.14 Ha, crop fields cover 206.95 Ha, with 208.94 Ha of house lots and a further 6.13 Ha.	
Stakeholders	Perum Perhutani Government Community (LMDH as representative organisation) Third parties (NGOs, education institutes, traders and others)	Collaboration that had previously lacked direction with discrepancies between planning and implementation has improved since the LPF project. Stakeholder communication, negotiation and coordination has improved through training and participatory multistakeholder meetings
Types of resources	Timber and non timber (stumps and roots, teak, firewood, grazing and grass, teak leaves, spices, forest land).	Community dependence on forest products results in forest degradation if it is not balanced with proper environmental awareness. Encroachment has left little land with forest stands that might be harvested in the near future. Collaboration between LMDH and Perhutani is a means for increasing community awareness
Party holding rights over forest management	Perum Perhutani organised all forest management, and worked with the LMDH in assigning contract work land to forest farmers	All parties involved in PHBM collaborate in preparing participatory plans and strategies and clear designation of forest management tasks is now apparent
Rights over benefit sharing	Allocations for LMDH organisers and village government	Village biophysical and environmental conditions 25% Productive enterprises 25% Social, religious activities and education 5% Organiser incentives 15% LMDH operational costs 20% Crop success funds 5% Cash reserves 5%
Value of resources in relation to local earnings	Farming 32.5%, Farm work 2.6%, Construction labour 6.8%, Services 11.9%, Trading 5.7%, Others 5.9%, Timber 14%, Fruit 13.9%, Livestock 6.5%, Medicinal plants 0.2%	
Management objectives and party determining objectives	Perum Perhutani set PHBM objectives	Prepared by the LMDH (as the organization representing forest village communities), Perum Perhutani, village government and institutions coordinated within a multistakeholder forum
Meetings such as	Done by inviting village government,	Done participatorily and with fixed schedules by inviting village

multistakeholder forums	LMDH organisers, Perum Perhutani, village institutions and community figures, but neither routinely nor participatorily	government, LMDH organisers, Perum Perhutani, village institutions and community figures
Incentives for local community	Organiser and village government incentives	Organiser, social fund, biophysical environment and forest farmer group incentives
Level of social capital (community capacity to speak with one voice, negotiate and manage)	Communities tended to follow decisions made by the village *pamong* or LMDH organisers	A confidence to express opinions in meeting forums has appeared; agreements made that accommodate multistakeholder interests; courage to negotiate
Support from outsiders	None as yet	None as yet

Gempol Village

Characteristic	Initial situation	Analysis following participatory evaluation
Location	Located in Jati subdistrict, the village borders Kadengan and Ngliron to the north, Banjarejo to the south, Bangleyan to the west and Kadengan to the east. Gempol Village covers an area of 7,172.36 Ha, with 70.02 Ha of settlements, 82.71 Ha of farming fields, and 41.35 Ha of rain-fed paddy fields.	
Stakeholders	Perum Perhutani responsible for forest management with attention to social, economic and environmental considerations. The government had a supporting role, authority over the region and political power influenced public actions. The community, through its representative organisation (LMDH) was the second party in PHBM collaboration. Legally and formally it had the same position as Perum Perhutani. Local businessmen, extracted forest resources by considering environmental conservation	Collaboration that had previously lacked direction with discrepancies between planning and implementation has improved since the LPF project. Stakeholder communication, negotiation and coordination has improved through training and participatory multistakeholder meetings
Types of resources	Timber and non timber (firewood, spices, teak leaves, seeds, timber, stumps, empty riverside land, teak, contract work land, forest animals, charcoal)	Community dependence on forest products results in forest degradation if it is not balanced with proper environmental awareness. Collaboration between LMDH and Perhutani is a means for increasing community awareness
Party holding forest management rights	Perum Perhutani organised all forest management, and worked with the LMDH in assigning contract work land to forest farmers	All parties involved in PHBM collaborate in preparing participatory plans and strategies and clear designation of forest management tasks is now apparent
Rights over benefit sharing	Organiser incentives 12%, PHBM campaign team incentives 5%, Village communication forum incentives 5%, Subdistrict communication forum incentives 3%, enterprise funds 40%, social funds 20%, operational costs 15%.	Association 0.5% Cross subsidies 4% Subdistrict PHBM communication forum 1.5% Village PHBM communication forum 3% Monitoring and evaluation 2% Forest farmers 4.5% Working group 2% Biophysical environment 30% Institutional operational costs 14% Organisers operational costs 8% Productive enterprises 20% Social fund 10%
Value of resources in relation to local earnings	Farming 12.16%, Farm work 21.6%, Timber trading 18.5%, Building labour, Services 9.79%, Trading 16.79%, Firewood 2.85%, Fruit	

	0.54%, Medicinal plants 0.52%, Animal feed 2.25%	
Management objective and party determining objective	Perum Perhutani determined PHBM objectives	Prepared by the LMDH (as the organization representing forest village communities), Perum Perhutani, village government and institutions coordinated within a multistakeholder forum
Meetings such as multistakeholder forums	Done by inviting village government, LMDH organisers, Perum Perhutani, village institutions and community figures, but neither routinely nor participatorily	Done participatorily and with fixed schedules by inviting village government, LMDH organisers, Perum Perhutani, village institutions and community figures
Incentives for local community	Incentives for LMDH organisers, PHBM campaign team, social fund, work group	Organiser, social fund (health, education), forest farmer group, biophysical environment incentives
Level of social capital (community capacity to speak with one voice, negotiate and manage)	Communities followed decisions made by the village *pamong* or LMDH organisers	A confidence to express opinions in meeting forums has appeared; agreements made that accommodate multistakeholder interests; courage to negotiate
Support from outsiders	None as yet	None as yet