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I. BACKGROUND AND RESULTS

1.1. Background

Forestry development issues in Java are interconnected with those in outer Java. As long as the roles of community are concern, their active participation should be encouraged and integrated in the forestry development processes. In reality, however, government plays bigger roles than the community in controlling and using the forests.

State forest in Java has been managed by the State Forest Company (called Perhutani) since early 1960s. The processes of forest control, forest utilization, and forest security are dominated by this company. The company is the only one who can manage and utilize the forest resource without the involvement of other stakeholders. This is especially true for the production forests. Forestry Department believes that only Perhutani has the capability to manage and control state forests in the whole Java. The dominance of one single actor, such as Perhutani, in forest management can only take place under the centralized government political system. It can not operate effectively under the decentralized government political system.

The total forest area in Indonesia is about 97 million hectares. Only around 3 million hectares are located in Java while the rest, 94 million hectares in total, are located in the outer Java such as in Sumatera, Celebes, Papua, Borneo, and other small islands. Java Island is unique because its total area is only 6.5% from the total area of Indonesia. Nevertheless, it is occupied by 64% of the total population. The total state forest area of 2,926,949 ha (19%) is affected by at least 35 millions people who are distributed over 6,200 villages (Awang, 2005). The villagers use forests to sustain their daily lives. Considering the population density around the forests and their dependency on the forests, forests can not be managed without the involvement of the local community. Most villages surrounding these forests are poor. Employment opportunities for the local people are limited, the productive age workers are abundant, and land ownership for agricultural activities is limited to around 0.25 ha per family in average. Many young people went to the city or worked overseas such as in Malaysia, Brunei, Saudi Arabia, and Hong Kong to generate income for their families. Job opportunities and cash income offered by Perhutani to the local villagers have been very limited. And there is no guarantee for the local people that their livelihood would improve by participating in Perhutani forest management activities.

Several activities have been carried out by Perhutani with the aims to improve the well-being of forest village community and to restore the quality of forest resources. These activities include: prosperity approach program in 1972-1985, social forestry program in 1986-2000, and forest village community development program in 1994-2000. The objectives of all those programs were to improve the well-being of forest farmers who participate in forest plantation activities, through mix-cropping (tumpang sari), cattle raising, and successful forest plantation. The results obtained from the monitoring and evaluation part of the programmes showed, however, that the objectives of those programmes were not fully achieved. Local communities remained poor despite the implementation of Perhutani’s social welfare programmes in the past 30 years. The success of those programmes would depend on Perhutani’s level of understanding of the social dynamics and local political processes at the village and the national level. The failure of those programmes thus indicated that Perhutani didn’t have a full grasp of the existing social issues.

Poverty in the local villages and the lack of participation of local community in Perhutani forest management contributed to the widespread plundering and illegal logging activities that took place within Perhutani forest areas. Forest plundering, which escalated in Java and outer Java islands within the period of 1998 and 2004, indicated that forest management system in Indonesia has not addressed the real need of the community for forest resources. Prior to 2000, Perhutani programmes have failed in empowering local community organizations and in improving villagers’ livelihood. Learning from their failures and experiences and being prompted by the Indonesian political reform of 1998, Perhutani revised their policy to resolve the conflicts that occurred with the different stakeholders. Since 1999/2000, Perhutani initiated a series of public consultations and discussions and engaged several NGOs and universities in their attempts to formulate a participatory forest management model for Java, to improve local people well-being, and to manage forests in a sustainable manner. In 2001, Perhutani produced
a new national programme called Collaborative Forest Management (PHBM or Pengelolaan Hutan Bersama Masyarakat). The main characteristic of PHBM is the empowerment of local community organization at the village level so that they can engage in forest management with Perhutani.

The total state forest under management of Perhutani is about 2,926,949 ha. It consists of 1,811,814 ha of production forest, 627,937 ha of protection forest, and 442,198 ha of conservation forest. According to the 2002 Forestry Department and Perhutani data, some parts of the forests were in highly critical situation: a total of 370,130 ha (12.65% of the total Perhutani forest area) was in the production forest, 191,200 ha (6.53%) was in the protection forest, while 68,375 ha (2.34%) was in the conservation forest (Foretika, 2004). This critical forest land was the result of low success in establishing forest plantation, forest land occupancy, and forest plundering. As an example, a total of 8,182,280 trees were illegally logged in Central Java province in the period of 1998-2003. This is equal to a capital loss of about Rp 1.477 trillions (Bisnis Indonesia, 2003). The roots of the deforestation that took place in Java after 1998 should be properly identified and its solutions should be properly formulated.

The spirit of decentralization influenced Perhutani in such a way that they changed their mindset with regards to how to reach their objectives. Perhutani opens the opportunity for local people to enjoy more benefits from forests, shares their profits with the local government and other participating stakeholders, and co-manages state forests with relevant stakeholders. These shifts are significant in the management of Java forests. Under the new approach, Perhutani is not the one and only “stakeholder and player” in the management of Java state forests. Communities, traders, and local governments can participate in forest management together with Perhutani.

PHBM has been implemented by Perhutani since 2001 following the Board of Perhutani’s regulation No. 136/Kpts/DI/R/2001. This regulation serves as a guide to integrate social, economic and environment conditions proportionally to reach Perhutani’s vision and mission. The objectives of PHBM are: (1) to improve the sense of responsibility of Perhutani, local people, and other stakeholders who have interests in sustaining forest resources; (2) to enhance the role of Perhutani, local people, and other stakeholders who have interests in managing the forests; (3) to harmonize all forest management activities and regional development according to the social dynamics in the village area; (4) to enhance the quality of forest resource by addressing site-specific problems; and (5) to improve the income of Perhutani, villagers, and other stakeholders simultaneously.

The concept, goal and objectives of PHBM would be implemented in cooperation with the local people and other related stakeholders at the local level. To do so, a lot of information should be collected to support PHBM planning and implementation, such as data on the social economic and the culture of forest dwellers, ecological problems, and the state of forest resources. To collect these information, a joint research team was established under the Levelling the Playing Field (LPF) program consisting of CIFOR, CIRAD, Faculty of Forestry, Gadjah Mada University and Perhutani. This research team looks closely at the PHBM implementation processes, and investigates to what extent participatory processes have been done so far. At the same time, the LPF program facilitates local community organizations to enhance their capability to participate in PHBM processes. Implemented in the period of 2004-2007, this collaborative research program is financially supported by European Union countries (EU). The research project in Java is fully supported by Perhutani as stated in the memorandum of understanding (MOU) among CIFOR, UGM, and Perhutani.

The preparation of LPF research project has been conducted since March 2004 through a series of meeting between Faculty of Forestry and CIFOR team in Yogyakarta, Jakarta and Bogor. A research proposal was presented at the international methodology workshop of LPF project which was held in Bogor in June 2004. Research methodology and work plan for PHBM research were approved by the meeting participants. To improve the plan, a meeting was held in Yogyakarta to come up with more detail indicators which will be used in the implementing process. A final work plan was produced through this process.

The LPF project activities are carried out in Pemalang and Randublatung Forest Districts. The activities are conducted in three main phases: (1) initialization, in the form of survey and baseline data collection activities; (2) intervention, which includes capacity building activities with the people's organizations, communication forums, village working groups, and other stakeholders, participatory forest planning and management, etc.; and (3) monitoring and
evaluation, which includes training, formulation of the criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management under PHBM.

Within the two forest districts of Pemalang and Randublatung, Central Java, the PHBM research activities have been carried out in 4 villages: Surajaya, Glandang, Tanggel, and Gempol. Baseline studies have been collected for each village: literature review of policies and regulations, stakeholders analysis (to identify important actors and stakeholders at each village), resource and resource use study (to identify forest products, boundaries, rules and norms, issue and problems with regards to forest use), livelihood (social economic survey, access to land), institution analysis, and analysis on formal and informal agreement (including analysis of PHBM agreement). Participatory action research (PAR) is used throughout the intervention stage of the LPF project.

In Year 2, LPF focused its efforts on providing information with regards to LPF project and its activities to stakeholders, utilizing information generated by the baseline studies, facilitating local stakeholders in formulating a common vision, establishing village working groups, providing training on forest planning for villagers and Perhutani field staff, and facilitating stakeholders in formulating PHBM forest plan. The key result of the LPF project in Year 2 (2005) was the success of PHBM group in each village in formulating a common vision for their respective village, and in formulating a new PHBM forest plan.

In Year 3, LPF project focused on building the capacities of PHBM organization, and formulating the criteria and indicators of forest sustainability based on people’s point of view. The key results of year 3 are the increased awareness of the role of community organization and the benefits of PHBM activities for their life, and the formulation of a new set of criteria and indicators of forest sustainability by PHBM group.

This Year 3 report will provide a summary of Year 1 and Year 2 activities of LPF project. It will also provide detailed information on LPF activities and achievements in Year 3. Lastly, this report provides a working plan for Year 4.

1.2. Summary of Results and Key Outputs of Year 1 and Year 2

1.2.1. Year 1 Results and Key Outputs

Four villages (Surajaya, Glandang, Tanggel and Gempol) were selected as research sites in two forest districts of Pemalang and Randublatung. Brief information of those villages are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. The characteristics of research sites in four villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General information</th>
<th>Surajaya</th>
<th>Glandang</th>
<th>Tanggel</th>
<th>Gempol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest District</td>
<td>Pemalang</td>
<td>Pemalang</td>
<td>Randublatung</td>
<td>Randublatung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-District</td>
<td>Pemalang</td>
<td>Bantar Bolang</td>
<td>Randublatung</td>
<td>Jati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhabitants (person)</td>
<td>7,644</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>3,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village area (ha)</td>
<td>570.265</td>
<td>648.58</td>
<td>3,265.348</td>
<td>3,395.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest area of PHBM (ha)</td>
<td>1,480.04</td>
<td>702.1</td>
<td>2,850.3</td>
<td>2,605.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of LMDH 1 (households)</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activities: a. forest-related</td>
<td>a. wood and non-wood collectors b. carpenters c. labours in forest planting d. sand miners</td>
<td>a. non-wood collectors b. labours in forest planting</td>
<td>a. collecting wood and non wood b. to be a carpenter c. labour in forest planting</td>
<td>a. collecting wood and non wood b. labour in forest planting, agroforestry wood transporta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 LMDH = Lembaga Masyarakat Desa Hutan or the name of local community organization who manages PHBM program
As mentioned earlier, five activities of baseline study were conducted in all villages. The information collected under those studies include the information on the village and villagers, resource and resource use, livelihood, institution, and PHBM agreement. The results of the baseline study are summarized in the following section.

A. Surajaya Village, Pemalang Forest District

1. Basic information
   The basic information and PHBM implementation in Surajaya village can be summarised as follows:
   1) Most Surajaya villagers (82.46%) earned their living as farmers. They depended their lives on agriculture cultivation, either on the dry (non-irrigated) field or on the wet (irrigated) field (i.e. rice fields).
   2) Surajaya Village government had several sources of income. Nevertheless, village government land (tanah bengkok) has been its major source of income, making up for 79.83% of the total income. Other sources of income are villagers’ contribution and government financial support. From those resources, the total income of the village government in year 2002 was Rp 95,749,000.
   3) Surajaya Village can be categorized as moderately developed village, despite its limited access to the nearby town. This village has also been equipped with well-functioning facilities, such as religious facilities (mosques), health clinics, schools, sport facilities, and public transportation.

2. Resource use
   Information and data acquired from the resource use study are as follows:
   1) Surajaya villagers are highly dependent on forests for their livelihood.
   2) Natural resources of Surajaya village include forests with its wood and non-wood products (livestock feed, teak leaves, herbal plants, forest foods, grasshoppers, forest lot), rice fields, dry fields, sugarcane plantation, farms, sand and stone mines, water springs, and rivers.
   3) No formal rules exist to regulate the use of those resources. The resources use was based on the agreement among stakeholders.

3. Livelihood
   The well-being of Surajaya villagers can be gleaned from the following information:
   1) Averaged land size under private ownership was approximately 0.29 hectare/household. It consists of 0.11 hectare of rice fields, 0.12 ha of dry fields and 0.06 ha of house yard. The size of forest lot used by forest farmers was 0.125 ha/farmer or 43.10% of the total farmers’ land.
   2) The majority of Surajaya villagers depended their lives on farming and working as farm labourers (85%). Nevertheless, in general, they also have sideline job as pedicab drivers, drivers, carpenters, fuel wood traders, food vendors, livestock farmers, and mechanics.
   3) The averaged income of each household was Rp. 4,659,163 per year. The biggest portion (24% of the total income) came from farming, either from their private land or from the forest lot. The crops planted were rice, corn, cassava, mug beans, peanut, and forest peanuts, and vegetables. The sources of income from the forests were forest land,
fuelwood and teak leaves. The income from the sale of teak leaves and fuel wood made up for 8.33% of the total income.

4) The averaged expenditure of the household was Rp. 7,502,688 per year. A big proportion of the expenditure, 34.37%, was for food. The rest was spent on house renovation, energy supply, social needs, snacks, transportation, education, health service, recreation, taxes, and instalments.

5) In general, the people were skilled farmers and their living standard was moderate. Their living standard was assessed based on the house conditions, availability of water supply, toilets, drainage systems, electricity, savings, etc. Most houses were permanent, although some were still semi-permanent or non-permanent.

6) The villagers kept some sort of saving. It is not only in the form of money, but also in the form of land, livestock, trees, or jewelries.

4. Institution
Information acquired from the study of village institutions in relation to PHBM implementation are as follows:

1) The initial process of establishing LMDH and PHBM Communication Forum in Surajaya Village was conducted by Perhutani to support the implementation of PHBM and not as response to the accumulative needs of the community to take part in forest management.

2) The LMDH and CF – PHBM were established by Perhutani. They were established without community participation. It can be described from these processes as follows: (1) the establishment of LMDH and CF-PHBM, (2) the formulation of LMDH founding act, (3) The formulation of PHBM collaboration act between Perhutani and LMDH, and (4) strategic plan of LMDH.

3) The agreement about the village community’s share in LMDH has not been met, particularly Forest User Group (Kelompok Tani Hutan or KTH) in LMDH.

4) Internal rules which regulate coordination between the LMDH board and the member, and among members, have not been established.

5) The positions in village institutions boards (village government, BPD, LPMD, CF-PHBM) were held by a small number of people with one person held more than one position. There were two contradictory opinions on this issue. First opinion, there were only small number of people in Surajaya village who were capable and can devote themselves for village development. Second opinion, this situation was contributed by poor dissemination of PHBM information at the early stage. The information only reached the elites in the village.

5. PHBM agreement
The agreements on the implementation of PHBM can be categorised into 2 groups: formal and informal agreements. The analysis of PHBM agreements in Surajaya village found the following:

1) There was no written formal regulation on forest use. Instead, norms on forest conservation have been used as the basis. Furthermore, only informal agreements existed.

2) The different levels of understanding among stakeholders regarding the implementation of PHBM.

3) There is a need to develop agreements among stakeholders in the implementation of PHBM in Surajaya village.

6. The results of the baseline studies were used by LPF project in formulating its Year 2 activities
The activities of LPF project in Year 2 can be summarised as follows:

1. The identification of opportunities and problems in the efforts to improve people’s well-being.

2. The formulation of adaptive strategies in order to encourage the efforts to improve people’s well-being.

3. The activation of the role and function of village institutions in communication, coordination, cooperation, monitoring, and evaluation in order to support the implementation of PHBM.
4. The development of an agreement on villagers’ role in LMDH and the development of internal regulations of LMDH.
5. The formulation of common agreements on the rights and obligations of the institutions to support the implementation of PHBM in Surajaya village.

B. Glandang Village, Pemalang Forest District

1. Basic information
Several basic information gathered on the village are as follows:
1) The total area of Glandang village is about 648.58 hectares. Around 71% of the total village area was forest land.
2) The village had only had limited economic, transportation, and communication facilities. With regards to education facility, the village had an elementary school in sub-standard conditions. In health sector, villagers depended on shamans. Religious activities in this village are quite significant.
5. The income of Glandang village government came from village government land which amounted to Rp. 419,100. Other sources included village collected fund (Rp 570,000), villagers’ self-raising fund (Rp 6,220,000), mutual cooperation (Rp. 2,500,000), and government financial support (Rp. 30,000,000). From those resources, the total income of the village government in year 2002 amounted to Rp 39,709,100.

2. Resource use
The information collected from focus groups and key informants with regards to resource and resource use were as follows:
1) Glandang villagers used the following natural and forest resources: water, sand, and stones from the river. Community also collected fuel wood, timber, forest land (baronan), fruits and banana leaves. All those resources were collected for their own consumption or for sale. They also made use of their own private rice fields and community forest.
2) Villagers were highly dependent on forests for the following reasons:
   a. Private land ownership was very limited, with the average size of 0.125 ha/household.
   b. The state forest land used by the community (baronan), managed for plant diversification (90%), contributed significantly to peoples’ income.
   c. In the past, community who did not have private rice fields worked as labourers in other villagers’land. But nowadays they preferred to cultivate state forest land (baronan).

3. Livelihood
1) The majority of the villagers (87.5%) only had elementary education. Most villagers (87.5% of the total population) generated their income solely from farming.
2) The size of the land, in the form of home garden, rice field, and small estate, owned by the respondents was between 0.06 ha and 0.8 ha. Farming was the major source of income for the respondents, contributing to 56% of the total income. Farming took place either on state forest land or on rice fields. Other sources of income contributed to less than 15% of the total household income.
3) Most respondents had assets and saving in the form of land (99%), livestock (0.15 %), and cash (0.09 %). Other assets included farming tools such as hoe, sickle, etc.
4) Villagers lived in permanent houses (62.5%), semi-permanent houses (12.5%) and non-permanent houses (25%). Almost all of the houses were roof-tiled with tiled floor dominating (70%). Most toilets were located outside the house (72.5%), 82.5% of the total toilet had drainage facility or septic tank. The main source of clean water was wells.

4. Institution
The information collected from focus groups and key informants with regards to institution can be summarised as follows:
1) Socialization of PHBM was the first socialization ever held for village headman and people of Glandang. Even the village government personels did not have sufficient knowledge of PHBM at the early stage of its implementation.
2) Multi-stakeholders dialogue was never held, because the forum was only attended by village administrator and representatives from village institutions. Forest farmers and KTH were not active because they did not understand the substance of the meeting.

3) Organizational structure and membership of LMDH in Glandang village has not been established. The membership of Glandang LMDH itself has not been well defined. Perhutani claimed that LMDH members are KTH that have already worked in the area. KTH was under the LMDH, and the LMDH would be the one who negotiate with Perhutani during agreement making. But in relation with coordination on KTH level, there were direct interactions between KTH and Perhutani (Mandor and Mantri).

4) With regards to PHBM, Perhutani has 2 cooperative models: 1) Cooperation with LMDH, in the form of PHBM agreement with product sharing pattern. This cooperation was specified in a legal document, 2) Cooperation with forest farmers in the form of working contract with KTH for plant diversification over a period of 2 years. The contract is renewable.

5. PHBM agreement
   1) The agreement between Perhutani and LMDH is still in the process.
   2) There were 2 regulations issued by Pemalang District Government : (i) Pemalang District Regulation No. 188.4/59/2003 on the establishment of Pemalang regency CF-PHBM, (ii) Sub-district Bantar Bolang regulation No. 522/KPTS/2002 on the establishment of Bantar Bolang Subdistrict CF-PHBM.

6. The results of the baseline studies were used by LPF project in formulating its Year 2 activities
   The activities of LPF project in Year 2 can be summarised as follows:
   1) The identification of opportunities and problems in developing the resources of Glandang village.
   2) The development of management plan for the village-administered forest compartment.
   3) The identification of opportunities and problems in the effort to increase people’s well-being.
   4) The development of common agreement on people membership in LMDH and internal regulation of LMDH itself.
   5) The development of common agreement about the rights and obligations of village institutions in supporting PHBM implementation in Glandang Village.
   6) The use of participatory processes in formulating the MoU between Glandang LMDH and Perhutani.

C. Tanggel Village, Randublatung Forest District

1. Basic information
   Data obtained from the study are as follows:
   1) Land condition and land use: rain-fed fields 283,145 ha, dry field 206,950 ha, yard 208,940 ha and others 6,133 ha.
   2) The total population was 5,270 inhabitants consisting of 1,585 households. The averaged number per household was 3.
   3) The distribution of population according to gender was 50.3% male and 49.7% female; 66.3% of the total population was on reproductive age. 65.5% of the population enjoyed elementary school education. Farming was the occupation of the majority (78% of the population).

2. Resource use
   1) All stakeholders involved in forest management in Tanggel Village observed that the forest has experienced severe destruction in the period of 1998 – 2001 due to unstable political situation. As the result, BKPH Tanggel suffered a total loss of over 1,500 ha of teak forest. With regards to forest management, nowadays Tanggel village encountered difficulties in finding forest farmers that were willing to utilize forest lots. Consequently all forest area
was left empty or covered by young seedlings that are managed by strip-alley cropping system.

2) The results of the interviews showed that the community had high dependency on forest. Forest product utilized by the community included stumps, fuel wood (rencek), herbal plants, teak leaves, owned land and forest lot (to grow agricultural crops, rice plant, and orange), live stock feed. Forest was also used by the community as a place to herd their cattle. Forest products are either used for their own consumption or for sale. Home garden products utilized daily by the community were mango, coconut, orange, jackfruit. Crops from forest lot include rice, nut, corn, and cassava.

3) Local knowledge was not effectively used, particularly in herding and herbs planting. The utilization of forest resource for handicrafts was not commonly done. The villagers were aware that forest destruction would lead to the loss of Tanggel village’s natural resources and water springs.

3. Livelihood

1) Most respondents were on productive age (87.5% of total respondents) with an averaged of 3 members per household. Respondents’ source of income came from farming and non farming activities.

2) Average annual income of respondents per household was Rp. 6,003,775 or the gross annual income per capita was Rp 1,500,944. With regards to commercialisation of agricultural products, respondents sold them as raw products and the production system was still traditional.

3) Comparing the respondents’ income and expenditure per year, it seemed the respondents should be able to save some money. The allocation of income in the household indicated that local culture influenced respondents’ way of thinking about their basic needs.

4) Based on the respondents’ expenditures, their top five expenditures were: food (37.2%), farming-associated cost (11.7%), house renovation (11.6%), social costs (11.1%), snack, gambling, and cigarette smoking (8.9%).

4. Institution

1) Tanggel village institutions consisted of formal and non-formal institutions. Formal institution has rules, coordination among members, and modern organizational structure. Non-formal institutions used unwritten rules, and simple organizational structure. Formal institutions include: village councils of BPD and LKMD, Village government, youth organisation, PKK, BPKBD, LMDH, and Perhutani. Informal institutions include Islamic study group.

2) Formal and non formal institutions were involved in the early implementation of PHBM, i.e. in selecting LMDH board. As the representatives of different institutions were involved in the selection process, hopefully LMDH board could represent the whole community.

3) There was no coordination among Tanggel Village institutions. Some institutions had tried to engage the community members in their institutions. However, only women institutions, such Islam women’s study group, have been attempted to encourage women to participate. Youth participation was not sought, because no activities took place. Each institution has rights and obligations.

5. PHBM agreement

1) Stakeholders involved on PHBM system had poor understanding of their rights and obligations due to inadequate PHBM awareness process to them. Different level of understanding of PHBM in turn affected their participation in PHBM implementation.

2) The agreement on PHBM in Tanggel village mainly involved Perhutani and the community only. The third stakeholder involved in PHBM implementation was the district government, who took part in CF-PHBM. Similar to government hierarchies, CF-PHBM also exist at different levels, starting from the village, sub-district, district, and provincial levels. The role of CF-PHBM is to facilitate the community and Perhutani, and to evaluate PHBM implementation at each level.
6. The results of the baseline studies were used by LPF project in formulating its Year 2 activities

The activities of LPF project in Year 2 can be summarised as follows:

1) The information collected on forest resource conditions and their use in Tanggel village were used in developing forest management plan that gives the community a bigger share of benefits.
2) Based on the collected information on the community well-being, follow-up actions were formulated to improve the community’s welfare. This was done through institutional approach to optimize Tanggel forest land utilization by the community.
3) Information on Tanggel village institutions and the analysis of those institutions were useful to strengthen the weak ones and revive the inactive ones.
4) PHBM agreements are fundamental in setting out cooperation among the involved stakeholders to carry out their rights and obligations in implementing PHBM. As these agreements are developed in accordance to the bargaining power and interests of each stakeholder, they can be further improved by strengthening the stakeholder with weaker bargaining power.

D. Gempol Village, Randublatung Forest District

1. Basic information

1) Demographic conditions: total population (3,246 people), total household (860 households), gender distribution (50% female and 50% male), age group (84.5% were in the reproductive age group), education (63% did not graduate from elementary school) and occupation (79% were farmers).
2) Policies related to PHBM:
   Policies related to PHBM implementation were issued by:
   • Gempol village administrators, in the form of village regulation
   • Jati sub-district government, in the form of regulation on CF-PHBM formation.
   • Blora district government, in the form of district regulation on CF-PHBM formation.
   • Central Java Province government, in the form of provincial regulation on the formation of CF-PHBM, PHBM, and practical guidelines of PHBM implementation.
   • Central Perum Perhutani, in the form of director’s regulation.
   • LMDH “Wana Bersemi” and KPH Randublatung, in the form of cooperation agreement on PHBM and the founding act of LMDH.
   • LMDH “Wana Bersemi”, in the form of basic regulations of LMDH and agreement on allocation of product sharing.
   • Perum Perhutani KPH Randublatung, in the form of Gempol forest area potential asset, cooperation contract with pesanggem of Gempol, and cooperation contract on community forest.

2. Resource use

Through interviews with key informants and focus group discussions, the following information is obtained:

1) People found the forest conditions in recent times were significantly different from those in the past. Ten years ago, forest area was extremely vast; animals and plants were abundant. Their numbers have declined nowadays. People were aware of the forest destruction incidence in recent times, especially the ones that took place in the period of 1997 – 2001. According to the informants, forest plundering and timber extraction were carried out by outsiders and not by Gempol community. Gempol villagers only provided their labour, but they were not in charge of those destructive activities.
2) Gempol villagers were highly dependent on the forest. Nearly all activities of the people are related to the forest. This is because Gempol Village is surrounded by the forest. Thus, people based their lives on farming or forest utilization.
3) For the villagers, the forests served the following functions:
   a. As an ecosystem unit
   b. To protect them from flood, erosion, wind, etc
   c. The source of economic income
d. The source of wildlife
e. To sustain the water springs
f. To create conducive climate
g. The source of income for national or local government
h. The source of fuel wood, charcoal etc.
i. To restore soil fertility, either in the forest or the surrounding area.

4) Recent problems concerning the forest were:
   a. The proneness of the forests to looting and illegal herding.
   b. Low religious morality of the society.
   c. Low social economic status of the society.
   d. Consumptive habit of the society.
   e. Low quality of the human resources.
   f. People's low understanding of the functions of the forest.
   g. Lack of law enforcement.
   h. Low social cohesiveness within the community.

5) Forest products utilised include fuel wood, herbal plants, teak leaves, seeds timber, tree stump, livestock feed, teak, grasshopper, and forest lot. Forest products are collected for villagers' own consumption or for sale.

3. Livelihood

Data on respondents' well-being showed that:
   1) Around 84% of the respondents had elementary school education, 77% of the respondents was in the age range of 30 – 49 years.
   2) Total income per year was Rp 8,039,875 or Rp. 1,433,187.5 per capita per year. The respondents’ expenditures were as follows: food 45%, education 17.8%, social needs 16.6%, and snacks 6.6%.
   3) Respondents’ quality of life, indicated by the conditions of their house and the surrounding environment, the fulfilment of daily needs, the availability of saving, and assets owned by the respondents. Around 50% of the respondents’ housing was permanent, while 37.5% was semi-permanent.

4. Institution

The baseline study on institutions revealed the existence of all institutions in Gempol Village, either related or not related to forest management.

   1) Institutions involved in the management of forest management were:
      a. LMDH
      b. Forkomdes (village communication forum)
      c. Perhutani
      d. Village council: LKMD/BPD

   2) Information on the relationships among the institutions and how each institution played their particular role were obtained through the interviews with key informants and focus group discussions carried out with the community members. Each institution, except CF-PHBM, has engaged the community in their activities at different levels.

5. PHBM Agreement

PHBM agreement is an agreement among the stakeholders with regards to the implementation of PHBM. Thus, as long as PHBM system is still in place in the forest management, the agreements among those stakeholders will also apply.

There are 2 forms of PHBM agreements:

   1) Written agreement among stakeholders involved in PHBM implementation. They consist of:
      a. The agreement between Perhutani and the community to engage in collaborative forest management (LMDH)
      b. The agreement among four stakeholders: LMDH, village council, entrepreneur, and Perhutani. The latter served as regulator or authority-in-charge of forest resources. This agreement revolves around the amount of retribution to be paid by the
entrepreneur to LMDH and the village administrator. The objects of the cooperation are fuel wood, stump, and buried timber.
c. The agreement between Perhutani and forest farmers to establish various plantations on Perhutani’s land.

2) Unwritten agreement:
Agreement between the villagers, LMDH, Perhutani and village’s brokers of fuel wood, buried wood and charcoal to pay retribution to LMDH and Perhutani.

6. The results of the baseline studies were used by LPF project in formulating its Year 2 activities

The activities of LPF project in Year 2 can be summarised as follows:
1) Data on resources and their utilization which were useful to encourage optimization of non-timber forest product to improve the well-being of the people.
2) Identification of existing opportunities and problems to support optimal utilization of the natural resources in Gempol village.
3) Data on the institutions were useful to strengthen the institutions and to improve the relationship among them.
4) Coordination and communication among these institutions will encourage people’s participation in forest management.

1.2.2. Year 2 Results and Key Outputs

The second year of LPF project implementation, which is called the intervention phase, utilized the results and key outputs generated in the first year, particularly in designing suitable interventions.

The overall goals of the LPF intervention phase were:
1. Improved livelihood for the community in the research site;
2. Proper management of natural resources, improved human resources and institutions;
3. Improved processes of communication, coordination, negotiation, agreement and contract making between and among different stakeholders.

The outcomes of the LPF intervention phase were:
1. Identified and clarified roles and responsibilities of relevant stakeholders.
2. Discussed and accepted action plans to address issues related to natural resources management and problems faced by community.
3. Efficiently negotiated and accepted agreements among stakeholders on natural resources management.
4. Improved capability of stakeholders, i.e. Perhutani, forestry department, local community, local government, to properly manage natural resources.
5. Efficient delivery of services or assistance by the supporting agencies, i.e. Perhutani, local government unit, NGO, and university.

The outputs of the LPF intervention phase were:
1. Processes for stakeholders to share perception over long term view and livelihood issues
2. Printed brief information on LPF project to improve the stakeholders’ shared understanding about the project (project primer)
3. Establishment of community working groups as media to address their needs
4. Guidelines to facilitate multi-stakeholder negotiation
5. Guidelines to implement various village development activities
6. Capacity building to:
   a. Improve local community’s capabilities in the project location
   b. Improve communication and information sharing among stakeholders
   c. Prepare local development plan (participatory forest management plan)
   d. Improve local community’s bargaining power in relation to other stakeholders.
7. Improved access for local community to obtain services related to natural resources management and livelihoods.
8. Improved communication and information sharing among stakeholders at the local level with regards to natural resources management.
9. Stabilised collaborative forest management planning system in LMDH.

There are at least five activities conducted in the second year of LPF intervention phase. They were: socialization, common vision building, working group establishment, training on participatory community forestry planning, formulation of participatory community forestry plan, and coordination. The summary and the results of the intervention phase are described below.

A. Surajaya Village, Pemalang Forest District

1. LPF Project Socialization
The LPF intervention phase was started by socialization to the village community and other related stakeholders such as the staff of Perum Perhutani and government institutions related to the program in Pemalang District. In Surajaya village, information on LPF project was explained and disseminated to the village headman, LMDH, PHBM communication forum, and other institutions. Generally people of Surajaya understood the mission and target of LPF program, and they expressed their commitment to participate in the project. The LMDH group felt that they really could use the assistance from LPF project.

2. Common vision development
It began with a workshop on to develop a common vision for the village community, followed by the identification and prioritization of the problems, and the formulation of appropriate strategies to solve those problems. Working groups were formed to implement the agreed strategy. These were done with the aim to meet the expectation as expressed in the community vision.

The results of the common vision development workshop were as follows:
(1) There are nine important components which are needed by Surajaya community: improved conditions in forestry, agriculture, social, communication, transportation (road infrastructure), economy, health, education, and governance sectors.
(2) The common vision formulated for Surajaya village was: “Natural resource management in Surajaya village should be considered as source of village property, justice, democratic, efficient and professional ways to give guaranty that the successful of development just for community welfare in Surajaya village”

3. Community working group
Community working groups (CWGs) were formed by the community who attended the UGM team-facilitated meetings. The results of those meetings were as follows:
(1) Adaptive strategies to address the nine problems identified by the community representatives
(2) Establishment community working groups in Surajaya village
(3) The community working groups will address the identified community problems.

4. Training on participatory forest management planning
The “Hutan Lestari” and “PHBM” working groups need to develop their knowledge and capacities on forest planning. Both groups agreed to join the training on forestry planning. Participatory planning process was selected as a topic for this training. The training was conducted collaboratively by LMDH Surajaya and LMDH Glandang. The training was attended by the group members of LMDH Surajaya and Glandang, village government, PHBM communication forum, forest farmer organization, and some Perhutani staff (Mantri, Mandor, and field supervisor).

One of the objectives of this training was to support PHBM collaborative planning process. Perhutani should not plan PBHM on its own. The planning of PHBM should be done collaboratively by Perhutani, LMDH, and other stakeholders. Apart than enhancing the capacity building of LMDH, community and Perhutani field staff in PHBM collaborative planning process, the training also aims to synchronize Perhutani plan with LMDH plan.
5. The formulation of forest management plan for LMDH Surajaya

Following the training, LMDH in Surajaya village proceeded with the development of a management plan for the village-administered forest compartments for the period of 2005-2014. The initial plan has been made by LMDH group based on the existing potency data. If there were problems on those forest data, the plan should be revised accordingly.

Planning in PHBM of Surajaya should be made according to the vision, mission, program, activities, executing organization, budget and policy. To ensure that all stakeholders understand the PHBM planning process, the produced plan will be presented by LMDH team in the next participatory planning workshop at the Pemalang district level. By doing so, it is expected that the final PHBM plan for Surajaya will be accepted by all stakeholders.

Key outputs of the intervention phase which were used as inputs for LPF activities in the Year 2 were as follows:

1. There are 9 important components which are needed by the community of Surajaya, i.e. improved conditions in forestry, agriculture, social, communication, transportation (road infrastructure), economy, health, education, and governance sectors.

2. Establishment community working groups in Surajaya village

3. The identified community problems will be addressed by the community working groups.

4. Increased stakeholders’ understanding and awareness, as a result of the training, of the importance of participatory forest planning processes and dissemination of technical information and Perhutani policies to community and other stakeholders.

5. A new community forest management plan that will be implemented and evaluated at later stage, i.e. which parts work well, which parts don’t work well, and why.

B. Glandang Village, Pemalang Forest District

1. LPF Project socialization

The LPF intervention phase began with socialization to the village community and other related stakeholders, such as the staff of Perum Perhutani and government institutions related to the program in Pemalang District. In Glandang village, information on LPF project was explained and disseminated to the village headman, LMDH, PHBM communication forum at the village and sub-district levels, and other institutions. Meeting with social organizations were done at village level, i.e. with religious thalilan group. Glandang villagers in general understood the mission and target of LPF project, and they expressed their commitment to engage in the project. The LMDH group, in particular, felt that they can really make use of the support from LPF project.

2. Common vision formulation

In a workshop, the concerned stakeholders developed a common vision for the village community. This was followed by the identification and prioritization of the problems, and the formulation of appropriate strategies to solve those problems. These were done with the aim to meet the expectation as expressed in the community vision.

The results of the common vision development processes were as follows:

1. A picture of Glandang village’s vision following the projection scenario method

2. The establishment of formulation team to develop common vision statement for Glandang village.

3. A common vision statement for Glandang village “With natural resource management which is supported by high quality of human resource, we realize the community welfare, physically and spiritually”.

4. Identification of common components and problems in Glandang village (i.e. in forest, transportation, education, agriculture, clean water, economy, communication, and institution sectors)

3. Community working group (CWG) establishment

The result of the community working groups establishment processes were:

1. A strategy to deal with all prioritised problems in Glandang village

2. Establishment of Community working groups in Glandang village

3. An agenda for community working group's meeting and coordination.
4. Training on participatory community forest planning
The “Hutan Lestari” and “PHBM” working groups would like to develop their knowledge and capacities on forest planning. Both groups agreed to join the training on forestry planning. Participatory planning process was selected as a topic for this training. The training was conducted collaboratively by LMDH Surajaya and LMDH Glandang. It was attended by the group members of LMDH Surajaya and Glandang, village government, PHBM communication forum, forest farmer organization, and some Perhutani staff (Mantri, Mandor, and field supervisor).

One of the objectives of this training was to support PHBM collaborative planning process. Perhutani should not plan PHBM on its own. The planning of PHBM should be done collaboratively by Perhutani, LMDH, and other stakeholders. Other objectives of this training were to enhance the capacities of LMDH, community and Perhutani field staff, and to synchronize Perhutani plan with LMDH plan.

5. The formulation of participatory forest management plan
After the forest planning training, the next step was the formulation of forest management plan, following a participatory approach. It is expected that this new approach will be adopted and implemented by Perhutani and LMDH collaboratively.

This participatory process began with a formulation of a common vision and mission of LMDH Glandang. Since a common vision has been developed earlier, this planning process made use of the developed common vision. No new vision and mission statement was formulated. Other information that must be taken into account in PHBM planning include social economic data, detailed plan for forest utilization, planting, maintaining, pruning, and harvesting of timber, planting and harvesting of non-timber forest products, marketing, benefits sharing analysis, budget, institutional development and empowerment, and community economy development. Those data should be formulated by the board of LMDH and put together in one document. To improve the plan, this document should be subsequently presented to and discussed with Perhutani.

Key outputs generated from the intervention phase for the input of the third year activities of LPF project in Glandang village are as follows:
(1) Establishment of a formulation team to develop a common vision for Glandang village.
(2) Establishment community working groups in Glandang village
(3) Increased understanding and awareness of all stakeholders that participatory forest planning is important, and that technical information and Perhutani policy must be shared with community and other stakeholders.
(4) A new community forest management plan that will be implemented and evaluated at later stage, i.e. which parts work well, which parts don’t work well, and why.

C. Tanggel Village, Randublatung Forest District

1. Socialization of LPF Project
Information dissemination on LPF project was done so that the community of Tanggel village in general understands what LPF project is about, its activities, and gets to know the facilitator team from UGM. The community members understand that the LPF project is trying to support collaborative forest management (PHBM) program in the village. It is very important to get PHBM to run well so that the program can generate benefits and that these benefits can be enjoyed by all involved parties.

The socialization of LPF project was done to several community groups in Tanggel villagers by holding a meeting with each group. Socialization at the sub-village level was done together with the PHBM implementation in the sub-village as the socialization has been scheduled to be done by both forest village community institution (LMDH) and Perhutani.

2. The formulation of a common vision
The workshop to build a common vision and to establish community working groups (CWGs) in Tanggel village was held for two days, i.e. in March 27, 2005 and in April 3, 2005 at Tanggel Village Hall. This workshop aimed to: 1) build community common vision for natural resources
management in Tanggel, 2) identify problems and opportunities in natural resources management in this village, 3) produce strategy and follow-up plan to achieve common vision of Tanggel community and to address the identified and prioritized problems, 4) establish CWGs as working groups to implement the strategies. The CWGs were formed based on the clustering of identified problems in Tanggel.

From this workshop we generated the following results: 1) a draft common vision of Tanggel community in natural resource management, 2) a list of problems and opportunities in natural resource management, 3) a follow-up strategy and plan to achieve the common vision, 4) several community working groups (CWGs) to address the problems in the village.

3. Community working group (CWG) establishment
The results of CWG on human resources development and small-scale industry were: 1) activities to develop human resources, 2) activities to develop small-scale industry, 3) implementation schedule for human resources and small-scale industry development, 4) follow-up plan to implement the strategies.

4. Training on participatory community forest planning
This training was important to prepare for the plan and strategies for PHBM implementation in Tanggel village. Training was done to increase understanding of the importance of engaging villagers in all stages of PHBM implementation, from planning, implementation, evaluation, to monitoring.

Perhutani claimed that they had developed a participatory planning process. In reality, nevertheless, the process was not fully participatory. The existing process focused on output rather than process, and planning was done by Perhutani staff, i.e. asper or mantri, as they had to meet the targeted time and to handle administrative matter. Furthermore, villagers, in this case LMDH, did not proactively engage themselves in forest management planning process because they felt they didn’t have the technical knowledge. They let the Perhutani field staff to make the decisions.

In this training, an agreement was reached that the next follow-up planning should be done in a participatory way. Villagers, in this case represented by LMDH and CF-PHBM, will be actively involved in the preparation of forest management plan in Tanggel.

5. The formulation of participatory forest management plan
The formulation of a management plan was carried out as a follow-up from the previous training. This activity was aimed to adopt a new approach in forest planning process, i.e. a new model of participatory PHBM planning process. It was expected that this new approach will be adopted and implemented by Perhutani and LMDH collaboratively.

This participatory process began with a formulation of a common vision and mission of LMDH Tanggel. Since a common vision has been developed earlier, this planning process made use of the developed vision. Other information that must be taken into account in PHBM planning are social economic data, detailed plan for forest utilization, planting, maintaining, pruning, and harvesting of timber, planting and harvesting of non-timber forest products, marketing, benefits sharing analysis, budget, institutional development and empowerment, and community economic development.

Key outputs generated from the intervention phase for the input of the third year activities of LPF project in Glandang village are as follows:

1) A common vision which should be used as reference for all villagers
2) The workshop results then followed up by CWG in some meetings, to discuss the follow-up strategy that was formulated to achieve common vision of Tanggel.
3) The training will increase all stakeholders understanding and awareness of the importance of participatory forest planning, and that the technical information and Perhutani’s policy must be shared with community and other stakeholder.
4) A new community forest management plan that would be implemented and evaluated at later stage, i.e. which parts work well, which parts don’t work well, and why.
D. Gempol Village, Randublatung Forest District

1. Socialization of LPF Project
Socialization LPF project in Gempol village was aimed to increase the understanding of Tanggel community of LPF project so that they would participate during LPF project implementation. The level of community participation in LPF project may vary: some persons may involve in all LPF activities while others may only involve in some of the activities. This variation was explained by the facilitators in the socialization stage to avoid any misunderstanding of LPF activities.

2. Common vision formulation
The workshop produced the following results:
1) A draft of common vision which was accepted by all participants
2) Identification of problems and opportunities in Gempol
3) Prioritised problems
4) Agreement on the strategies to address the problems
5) Establishment of community working groups according to the relationships among Gempol institutions.

3. Community working group (CWG) establishment
The agreements achieved by participants in the workshop on forest management development were: (1) To follow guidelines on forest planting which is produced by Perhutani and community), (2) Perhutani will explain and hold technical training on forest planting (3) To plant trees on unproductive private land to develop community forest (hutan rakyat), (4) To conduct a training for LMDH on profit sharing calculation, (5) To increase understanding about PHBM, (6) To increase the utilization of forest land under the tree stands by planting them with traditional medicine plants such as “porang” (Amorphophalus sp.).

4. Training on participatory community forest planning
Training on participatory community forest planning was held to provide insights to related institutions of Gempol village into forest management, in particular their rights to be involved in all activities of forest management. Training was done to increase participants’ understanding of the important roles they play in all PHBM implementation phases, from planning, implementation, evaluation, and monitoring. This activity was done in August 3, 2005 in the house of the head of LMDH “Wana Bersemi”. The participants of this training were Perhutani, LMDH, forest user, businessmen, village government, CF-PHBM at the village level, community forest user, and student of Lampung University.

5. Formulation of participatory forest management plan
The formulation of a management plan was carried out as a follow-up from the previous training. This activity was aimed to adopt a new approach in forest planning process, i.e. a new model of participatory PHBM planning process. It was expected that this new approach will be adopted and implemented by Perhutani and LMDH collaboratively.

This participatory process began with a formulation of a common vision and mission of LMDH Tanggel. Since a common vision has been developed earlier, this planning process made use of the developed vision. Other information that must be taken into account in PHBM planning are social economic data, detailed plan for forest utilization, planting, maintaining, pruning, and harvesting of timber, planting and harvesting of non-timber forest products, marketing, benefits sharing analysis, budget, institutional development and empowerment, and community economy development.

Key outputs generated from the intervention phase for the input of the third year activities of LPF project in Gempol village are as follows:
1) The results of the workshop will be followed up by CWG in subsequent meetings, to discuss the formulated follow-up strategy to achieve the common vision of Gempol.
2) The training will increase all stakeholders’ understanding and awareness that participatory forest planning is important, and that the technical and Perhutani policy must be shared with community and other stakeholders.
(3) A new community forest management plan that will be implemented and evaluated at later stage, i.e. which parts work well, which parts don’t work well, and why.
(4) The result of this training can be incorporated into community plan and will be implemented in 2006.

1.3. Year 3 Results of LPF Project

The third year of LPF project focused on monitoring and evaluation activity following the intervention phase that took place during the second year of the project. The third year activities were based on the outcomes of collective actions that took place through the second year. These collective actions were aimed to increase community welfare and to develop forest management institutions. The objectives of the third year of LPF project are: (1) to properly improve the capability in the management of natural, human, and institution resources, (2) to develop a scheme for participatory evaluation of forest management sustainability.

The results obtained in the third year of LPF project implementation are presented in Table 4. The following chapter describes the activities in each village in more details.
II. ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT IN 2005-2006 (YEAR 3)

2.1. Pemalang Forest District

2.1.1. Common Progress in Research Sites

The mutation of Perhutani Director in mid-2005 brought about significant changes in the internal management of Perhutani in Java. Changes occurred at least at the top level of forest district (KPH). First, the rotation of the head of forest district which occurred in almost 90% of the forest district area in Java; second, the replacement of Ajun KSKPH and Ajun KTKU positions with ADM Deputy and Head of Forest Resources Management Planning positions respectively; and lastly, the authority of KPH in wood marketing was withdrawn and this authority was shifted to the General Manager (GM) of Marketing who reports and coordinates directly with the provincial level of Perhutani.

This change also occurred in KPH Pemalang. The former ADM official, Ir. Suripto, was mutated to KPH Ngawi of Unit II East Java. He was replaced by the new official, Ir. Bambang, from KPH Pati. The personnel at lower positions remained unchanged but they were shifted to different positions, i.e., Ir. Toni Suratno, MM was moved from Ajun KSKPH to ADM deputy and Herta Pari, S.Hut. was moved from Ajun KTKU to the Head of Forest Resources Management Section. The mutation also occurred for the position of PHBM supervisor. The former official, Reno, who was retiring, was replaced by Suhardi. The latter previously held the position of PHBM supervisor in the KPH Randublatung. The reshuffling of the top positions of KPH Pemalang required LPF team to re-introduce themselves and the project to the new head of KPH Pemalang especially the ADM. LPF team presented to them the results of LPF activities during the intervention phase on March 25, 2006. Meanwhile, communication with the new PHBM supervisor was established easily because he has already been involved in LPF activities in KPH Randublatung.

In August, ADM KPH Pemalang was replaced by Ir Ananda Artono, MS, the former officer of KPH Jember. At the field level, there was also a mutation of the head of sub-forest district, the head of forest ranger at Paduraksa and Glandang. These prompted LPF team to inform the new Perhutani field staff about the on-going LPF processes and activities.

The new ADM in KPH Pemalang at the moment faced a serious challenge related to PHBM. Based on the evaluation of Perhutani Unit I Central Java, KPH Pemalang was considered unsuccessful in implementing PHBM. It ranked the lowest among the twenty existing KPHs.

There several fundamental weaknesses in this region. First, many LMDH were established in a hurry, to meet the set target, so that many LMDH are still inactive, have no internal rules, and their members have no understanding of the function of LMDH. Second, LMDH are institutionally weak, administrative and personnel-wise. Third, KPH still lacks the capability to engage local government in the PBHM implementation and to make PHBM as an integrated rural development model. The LPF team noted that the government agencies who are interested in PHBM were only the Forestry and Environment Agency and they participated in PBHM communication forum (CF-PHBM) at the district level. The activities done by the district level PHBM-CF, include, among other things, monitoring and evaluation, and trainings on economic management. These activities seemed to be lip-service only and they had not become an integral part of the local government policy. The lack of local government enthusiasm in PHBM was reflected in the low reinvestment they made into PHBM from the timber taxes they received. From Rp 400 million paid by KPH Pemalang in 2005, only 17 million was reinvested. Fourth, the implementation of forest management activities was still dominated by Perhutani, while LMDH has not been regarded as a partner. Fifth, the coordination among the head of sub-forest district, the head of forest ranger and the local LMDH were poor.

The commitment to build community trust in the seriousness of Perhutani in applying PHBM was nevertheless gradually realised. KPH Pemalang had allocated wood sharing with

---

2 ADM is the head of forest district
3 KPH is forest district
4 PHBM is community collaboration forest management
LMDH based on the cooperative agreement. In early 2006, KPH had provided the second shared profit of Rp 501,000,000.- to all LMDH in KPH Pemalang. The highest amount was provided to LMDH Sukowati (Rp 103,000,000.-) whereas the lowest amount was given to LMDH Kramat (Rp 230,000.-).

KPH Pemalang had also evaluated and monitored LMDH activities in 2005. The aspects being evaluated and monitored were: (1) administrative completeness, especially the activity and financial records. (2) the performance of the officers (3) the availability of the basic protocol of LMDH (4) The development of LMDH productive business initiatives (5) coordination with Perhutani (6) strategic planning. Based on the evaluation of these aspects, LMDH ranked the highest was LMDH Wotgalih at BKPH Jatinegara, Tegal Regency. The second position was held by LMDH Surajaya, and the seventh position held by LMDH Glandang. Both of them were the partners of LPF project.

A. Surajaya Village

The third phase of LPF project, i.e. the monitoring and evaluation phase, began since early February 2006. The activities include some follow-up activities from the previous intervention stage. During the long interval between the second and third stage, significant progress in the village and within LMDH were achieved. The formulated strategies to attain the agreed common vision had been implemented, such as a road has been asphalted. One part of the road section was financially supported by the fund allocated from LMDH share. “Taman Pendidikan Al-Qur'an (TPA)” at Slarang and Kemamang sub-villages were established, and trainings have been carried out to enhance the skills of the youth. Several strategies related to PHBM and sustainable forest have also been implemented.

The political momentum related to village head succession began to build up at the end of 2006. There is a tendency that the incumbent village head is eager to run for village headman election. Besides, most of the LMDH Wanajaya officers sit as members of the village headman election committee.

LMDH Wanajaya of Surajaya Village had tried to run the organization more dynamically. In 2005, institutional financial source obtained from timber profit sharing amounted to Rp 29,000,000.- and the credit fund of PUKK amounted to Rp 7,000,000.- were used as the current capital for the institutional development. The mechanism of share fund distribution is regulated in ART LMDH. The allocation and distribution from stands without cooperation with forest farmer is 20% for LMDH officer honorarium, 30% for village development (for road construction), 5% for operational of CF-PHBM at the village level, LMDH cash, social fund, and operational fund of LMDH. Profit sharing allocation was not well socialized in the community. The information on this allocation was unclear and conflicting and may even become the source of new conflict. PUKK fund was allocated for development of goat fattening in Siali-ali sub-village.

To strengthen LMDH role as a representative of the community organizations in forest business, LMDH came up with two pioneering efforts: first, data gathering of pesanggem (forest users) in the forest compartment by LMDH staff based on the location of the staff’s residence. The staff living in Surajaya sub-village gathered information on forest farmers in Surajaya sub-village, while the staff living in Kemamang sub-village gathered information for Kemamang. This work division was made based on relative distance to forest and the staff’s interaction with pesanggem. Second, there had been a plan for the members to meet up to re-examine the current ART, and to conduct internal evaluation by all members of LMDH board. The internal evaluation is carried out to discuss the tension and jealousy caused by unequal honorarium distribution. There had been some inactive officers who received the same honorarium as the active ones.

---

5 PUKK is Perhutani community economic program to help working capital of forest farmer who are involved in the PHBM program through credit scheme
6 ART is an internal protocol of LMDH
B. Glandang Village

The conditions of Glandang Village improved rapidly in recent times as clearly indicated by the existence of newly asphalted roads, the nearly complete construction of Madrasah Diniyah (religious school), and the fully constructed SD 01 rooms and a dam. The election of village headman, which took place on 30 December 2006, was an event worth noting in Glandang. Former functionaries may run for the election and compete with other prominent figures in the village. The social dynamics around this election process worth noting for several reasons. First, LMDH as an institution at the village level with the interest to manage forest had pesanggem as the major electors. As a new institution, it also requires concrete political support from village government. Second, profit share is also allocated for village government and LMDH has the interest to monitor and ensure that the fund is appropriately used. Third, the persons involved in LMDH may also run for candidacy in the village headman election. Moreover, the head of LMDH Karya Lestari of Glandang Village served as the chairman of the village headmen committee. These make LMDH vulnerable to frictions that may take place among its officers and to manipulation by those who want to make LMDH as their political vehicle.

LMDH Karya Lestari of Glandang Village has experienced a crisis of motivation for some time. This is because the officers were not motivated to run the organization and to coordinate with Perhutani. However, the flow of profit sharing fund to other LMDH in KPH Pemalang provided LMDH Karya Lestari with a new motivation. LMDH Karya Lestari also obtained PUKK credit for sorghum cultivation for the total of Rp 4,000,000.-. The establishment of 2-ha sorghum demonstration plot was carried out in the forest compartment number 62L. The sorghum has currently been harvested although the harvest was not satisfactory. An important progress achieved by LMDH Glandang was the formulation of basic internal protocol (ART) of LMDH. The ART was formulated during the LMDH meeting which was attended by the board of LMDH, forest user groups both from within the Glandang village and outside the village. The most recent activity carried out by LMDH was the establishment of a 36 ha-sugar cane plantation at the field forest compartment number 68 in cooperation with Perhutani and sugar factory of Sumberharjo using a profit sharing scheme.

2.1.2. Coordination of LPF Project

Coordination activities were carried out in Surajaya village to plan for LPF project activities in year 3 and also to inform stakeholders on the progress achieved by the project. Coordination activities were carried out with various stakeholders, such as Perhutani, LMDH officers, village government, and Village CF-PHBM.

1. Coordination with Perhutani was done as follows:
   a. LPF team informed ADM deputy about the results of the second year activities, discussed activities for the third year, and requested the participation of Perhutani in LPF activities.
   b. LPF team informed the Head of Forest Resources Management Planning Division that the Forest compartment Development Planning has been mutually formulated by LMDH Surajaya, LMDH Glandang and Perhutani, and asked Perhutani to become the source person in LMDH profit sharing calculation training.
   c. LPF team coordinated with PHBM supervisor on the progress of the monitoring and evaluation activities.
   d. LPF team coordinated with the Head of sub-forest district Slarang on the progress of the monitoring and evaluation activities and asked the participation of Perhutani field staff in the activity.

2. Coordination with village government
   The project discussed with the village secretary and village staff about village issues in relation to the working groups, last year strategies, and the monitoring and evaluation activities.

3. Coordination with LMDH
   a. The Head of LMDH reviewed the progress achieved by LMDH.
   b. Coordinated all monitoring and evaluation activities which were mostly conducted by LMDH.
4. Coordination with CF-PHB M at the village level
   The chairman of CF-PHB M reviewed PHBM progress and analyzed the strategy implemented by the village working groups.

2.1.3. LPF Project Activities

A. Surajaya Village

1. Profit sharing calculation training for LMDH Surajaya

To develop LMDH into an organization that can represent community in forest management, the capability of LMDH officers should be strengthened. After successfully planning the forest compartment development in 2005, LMDH began to undertake trainings based on the agreed priorities. The training on profit sharing calculation was important because LMDH had received profit share twice but they were not involved in calculating the profit. Consequently LMDH had no understanding of where the figure of profit sharing fund comes from. The training was aimed to equip LMDH with the knowledge of the share they should receive, to increase the transparency of Perhutani, and to promote the working spirit of the officers.

The training was conducted on Wednesday, February 22, 2006 and was attended by 24 participants. They were LMDH officers, CF-PHB M representation, village staffs, “Pesanggem”, Perhutani staffs and the LMDH representatives from the surrounding area. The trainers come from Perhutani KPH Pemalang, i.e. Herta Pari, S.Hut. who was the Head of Forest Resources Management Planning Division.

The training provided LMDH with a deeper understanding of how to calculate the profit share. LMDH also increased their critical capability by clarifying issues of their interests. In the future it is expected that LMDH will be able to calculate production volume and profit sharing of both Perhutani and LMDH.

2. Outbound Management Training in Surajaya Village

Outbound Management Training was aimed to: (1) identify the capability of the officers and Wanajaya LMDH organization in managing the forests, (2) increase the knowledge and understanding of LMDH officers of Langgeng Jati of organizational management. Outbound management training was carried out on 9, 11, and 13 March 2006. The participants include representatives of PHBM institutions in Surajaya village, such as LMDH, Perhutani, village CF-PHB M, and village government staff.

The training for LMDH Wanajaya of Surajaya village was carried out in three main phases: Pre-test, OMT Operation, and Post-test. Pre-test and Post-test are the tools for assessing the level of participants' knowledge of the groups and organizations before and after the training. The rationale behind the Pre-test and Post-test programs is that the implementation of organization management is influenced by the level of participants’ understanding. Pre-test was carried out before OMT to evaluate participants' initial understanding, and Post-test was carried out after OMT to evaluate the difference in participants' understanding of organizational management.

The score obtained shows that the understanding level of LMDH Wanajaya increases after the training of up to 13.58%. This shows that OMT is quite significant in increasing the understanding of LMDH Wanajaya. With regards to the institutional potential of LMDH Wanajaya, their weakness lies in its low capability in understanding the objective of the exercise, while their highest potential lies in the loyalty of the personnel. To strengthen LMDH Wanajaya institutionally in the future, these strength and weakness should be taken into account in identifying strategies for improvement.

3. Training for Micro Financial Institution and Cooperative in Surajaya Village

This activity was carried out in April 16-17, 2006 at Surajaya village hall and was attended by participants from LMDH, village government, pesanggem, CF-PHB M at village level, and village activity management unit (UPK). Micro financial institution training was conducted for 2 days. The first day focused mainly on the basic of micro financial institution, especially cooperative. Materials on the basic micro financial institution were delivered by LPF Team whereas materials
on cooperative were given by Bambang Gunawan from the cooperative agency of Pemalang regency. Discussion session, led by the resource persons, mainly focused on the procedures to establish a cooperative. The second day focused on financial management and book keeping. These topics were delivered by LPF facilitators.

The methods used in the training includes: talk, plenary discussion, group discussion, and book keeping practices. The results of the training include:

a. Participants’ understanding of the principles of micro economic and its formats
b. Participants’ understanding of the procedures and mechanisms for establishing cooperative.
c. Participants are able to apply their knowledge on management and book keeping in his/her respective institution
d. Participants are able to apply their knowledge and book keeping skills in managing the finance of their own institutions.

Meanwhile, the training on micro financial institution in Glandang village took place in June 27, 2006. The training was delayed by the earthquake that hit Yogyakarta and the activity had to be stopped.

4. Training on Stand Inventory in LMDH Surajaya and Its Realization in Area 54
Forest compartment area under LMDH Surajaya management, covering a total of 1402 ha, consists of various age classes of forest stand. The compartment has high age class that can be cut down. LMDH Wanajaya initiated stand inventory of age class IV and above for the purpose of assessing its potential and calculating wood profit sharing with Perhutani. Prior to the inventory, in April 21, 2006, LMDH conducted a training on stand inventory which was attended by officers of LMDH Wanajaya, Surajaya village. The training began with an explanation of how to measure tree stands and what measurements should be done to complete the tally sheets. Besides undertaking the inventory, LMDH also put up numbers at the tree stands. Inventory was done in the forest compartment number 54b.

5. Workshop to Formulate Criteria and Indicator for Surajaya Village
The participatory formulation of the the Criteria and indicator for forest sustainability under PHBM engaged representatives from Forest Village Community Institution, village government, Perhutani, village level CF-PHBM, and other stakeholders at the village level. The participants need to formulate criteria and indicators for ecological, institutional, social, and economic components of forest sustainability.

In Surajaya village, LMDH Wanajaya and representatives from village government, Perhutani, CF-PHBM at the village level, and other stakeholders at the village level formulated an evaluation model based on the principle, criteria, and indicator. The information would be collected based on the real conditions in the field. The results of the evaluation would indicate the performance of PHBM in Surajaya village.

The objectives of the participatory PHBM evaluation are as follows:
(1) As a learning process for PHBM stakeholders to evaluate the progress and problems of PHBM.
(2) To study the impact of PHBM implementation in all related aspects (ecological, institutional, economic, and social).
(3) As material to prepare for follow-up plan and to improve the implementation process of PHBM.

The goal of participatory PHBM evaluation is to evaluate all activities conducted by PHBM stakeholders, such as:

a. Activities carried out by Forest Village Community in LMDH
b. Activities carried out by village government
c. PHBM Communication Forum from the Village to Regency level
d. PHBM Implementation process carried out by Perhutani.

The evaluation process of forest sustainability under PHBM system began with a workshop attended by PHBM stakeholders/institutions, such as forest farmers, LMDH, Village CF-PHBM at the village, sub-district levels, village government, LPMD, BPD, PKK and Perhutani (Mandor,
The workshop was held in June 22 and 23, 2006, whereas the workshop for evaluating the conditions, using the produced criteria and indicator framework, at the village level was carried out in September 2, 2006. Before the evaluation, focus group discussions were held to evaluate each PHBM institution for verification.

The results obtained from the workshop are:

1. The knowledge of the development of participatory forest sustainable management evaluation.
2. A framework consisting of principles, criteria, and indicators, as a tool to evaluate the sustainability of forest resources in Surajaya village, which was agreed by all parties in the village.
3. A media for mutually and critically examine the conditions of forest and forest management and the roles each party play in the management.
4. A formulation of follow-up plans to be carried out by each institution involved in forest management at Surajaya village.

B. Glandang Village

1. Formulation of ART LMDH Glandang

In running the organization, LMDH of Glandang village needs to have basic protocol of LMDH (AD) and internal protocol of LMDH (ART) as the basis of their organization and institutional policies. LMDH Glandang has already had AD included in their establishment certificate under the public notary in 2004.

On 19 February 2006, a meeting was held to formulate ART of LMDH. The meeting was held at the residence of Sri Budi Priyanto, the LMDH chairman, from 19.00 to 02.15 WIB. The meeting was attended by all LMDH officers and pesanggem in managerial sector of Glandang LMDH from Glandang village or the surrounding area (Sipanjang sub-village, Kuta Village). In the meeting, the participants formulated ART of LMDH Glandang by evaluating ART of other LMDH, i.e., LMDH Surajaya and LMDH Pegiringan. Officers and pesanggem were required to understand the contents of ART, so that they could give inputs to improve the ART. In the discussion, the participants interestingly discussed the rights and duties of the non-Glandang members vis-à-vis LMDH Glandang and Glandang village government. Basically, pesanggem from outside Glandang village asked for similar rights and duties as those of other Glandang members. Nevertheless, the officers and pesanggem from Glandang village disagreed with the article that specified that non-Glandang pesanggem have the rights to hold the position as officers. They concern that if the officers are non-Glandang villagers, they may move the organization out of the Glandang village.

A debate also took place on the issue of the percentage of profit sharing. Finally it was agreed that each party would receive profit sharing allocation according to his/her contribution in forest sustainability and LMDH. The final profit sharing allocation agreed by the participants was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Operational Cost of LMDH</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Honorarium of officers</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Village government/village income</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Operational of CF-PHBM village level</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Social fund</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LMDH cash flow</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profit sharing allocation for forest compartment without the cooperation of pesanggem in compartment number 68 (compartment with stands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Operational Cost of LMDH</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profit sharing allocation for forest compartment in cooperation with pesanggem (compartment with stands and new plantation):
2. Honorarium of officers 15%
3. Village government/village income 10%
4. Operational of CF-PHBM at village level 2.5%
5. Members or pesanggem 55%
6. Social fund 2.5%
7. LMDH cash flow 5%

The above profit sharing allocation showed that pesanggem received the biggest share. This reflects the recognition of their roles and their loyalty in forest management.

After the articles in ART were agreed by officers and pesanggem representatives, LMDH socialized the produced ART to all pesanggem and other stakeholders in the village.

2. Training on profit sharing calculation for LMDH Glandang

Forest compartment located in the Glandang village has recently been dominated by new plantation, and the enthusiasms of LMDH officers and pesanggem to increase its capacity is very high. Their enthusiasm is indicated by their willingness to learn about the profit sharing mechanism although LMDH will not receive profit sharing from wood production within the next few years. Facilitated by LPF project, the training on calculating profit sharing of wood production was carried out.

The training was conducted on February 23, 2006, at 09.00-12.30 WIB in Glandang village hall. Participants were LMDH officers, CF-PHBM, village government, pesanggem, Perhutani staffs, and representatives from neighborhood. The LMDH Expert in the training was Herta Pari, S.Hut who is the head of the forest resources management planning division of KPH Pemalang. The topics of the training included the improvement of LMDH role in forest management by improving the correction factor of operational PHBM guide (SK No. 2142/KPTS/I/2002) and the calculation mechanism of the sharing of felled tree to TPK, either felled tree A, B, or E based on the Director Decree No. 001/2002 on profit sharing guide from wood production.

The discussion session was lively because the officers and pesanggem discussed various issues with the resource person. Questions were dominated by the following issues:
1. The time and profit sharing mechanism of forest compartment number 62 which is immediately pruned.
2. The objection on the correction factor of successful plantation should be more than 90% for planting distance of 3 x 2m or 3 x 3m.

3. Village Meeting on Joint Program Institution

This activity was carried out by various institutions involved in PHBM of Glandang village. These included LMDH, CF-PHBM, village government, and BPD. The activity was carried out in March 8, 2006. The objectives of the joint program activity were, first, to improve coordination and communication among the existing institutions in the village in PHBM operation at Glandang village, second, to integrate program from various activities related to PHBM. The output of the activity includes the legalization of ART LMDH previously created and its introduction to all institutions about rules in LMDH, and the establishment of communication and coordination from various institutions in the village in relation to their functions and tasks.

4. Outbound Management Training in Glandang Village

The Outbound management training carried out in LMDH Glandang applied similar processes but it produced different outcomes. The training was carried out on 10, 12 and 13 March, 2006, involving participants from LMDH, Perhutani, village government, village level CF-PHBM, BPD, and pesanggem.

The results of the training evaluation showed that: (1) the level of understanding of LMDH Karya Lestari and Perhutani increased 14.04% and 12.17%, respectively, after the training. This shows that OMT is quite significant in increasing the understanding of PHBM institutions in Glandang village (2) the institutional assessment of PHBM institution in Glandang village shows that the institutional problem of PHBM at Glandang village rested in their low ability in understanding the group’s objectives or the objective of the activity. Its highest potential is in planning. With regards to LMDH Karya Lestari, the problem is in its low loyalty to the institution
while its highest potential rested in its effectiveness. To strengthen the institutional aspect of LMDH Glandang in the future, these institutional strengths and weaknesses should be taken into consideration.

5. Training on alternative Silviculture System for LMDH Glandang and Surajaya
The training was a collaborative activity between LMDH Surajaya and LMDH Glandang. The training was conducted because there was a need for knowledge on plantation cultivation system which is suitable for the land conditions. The training was carried out in forest compartment number 69. The training was held in March 26, 2006. The location was selected in order to approach pesanggem and members. The training was attended by representatives from LMDH Surajaya (officers and members), and representatives from LMDH Glandang (officers and members), village government, and Perhutani. The training was facilitated by LPF team of UGM with Dr. Ir. San Afri Awang as the resource person. The activity was carried out through plenary discussion and group discussion.

The results of the training are as follows:
- The participants is able to describe the conditions of the plant cultivation system which have been carried out so far
- The participants able to choose plant cultivation system which suitable to land conditions and forest management requirements
- The participants are able to select planting scheme, which is profitable both ecologically and economically.
- The planting scheme agreed for the activity was the belt pattern, i.e. for a total of 1 ha, 0.75 ha of which are planted with teak with planting distance of 3x1, and the rest (0.25 ha) is planted with food crops for the community.
- LMDH will regulate pesanggem and share land area in the forest compartment before starting the planting activities.

6. Training on Plant Cultivation in LMDH Glandang
The ability of the people to manage the forests depends not only on their understanding of the management system but also of the technical aspect of management activity. For this reason, the training on the technical aspect of plant cultivation was held in April 19, 2006, in field 69 of LMDH Karya Lestary, in Glandang village. The invited participants include pesanggem from Glandang and Surajaya village, LMDH from Glandang and Surajaya village, Perhutani (from planting supervisor to the Head of sub division planting KPH Pemalang), CF-PHBM at village, Glandang village government, and several LMDH from the neighborhood villages. The trainer was Wayudin from the Slarang sub-forest district who directly handled technical aspects in the field. The results obtained include:

(1) LMDH understands and is capable of undertaking management activities from land preparation, planting, to harvesting.
(2) LMDH understands the implementation schedule of forest management activities.
(3) LMDH will undertake all management activities in field 68.

7. Training on Micro-financial Institution in Glandang Village
The micro-financial institution training to improve the management capability of the participants in book-keeping was carried out in July 28, 2006, in Glandang village hall. The participants came from LMDH, CF-PHBM, LPMD, Karang Taruna (youth organization), PKK, village cooperative, BPD, LMDH Kuta, LMDH Bantarbolang, and Perhutani at RPH Glandang. The trainer of the training was Dianingtyas Purborini, A.Md. During the training, the participants discussed book-keeping procedures, financial management, and financial reporting system.

The outputs of the training include:
- The participants understand and are able to keep a proper book-keeping in their respective institutions
- A plan to expand the existing village cooperative business into a collaborative effort with LMDH.

8. Preparation of Participative Criteria and Indicator in Glandang village
The implementation of PHBM is a big responsibility in the attempt to rebuild the Java forests. The program has been in operation since 2001 based on the decree of Perhutani Supervisory Board No. 136/Dir/2001. In promoting sustainable forest in PHBM system, many evaluation models have been formulated and used a guide. Perhutani, as a leading sector in forest management in Java, has established their own evaluation guide for PHBM as stated in the decree of 660/KPTS/Dir/2003. For the office in Central Java province, the decree of the Head of Forestry Service No. 188.4/663 on monitoring and evaluation guide has been enacted.

The formulation from Perhutani and the Provincial forestry office basically comes from policy makers and it is hoped that it can be implemented to solve the problems in PHBM. At this level, it is possible that some problems remain unaddressed. Or on the contrary, the materials evaluated are perceived to be irrelevant with the existing field conditions. For this reason, mutually agreed criteria and indicators are required. Participative approach is used to develop the Criteria and Indicator framework which is acceptable by the relevant stakeholders. A workshop to produce a framework of criteria and indicator for sustainable forest in PHBM system was conducted in July 17 and 19, and afterwards, a workshop on sustainability evaluation of forest management in PHBM system was carried out in August 21, 2006. The stakeholders involved in preparing the criteria and indicators include representatives from LMDH, Perhutani, village government, CF-PHBM, BPD, prominent figures, PKK, and LPMD.

The process for developing criteria and indicators here is similar with those in Surajaya village. The only difference was the evaluation standards and the formulated criteria as they depend on the participant’s level of knowledge and involvement in each village.

The results obtained from workshop are:
1. The learning process of the involved parties on the issue of forest management, forest evaluation and participatory process.
2. The framework of Aspects, Principles, Criteria, and Indicators, which was agreed by all stakeholders in the village, as a tool to evaluate the sustainability of forest resources in Glandang village.
3. The media to mutually evaluate the conditions and the role of each stakeholders in managing the forest at Glandang village.
4. A follow-up plan for each institutions involved in forest management in the village.

2.2. Randublatung Forest District

2.2.1. Common Progress in Research Sites

Progress in the Scope of KPH Randublatung

Changes are unavoidable. The question is when those changes take place. At the end of 2005, the board of Perhutani replaced many staffs from the medium to high ranked positions. The mutation of Perhutani staff also occurred in KPH Randublatung. The staff being mutated were:
1. The head of forest district
2. Ajun (Head of Section)
3. The head of sub forest district, including BKPH Tanggel
4. PHBM Supervision
5. Forest rangers in various regions, such as in Tanggel and Bogorejo, the sub-forest district of Tanggel.

Those staff mutations affected the processes and cooperation that have been built by the LPF Project so far. This is because change in leadership position is usually followed by changes in policy. Situation may deteriorate when information was not transferred to new staff properly and clear mandate between the staff and their successor is not provided. Misunderstandings may arise and longer time is needed to establish cooperative relationships. These changes led LPF team to re-socialize the existence of LPF Project in KPH Randublatung and its on-going activities and processes to several stakeholders.

The most serious policy change with regards to LMDH and PHBM was that, up to mid March 2006, LMDH should establish itself as a cooperative with a legal body. This target was nevertheless socialized by Perhutani of KPH Randublatung only in mid February 2006.
Previously, LMDH may conduct productive activities, that produce high impacts on the community, without having a legal body. The impact of this policy change was not only felt by LMDH (who were mostly unprepared to such changes) but also by some field workers who assisted LMDH and the community. Another change in the policy was the agreement signed by the chairman of LMDH over KPH Randublatung on the allocation of budget sharing for each institution. The agreement was reached in November 16, 2005, through the facilitation of KPH Randublatung. Another agreement related to LMDH was the hand-over of the mandate to establish supervisory board of LMDH and the mechanism to establish the board. As a whole, the produced agreement on the production sharing allocation is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type of sharing allocation</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The association of LMDH KPH Randublatung</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The communication forum at the sub-regency level</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The communication forum at the village level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Productive Business of LMDH</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Operational of LMDH organization and incentive for LMDH officers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Social fund</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LPF processes that took place up to phase 2 resulted in a work plan and a Forest Management Plan, which were produced through participatory processes, in two LMDH at two villages in the research locations. These have increased the spirit of KPH to implement PHBM based on its basic principles. Up to 2005, KPH Randublatung has provided the community a profit sharing for a total of Rp 2,679,365,925. Apart than how the agreement was reached between KPH and LMDH to allocate the sharing fund, this figure may be used by Perhutani as a "selling point" in implementing PHBM in its region. Moreover, as a political movement, when handing over the shared profit of 2004 and 2005, Perhutani invited the Regent of Blora. In addition, KPH Randublatung also planned to organize Jambore LMDH for Java inviting the President at the end of 2005. This plan has not been realized yet.

The amount of the shared profit accepted by LMDH also had an impact on the activity of some institutions, which are established to ensure the PHBM implementation in KPH Randublatung is a success, such as LMDH Association, Communication Forum of PHBM at the sub-district and village levels. This was related to the allocated shared profits accepted by LMDH for these institutions (see the table on the agreement of the above sharing allocation).

Community and Group
The result of LPF project in the second year was the forest management plan, developed through participatory processes, which is agreed by KPH Randublatung, LMDH and village government. The plan gave LMDH a clear direction in implementing their work program and a better bargaining position in negotiating the different policies that are not in line with the group capacity and the community’s interest. With this plan, LMDH Wana Bersemi was also able to accommodate the interests of pesanggem and other groups, such as Posyandu, education, and karang taruna, to utilize the shared fund so that there was a change in the agreement facilitated by Perhutani.

LMDH and village government has gradually gained better understanding of the LPF project and processes. Thus, the groups were able to undertake independent activities and to formulate their own need, to a certain level. These are indicated by the following indicators:
1) LMDH Wana Bersemi and Langgeng Jati began feeling the need to increase the capacity of their officers in administration and management.
2) LMDH began conducting routine staff meeting, to utilize LMDH secretariate, and to protect forest (in Gempol village)
3) LMDH Wana Bersemi began protecting the forest, especially in the area prone to wood theft.
4) LMDH began using the existing agreements and created new agreements to develop the group.
The impacts of the meeting facilitated by LPF Project were also felt by Tanggel village government. They began holding frequent coordination meeting with their staffs and LMDH to formulate village policies. Tanggel village hall held more meetings, either by village government or by other groups, such as LMDH and religious groups. Structural changes also occurred in PHBM Communication Forum of Tanggel village and LMDH Langgengjati. The forum reshuffled their staffs and elected new staffs with the involvement of LMDH, Perhutani, and the village government. With regards to the organizational structure of LMDH Langgengjati, at the turn of 2006 many staff retired due to old age.

This conducive environment became a good entry point for the stage 3 of the LPF project. This is because some activities prepared in the work plan of LMDH, facilitated by LPF Project, were in line with the policy change which requires LMDH to establish itself into a cooperative in KPH Randublatung.

2.2.2. LPF Project Activities

A. Tanggel village

1. Coordination of LPF Project

The coordination of the LPF Project in Year 3 consisted of 2 levels:

Coordination at KPH Level

Related to the changes in KPH Randublatung, the coordination at KPH level was late because several positions related to PHBM were handled by new personnel. These new functionaries need to adapt to their new working environment. The main hurdle in KPH level coordination was in finding a suitable time for both parties to meet up. UGM team coordinated with the head of forest district, Adm deputy, PHBM supervisor and staffs. During the coordinating meetings with these personnel, LPF team explained about the existence of LPF Project in Randublatung, the cooperation and the on-going processes that have been built in the community, and the stage 3 of LPF project.

The formal and more comprehensive coordination meeting was held in February 4, 2006, after LPF team started facilitating the stakeholders at the community level. LPF team invited Perhutani at the level of KPH, BKPH of KPH Randublatung, LMDH Wana Bersemi and Langgeng Jati, Association of LMDH KPH Randublatung, PHBM Communication Forum of Randublatung and Jati level, PHBM Communication Forum of Gempol and Tanggel village level, Tanggel and Gempol village government to attend this formal meeting which was held for KPH Randublatung level. The meeting was intended to present the results of Stage 2 LPF Project and to coordinate the activities of Stage 3 LPF Project. This multistakeholder meeting should serve as a platform learning and knowledge transfer for the participating institutions. This activity also became a public sphere for all parties involved in PHBM operation in KPH Randublatung to share their views, ideas, and interests. The inputs and information sharing by the stakeholders on communication and processes in the field with regards to the project and future cooperation are important for LPF Project.

Coordination at Village and BKPH Level

Coordination at the village and sub-forest district levels was conducted by engaging:

1) Village government of Gempol and Tanggel, 2) LMDH Wana Bersemi of Gempol village, 3) LMDH Langgengjati of Tanggel village, 4) The head of sub-forest district (BKPH Gempol, 5) KRPH Selogender, 6) KRPH Kuwojo, 7) KBKPH Tanggel, 8) KRPH Tanggel, 9) KRPH Bogorejo.

The village and BKPH level coordination was carried out to reflect on LPF activities during previous stages and to come up with agreed programs or activities for the third phase of LPF project. This coordination meeting was held especially to familiarize the new KBKPH and KRPH, and to plan on how LMDH would implement the participatory forest management plan and their work program in 2006. LMDH Wana Bersemi of Gempol Village and LMDH Langgengjati of Tanggel village implemented their 2006 work program as agreed. Although there was no change in the type of the activity and the work program, there was a change in the activity budget as the result of the change in sharing allocation received by both LMDH, and the agreement of all LMDH in KPH Randublatung. At the beginning of LMDH work plan formulation,
the sharing to be accepted by LMDH Wana Bersemi was estimated to be around 400 million. In reality, LMDH Wana Bersemi received a total of 793 million in early 2006, while LMDH Langgengjati received 87 million in 2005.

2. Meeting among the institutions in Tanggel Village

The meeting among the institutions in Tanggel village was held with the objective to discuss the utilization of social fund from the sharing allocation of LMDH Langgeng Jati. Most of the villagers expected that the allocation would be allocated for the activities or investments, such as infrastructure, that can be accessed and enjoyed by all Tanggel villagers. It was also expected that fair benefit distribution would increase people’s motivation to directly or indirectly involve in forest management activities.

The meeting was held in February 8, 2006. The village institutions participated in the meeting were: village government, LMDH Langgeng Jati, PHBM Communication forum, prominent figures, women’s group (PKK), youth club (Karang Taruna), and other community representatives.

The results of this meeting were: a) an agreement to evenly distribute social fund from the shared fund of LMDH Langgeng Jati to 29 neighborhoods (Rukun Tetangga or RT) in Tanggel village; the allocation was Rp 450.000 per neighbourhood (RT), which consists of 35-40 households ; b) An agreement that social fund at RT level would be managed based on the agreement of the respective RT.

3. Outbound Management Training

The Outbound Management Training was aimed at: 1) identifying Langgeng Jati LMDH organization and officers in managing organization related to the operation of forest management, 2) increasing the capability (knowledge and understanding) of LMDH officers of Langgeng Jati in organizational management.

The participants include representatives of LMDH Wana Bersemi, PHBM Communication Forum of Tanggel village and Tanggel village government. LMDH officers include the core officers, sections, and the PHBM success team. Facilitated by UGM facilitator team, the training was carried out on 22-26 February 2006. The activities were organized into three phases: i) pre test, 2) practice/outbound, 3) post test.

The results obtained from the training are 1) the descriptions of the quality of human resources or LMDH officers of Langgeng Jati; 2) the analysis of the training showed that the understanding level of the members of LMDH Langgeng Jati increased by 12.66%, 3) the willingness of LMDH officers to increase their organizational spirit.

4. Workshop on the Establishment of LMDH Cooperative with a Legal Body

The goals of the workshop were: 1) to increase the understanding of the members and officers of LMDH Langgeng Jati of cooperative, 2) to establish a cooperative of LMDH Langgeng Jati. The establishment of LMDH into a cooperative is in line with the program developed by KPH Randublatung. It was expected that by developing LMDH into a cooperative, it may develop into a productive economic institution and thus improve the PHBM operation.

The workshop was carried out on 6 and 13 March 2006, with the facilitation of UGM team. Brainstorming and structured discussion methods were used in the workshop.

The results obtained were: 1) the participants’ understanding of the processes to establish a cooperative, 2) an agreement by the participants to establish LMDH Langgeng Jati into a cooperative, 3) the selected officers, advisory board, and membership of the cooperative, 4) the formulation of AD and ART of LMDH Langgeng Jati cooperative.

5. LMDH and Cooperative Board Member Meeting

The meeting was carried out in March 6, 2006 with the goals: 1) to undertake coordination among board members of LMDH Langgeng Jati and LMDH Langgeng Jati Cooperative, 2) to create a learning forum for the officers in which they can communicate and coordinate to improve LMDH and cooperative as institutions related to PHBM operation.

The meeting was facilitated by UGM facilitator team using brainstorming and structured discussion methods. The meeting was attended by Tanggel village institutions, such as LMDH Langgeng Jati officers, LMDH cooperative officers, PHBM Communication Forum, Tanggel village government, and KTH.
The meeting achieved the following results: 1) an understanding of the need to improve the institutions which include the need to report the progress every 3 months, and to conduct routine meeting for the officers, 2) improved communication among officers and other institutions, 3) the agreement that LMDH should be involved in wood cutting activities by working as apprentice in those activities.

6. Socialization of PHBM in Tanggel Village Community
The objectives of this activity are: 1) to improve the understanding of the community and the LMDH officers of PHBM 2) to promote active participation of the officers and community in every LMDH Langgeng Jati activities related to forest management.

The results obtained from this socialization activity are: 1) LMDH officers, Perhutani, and village government have successfully undertaken socialization in 13 sub-villages of Tanggel village, 2) a mutual agreement to gather information on members of LMDH Langgeng Jati.

7. Accountability Meeting of LMDH Officers
The meeting was initiated by the community members and the village institutions in Tanggel village because they wanted to learn about the progress of PHBM implementation in Tanggel village. The goals of the meeting were: 1) for the LMDH officers to present the accountability report on the implementation of the activities and the financial report of 2005, 2) to develop the responsibility, transparency, and orderliness in managing the organization.

The meeting was held in April 5, 2006 without the facilitation of UGM facilitator team, although the team received the invitation and attended the meeting. The meeting was attended by LMDH officers, PHBM Communication Forum, village government, KTH, and prominent figures in the community.

The meeting achieved the following results: 1) LMDH officers have presented their accountability report quarterly, 2) an increase in participants’ understanding of the organizational administrative and management at the officers’ level.

8. Apprenticeship in Wood Cutting Activity
The goals of this activity were: 1) to increase LMDH knowledge in forest management, in particular the technique of wood cutting 2) to improve LMDH knowledge in calculating the wood volume produced in relation to the calculation of profit sharing fund. The activity was proposed by LMDH Langgeng Jati and gained the full support of KPH Randublatung.

The participants of the wood cutting apprenticeship were 3 Tanggel villagers: 1 person will undertake apprenticeship for three months and 2 persons will undergo the apprenticeship for 2 months. During the apprenticeship, the participants were directly involved in wood cutting activities that took place in the cutting compartment of BKPH Tanggel.

The results of the activity were 1) LMDH officers were involved in the cutting activities and in calculating the cutting outputs, 2) Increased awareness of how to sustain the forests 3) Increased awareness of the officers who are involved in the apprenticeship.

9. Planning meeting on innovative orange cultivation in Perhutani planting area in 2006
The goals of this activity were: 1) to socialize the establishment of orange plantation which has been planned during the 2005 strategic planning in Gumeng and Sonorejo sub-village, 2) to prepare the management plan and the division of tasks among the different stakeholders. The meeting was held in July 19, 2006.

The meeting was facilitated by UGM facilitator team, using the brainstorming and structured discussion methods. It was attended by LMDH officers, Perhutani, village government, PHBM Communication Forum.. The objectives of the programs were: 1) to increase people’s participation in forest management, especially in tree planting and maintenance, 2) to provide business opportunity in farming by intercropping the main forest trees with orange trees , 3) to increase the income of the community who live close to the forest.

The results of the activity are: 1) a mutual agreement between the participating farmers and Perhutani to cultivate orange in forest compartment number 74a, 110b, and 110c, 2) an agreement on the rights and obligation of related parties (LMDH, Perhutani, and farmer), 3) a mutual agreement that LMDH will be assisted by UGM team in making a proposal to raise fund to support the activity.

10. Workshop: Participatory Evaluation of Forest Resource Sustainability
The workshop on Participatory Evaluation of Forest Resources Sustainability had the following objectives: 1) to enhance the capability of forest village people as the forest manager in PHBM system by developing principles, criteria, and indicators for evaluating forest resource sustainability, 2) to enable the people to evaluate forest resource sustainability in a participatory way, 3) to enable the people in preparing a strategic plan to achieve sustainable forest resources (based on the evaluation results). The workshop was carried out in July 20, 2006 and August 6, 2006. Another follow-up meeting to prepare a strategic plan was held in August 25, 2006.

The workshop was facilitated by UGM facilitator team using brainstorming, meta card, group discussion, and structured discussion methods. The workshop was attended by Perhutani, Tanggel village government, LMDH Langgeng Jati officers, Tanggel village PHBM Communication Forum, LMDH Langgeng Jati Cooperative officers, PKK, BPD, LKMD, Posyandu, and forest farmer groups.

The result of the workshop are: 1) Mutual agreement on the principles and criteria which will be used in evaluating the forest resource sustainability in Tanggel village, 2) A participatory evaluation of forest resources sustainability by forest village people at the village level using the agreed criteria and indicators, 3) An agreement on the follow-up plan to manage forest at village level based on the participatory evaluation results which will be incorporated in the 2007 PHBM Strategic Plan.

B. Gempol village

1. Meeting among the Institutions in Gempol Village
The meeting was initiated by LMDH to increase the transparency and democracy among the people. The goal of the meeting was to build a mutual agreement on some LMDH work plans and on the use of the shared fund allocation by LMDH. The meeting was also meant to become an entry point for LMDH in encouraging the farmers involved in forest management to become LMDH members.

The meeting among Gempol village institutions, which was held in February 9, 2006, was facilitated by UGM facilitator team using brainstorming and structured discussion methods. Present in the meeting were Gempol village institutions (government, BPD, LKMD, Karang Taruna, Religious Groups, PKK, Posyandu, Perhutani, LMDH, PHBM Communication Forum at village and sub-district level, and forest farmers).

Results obtained from the meeting are the agreement that: 1) there should be fund from PHBM share to be allocated for village institutions as operational fund to support PHBM operation in Gempol village, 2) there should be fund from PHBM share to be allocated for pesanggem cultivating land (forest lots or andil) of plantation field, and 3) there should be data gathering on LMDH members as an effort to ascertain the memberships of LMDH organization.

2. Outbound Management Training
The outbound Management Training was aimed to: 1) assess the capability of Wana Bersemi LMDH organization and officers in managing the forest management-related organization, 2) increase the capability (knowledge and understanding) of LMDH officers of Wana Bersemi in organizational management.

The participants include representatives of LMDH Wana Bersemi, PHBM Communication Forum of Gempol village and Gempol village government. LMDH officers include core officers, sections, and PHBM success team. Facilitated by UGM facilitator team, the training was carried out on February 17-19, 2006. The activities were broken down into three phases: 1) pre test, 2) practice/outbound, 3) post test.

The results obtained from training are: 1) descriptions of the quality of the officers of LMDH Wana Bersemi; 2) the result of the analysis indicated that the comprehension level of LMDH Wana Bersemi increases by 36.46%, 3) the willingness of LMDH officers to increase their organizational spirit.

3. Workshop on the Establishment of Legal LMDH Cooperative
The objectives of this workshop were: 1) to increase the understanding of the LMDH members and officers of cooperative, 2) to establish legal cooperative of LMDH Wana Bersemi. The
establishment of legal LMDH cooperative is in line with the program developed by KPH Randublatung. By establishing cooperative with a legal body, it is expected that LMDH may grow into a productive economic institution, and therefore improve the implementation of PHBM.

The workshop was carried out for two days, on 22 and 23 February 2006, with the facilitation from UGM team. Brainstorming and structured discussion methods were used in the workshop.

The results of the workshops are: 1) increased knowledge of the members and officers of the cooperative, 2) an agreement to establish legal LMDH Wana Bersemi cooperative, 3) the formation of cooperative officers, supervisory board, and membership, 4) the formulation of AD and ART of LMDH Wana Bersemi cooperative.

4. Meeting on Accountability Report of LMDH Wana Bersemi Officers
This meeting was carried out in March 11, 2006. The objectives of the meeting were: 1) to develop the managerial and financial accountability in managing the institution, 2) to develop the responsibility, transparency and orderliness in managing organization.

The initiative of the meeting came from LMDH Wana Bersemi and Gempol village institutions. The meeting was not facilitated by the UGM facilitator but the team was invited and present at the meeting. The participants include Gempol village government, Perhutani, Communication Forum of village level PHBM, LMDH Wana Bersemi officers, and representatives of Gempol village institutions.

The results obtained from the meeting are: 1) LMDH officers have reported their three month accountability report 2) an increased understanding of the participants of the organizational administration and management at the officers' level.

5. Workshop on the Reshuffle of LMDH Wana Bersemi Officers
This workshop was carried out in three stages. In the first stage, which was conducted in March 17, 2006, the officer’s election committee discussed the election mechanisms. In the second stage, conducted in March 19, 2006, the committee met the candidates and discussed the implementation of the election.

The workshop was facilitated by UGM team using the brainstorming and structured discussion methods. The participants invited in the meeting were representatives from Gempol village institutions.

The third stage was the election of new officers of LMDH Wana Bersemi which took place in March 21, 2006. The goal of this officer regeneration was to meet the institutional rule as written in AD/ART that the officers should be reshuffled once in three years. The result of this activity was the election of new officers who are mostly young, active, and dynamic.

The workshop was followed by the establishment of LMDH sections in April 6, 2006, to complement the newly elected LMDH officers.

The workshop was facilitated by UGM facilitator team using brainstorming and structured discussion methods. The participants of the workshop include core officers of LMDH Wana Bersemi, Gempol village government, forest farmers, prominent figures, and former officers.

The results of the workshop are: 1) Socialization of new officers to other community members, 2) The establishment of new officers who are different in composition from the old one, and 3) An agreement to address the urgent matters by LMDH Wana Bersemi.

6. Training on Cultivation for Forest Farmers Group
The goals of this training are: 1) Forest farmers understand and are able to apply proper forestry methods in their cultivation, 2) forest farmers are able to fully develop inter-crop cultivation and produce maximal harvests.

The training was conducted in May 12 2006 and engaged participants from relevant institutions in Gempol villages, namely: LMDH Wana Bersemi, Gempol village government, BPD, Perhutani and Forest Farmers Group. The facilitators of the training were Agriculture office of Blora District who handled materials on agricultural plantation and Perhutani who handled materials on forest plantation.

The results of the training are: 1) forest farmers understand the technical aspects of forest cultivation activities, 2) forest farmers understand how to select good seeds for intercrop cultivation that are suitable with the field conditions.
7. Meeting of LMDH Wana Bersemi Officers and LMDH Cooperative
The meeting was conducted in April 9, 2006. The goals of the meeting were: 1) for the officers of LMDH and LMDH cooperative to coordinate with one another, 2) for the officers to learn together on how to run the organizations related to PHBM operation well. The meeting was attended by the representatives of the relevant institutions in Gempol village.

The results obtained from the activity are: 1) An agreement to improve the institution in terms of the accountability report and regular meetings of the officers, 2) to improve communication and coordination among the officers of LMDH, cooperative, and other village institutions.

8. Training on the Administration and Financial Management of LMDH Wana Bersemi of Gempol Village
This training was carried out in July 10, 2006, with the objectives: 1) to improve the participants’ knowledge of micro-financial institutions, 2) to equip the Gempol village institutions with good book-keeping skills.

The participants include representatives from LMDH Wana Bersemi, Cooperative of LMDH Wana Bersemi, and Investment Committee of Gempol village. The training was facilitated by UGM team.

The results obtained from the training are 1) Participants's increased knowledge of the organizational administration and financial management, 2) the participants' increased understanding of how to handle the finance and book-keeping, 3) the participants were able to apply the knowledge during the exercises although the results were not perfect yet.

9. Socialization of PHBM in Gempol Village Community
The objectives of this activity are: 1) to improve people and LMDH officers’ understanding of PHBM 2) to promote active participation of the officers and the community in every LMDH activity related to PHBM operation in Gempol village.

The result obtained from the activity is the implementation of socialization by LMDH Wana Bersemi officers and Perhutani. Socialization was carried out both formally and informally in sub-villages around Gempol village.

10. Workshop: Evaluation of Participatory Forest Resources Sustainability at Village Level
Workshop on the Participatory Evaluation of Forest Resources Sustainability had the following objectives: 1) to enhance the capability of forest village people, as the forest manager in PHBM system by developing principles, criteria, and indicators for evaluating forest resource sustainability, 2) to enable the people to evaluate forest resource sustainability in a participatory way, 3) to enable the people in preparing a strategic plan to achieve sustainable forest resources (based on the evaluation results). The workshop was carried out in July 22-23, 2006. It was followed by a workshop on the formulation of follow up plan in September 9, 2006.

The workshop was facilitated by UGM facilitator team using the brainstorming, meta card, group discussion, and structured discussion methods. The participants include Perhutani, Gempol village government, LMDH Wana Bersemi officers, Gempol village PHBM Communication Forum, LMDH Wana Bersemi Cooperative officers, PKK, BPD, LKMD, Posyandu, and Forest Farmers Group.

The results of the workshop are: 1) A mutual agreement on the principles and criteria that will be used in evaluating forest resource sustainability in Tanggel village, 2) A participatory evaluation of forest resources sustainability by forest village people at the village level using the agreed criteria and indicators, 3) An agreement on a follow up plan to manage forest at village level based on the results of the participatory evaluation which will be incorporated into the 2007 PHBM Strategic Plan in Gempol village.

2.2.3. Workshop on Participatory Evaluation of Forest Resources Sustainability at KPH Randublatung Level
This workshop was carried out in September 30, 2006. The goals of the workshop were: 1) to present the results of the workshop on the Participatory Evaluation of Forest Resources
Sustainability, 2) to become a learning platform for various stakeholders on the participatory evaluation of forest resources sustainability.

The workshop was facilitated by UGM facilitator team using brainstorming and structured discussion methods. The workshop was attended by LMDH Wana Bersemi, LMDH Langgeng Jati, representatives of LMDH of KPH Randublatung, PHBM Communication Forum of PHBM at the village, sub-regency, and regency levels, village government of Tanggel and Gempol, Perhutani (KPH Randublatung, KBKPH of KPH Randublatung, representatives from forest rangers and plantation supervisors in the sub-forest district of Tanggel and Gempol.

The results obtained from the workshop are several agreements on: 1) The criteria and indicators which were used to evaluate the sustainability of forest resources by LMDH Wana Bersemi and LMDH Langgeng Jati should be improved, 2) the participatory evaluation of PHBM which had been carried out by LMDH Wana Bersemi and LMDH Langgeng Jati should be further developed for other LMDH in KPH Randublatung, 3) the participatory evaluation scheme of PHBM will be proposed to Perhutani Unit I, Central Java.
III. OPERATION PLAN FOR 2006-2007 (YEAR 4)

3.1. Expected results

As LPF Project consists of inter-connected activities, the activities in the fourth year would be an extension of the activities of the previous years. In general, the results achieved in the third year are: 1) LMDH has carried out routine meetings, 2) the accountability mechanism of LMDH to the community at village level has been established, 3) LMDH has improved its administrative and financial systems, 4) the capability of LMDH in negotiating with other parties has increased, 5) communication, coordination, and cooperation among village institutions has improved, 6) An agreement has been reached to specify LMDH member and the allocation of shared fund for forest farmers, 7) the knowledge of forest management has increased, 8) mutual agreement on the criteria and indicators for evaluating forest resources sustainability has been reached, 9) an evaluation on forest resources sustainability at the village level has been carried out, and 10) the capability of LMDH in formulating forest management plan has improved.

The planning of LPF Project activities for the fourth year is based on the achievements of the LPF Project in the third year and on the needs of each village of both KPH. Based on those considerations, LPF Project in the fourth year will implement its activities with the objectives: 1) to support PHBM implementation based on the achieved agreements, 2) to undertake monitoring and evaluation of the PHBM implementation at the village level, 3) to prepare the institutions for the implementation of PHBM at the village level. The fourth year activities in the four villages in KPH Pemalang and KPH Randublatung will focus on the Monitoring and Evaluation activities, and the Exit Plan.

In the fourth year of LPF project, it is expected that the implementation of forest management under PHBM will run based on the mutual agreements produced by various stakeholders. The foundation of this PHBM implementation is the participatory forest management plan prepared by LMDH and acknowledged by all stakeholders involved in PHBM in each village. During the fourth year of LPF project, it is also expected that LMDH together with other village institutions would be able to manage the forests using PHBM system independently in the absence of UGM facilitation.

3.2. Activities of the LPF Project in the fourth year

The activities of LPF project in the fourth year are:

1. Monitoring and Evaluation of the physical conditions of PHBM implementation, such as: (a) forest compartment for plantation, (b) the location of plantation maintenance, and (c) forest security.
2. Monitoring and Evaluation of the social conditions, such as: (a) Fairness in the distribution of benefit sharing, (b) The welfare of the member of LMDH cooperative and (c) Membership management of LMDH
3. Exit plan: as the pre-condition for phasing out, the activity will focus on preparing the institutions so that they can continue implementing PHBM activities at the village level beyond LPF project.

In Year 4, LPF Project will produce a LPF Tool Box so that the approach used by LPF Project in the research locations can be used and further developed for other LMDHs. The LPF Tool Box will pull together the experience of LPF team in implementing LPF Project in KPH Pemalang and KPH Randublatung, such as:

1. Developing LMDH organizations : Building Common Vision
2. Participatory Planning
3. Participatory Evaluation using the Criteria and Indicators framework.
4. Building Partnership among PP, LMDH, CF-PHBM, and other PHBM stakeholders

LPF activities in the fourth year in KPH Pemalang and KPH Randublatung will be carried out through workshops, trainings, FGDs and field supervisions (in the case of micro project). The detailed plan and the schedule of activities are described in the following table.
### Java Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation - Biophysics</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Micro project on “innovation on mix cropping: orange and neem”</td>
<td>Facilitate the development of forest management through active involvement of local community, such as the development of agreement for micro project between LMDH, Perhutani and third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Annual plan for Collaborative Forest Management, lead by the community (LMDH)</td>
<td>LMDH is able to develop manual plan, which presented to other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation - Social</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 LMDH membership management</td>
<td>Management of LMDH membership (database of LMDH member including forest farmers, identity card, and the right and responsibility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Capacity development on building village cooperative</td>
<td>Improve the management and administrative of the cooperative (including services, capital and financial report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit Plan</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Open discussion among stakeholder about tasks and roles of communication forum</td>
<td>To improve the capacity of communication forum to perform better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Development of information center</td>
<td>LMDH is able to provide information and better communicate about PBHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Facilitation training to local community</td>
<td>Improve community’s facilitation skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3. Lessons learned from the Monitoring and Evaluation processes in KPH Randublatung

1. It is important to pay attention to the different capacity and characteristics at the local level.
2. The community can take advantage of the processes facilitated by the LPF Project in the third year.
3. Transparent and fair communication among LPF Project team, Perhutani, and LMDH should be continuously promoted and maintained.
4. Community is able to express their aspirations in relation to the calculation of profit sharing, and the future prospect of profit sharing calculation process.
5. The improvement of the capacity and insight of the community are key to a successful forest management.

### Budget for Year 4 LPF Project Activities

The Budget planning for Year 4 activities can be found in the appendix.
Appendix 1

Levelling the Playing Field: Fair Partnership for Local Development to Improve the Forest Sustainability in Southeast Asia

Proceeding of the First Workshop on Participatory Development of the Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management
Glandang Village, Pemalang

University of the Philippines Los Banos (UPLB)
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1. Participant Registration

The workshop participants arrived at around 9AM. The participants were the representatives from different institutions: the LMDH (11 persons), forest farmers (2 persons), Village government (4 persons), village level PHBM Communication Forum (1 person), and Perhutani (8 persons). The composition of the workshop participants is listed in the table below.

Table 1. The composition of the participants and the gender distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhutani</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMDH</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.83</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum at the village level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLPS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prominent figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Opening

The workshop was opened at 09.30 AM by the LMDH chairman as the organizer. He mentioned the intention and the aim of the activity. He also apologized for the absence of the representatives of the agency and the delay start of the workshop. Moreover, the chairman LMDH also expressed his expectation that this activity would be useful for the PHBM implementation in Glandang Village, especially for forest farmers or forest user group.

The subsequent welcome address was delivered by the Glandang Village Head who asked those who are involved to follow-up the work as best they could. He also congratulated the formulation and implementation of PHBM evaluation in Glandang Village.

3. The formulation of the aim of the workshop

Method: Brainstorming

Before the participants of the workshop formulated the criteria and the indicators, UGM facilitator assessed the understanding of the participants of the intention and the aim of the evaluation. The method the facilitator used was brainstorming. The participants were asked to reveal quickly what evaluation was about and the aim of the evaluation. The participants expressed their views and agreed that an evaluation was: an assessment, measurement, and review. And the evaluation was carried out with the aim to: 1) assess how far the work program has been carried out, 2) review what has been achieved and what has not been achieved by the program so far; 3) come up with a new work program to improve the situation.
4. The introduction of the criteria and the indicators

Method: Game, Brainstorming

This session was meant to increase participants’ understanding of the principle, the criteria and the indicators. The participants were divided into groups to draw the conditions of the forest that is still in good conditions. The pictures drawn by the participants were brought together and the participants selected the best picture. The groups naturally considered the pictures drawn by their respective group as the best one because the pictures contained special characteristics. This showed that there were difference views among groups with regards to the assessment. After the game, the facilitator used brainstorming method to draw out the reasons used by the participants in evaluating the pictures. The measurements used in selecting the best picture, among others, were: the tree stands are numerous, there was diversity of the forest class, the success of the crop exceeded 90%, there was river, there were animals, the forest made the community more prosperous. The measurements generated from this exercise were afterwards labeled as the principle, the criteria and the indicators. The participants understood the principle, the criteria and the indicators as follows:

- Principles: values that are believed as the truth
- Criteria: signs
- Indicators: facts that could be measured

After the participants understood what is meant by principles, criteria and indicators, they were facilitated to understand the aim of developing principle, criteria and indicators of successful of PHBM implementation.

5. Formulation of the principles, criteria and indicators

Method: Brainstorming (individual)

In this exercise, the participants were asked to identify the principles, criteria and the indicators of forest management under the PHBM system at the village level. The participants could also say the available diversity in their territory as the indicators of sustainable forest management. The method used in this exercise was brainstorming, using metacards. Each participant was asked to write the measures that could indicate the success of the implementation PHBM. The measures mentioned by the participants include the following:

- The Board of LMDH could co-operate
- Planting system of forest user group is arranged
- Strive for the new work program
- Forest sustainability is increased
- Community awareness to forest
- Forest security is guaranteed
- Institutional system runs well
- Forest function does not change
- Awareness of the community of the forest function
- Responsibility and the role of the community
- Community cares for the forest
- Community does not submit to Perhutani in forest management
- Perhutani co-operates with LMDH
- Community’s needs are addressed
- The organization: administration, the meeting of the member, results of the work of the agency, communication between institution
- Communication with LMDH
- Institution solidarity in implementing PHBM
- Successful inter-cropping
• Cooperation between forest user groups.
• Forest user group carry out the task.
• Takes part in securing the established plantation.
• The mix-cropping is left 2 years after planting
• Cooperation between cooperatives
• Implementation of the work program that has been planned
• LMDH co-operates with Perhutani
• The final goals are sustainable forest and community welfare
• Coordination of forest user group with LMDH and Perhutani
• Coordination among forest farmers, LMDH and Perhutani
• LMDH’s vision and mission are met
• Forest farmers’ planting location is not permanent
• The firmness and the undisciplined of LMDH
• PHBM implementers fully understand what PHBM is about
• The plantation is planned properly
• Coordination between institutions.
• Management of LMDH work collectively
• Routine meeting of the board of LMDH
• Cooperation between Perhutani with LMDH from planning until the harvesting stage.
• Community around the forest lives in prosperous condition.
• Socialization around the forest community's
• Inter-institutional co-ordination between Perhutani and the village community
• Business, marketing, and harvest activities are well-coordinated
• Transparent work contract in all forest activities.
• Forest function is maintained.
• Access of the community to forest management.
• Mix-cropping system is implemented

6. Clustering the principles, criteria and indicators

The Method: plenary discussions

After the measurements of the assessment were gathered, through plenary discussions the participants distinguished whether each measurement can be categorized as criteria or indicators. The next step was to group the indicators in accordance with their criteria, and to group the criteria according to their principles. Finally, the principles were grouped according to their aspects: Ecology, Institutional, Economics, or Social.
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1. Participant Registration

The participants of the workshop started to arrive at 7PM. The participants were representatives of the PHBM institutions, such as LMDH (11 people), Forest User group (2 people), Village Government (4 people), PHBM communication forum at the village level (1 person), and Perhutani (8 people). The composition of the workshop participants is listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhutani</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMDH</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum at the Village level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLPS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prominent figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Review of the previous day

The workshop begun with the review of the outputs of the previous day. The facilitator used brainstorming method in facilitating the participants. Participants revealed the results of the formulated criteria and the indicators that were agreed in the previous day. The review was completed in 10 minutes.

Introducing the ranking and scoring system

Method: Game, brainstorming

After the criteria and the indicators are formulated, they need to be ranked and scored. Before the ranking and the scoring was done, the facilitator explained the difference between weight and value to the participants through a shopping game. The participants were divided into 3 groups. Each group was asked to spend Rp. 1,000,000.-. The groups were asked to compile, within 5 minutes, a shopping list and ranked them according to their interests.

The results of this exercise were that the priority of Group 1 was to buy rice, Group 2 was to get a motorcycle credit, Group 3 was to pay the children’s educational fee. The total money expenditure from all group discussion were not suited with the priority of groups needs.
The complete results of the groups’ discussions were:

Group I (Teguh Purnomo, Sri Budi Asih, Basir, Ekit Lukito, Sri Budi Asih).
The group planned to spend the money on the following items:

1. Rice : Rp 200,000,-
2. Shoes : Rp 100,000,-
3. Clothes : Rp 150,000,-
4. Cosmetics : Rp 50,000,-

The group planned to spend the money on the following items:

1. Bicycle : Rp 300,000,-
2. Uniform : Rp 150,000,-
3. Books : Rp 50,000,-

The group 3 (Warsito, Sri Budi P, Eni Suswati, Suratno).
The group planned to spend the money on the following items:

1. School fees : Rp 100,000,
2. Rice : Rp 300,000,-
3. Clothes : Rp 100,000,-

The facilitator, using brainstorming method, asked the participants to reflect on what they have done during the game. The aim of the reflection was to point out to the participants that:

- They have prioritized or ranked the items during the game, and it is important to rank and score the activity that will be carried out.
- Each process always pointed in the limited time
- To learn together with other people

As the results of the reflection, the participants could understand the difference between the ranking (prioritisation) and scoring.

3. The scale of ranking and scoring

The next stage was the ranking of the principle, the criteria and the indicators. Ranking was in accordance with level of interest or priority. The ranking was done to make the level regular, so as item in same level. The level covered each indicator in one criterion and each criterion in one principle. In the hierarchy, one principle can consist of one or several criteria, one criterion can consist of one or several indicators. One indicator can consist on one or several verifiers. The total weight of one principle is 100%, the total weight of the criteria in one principle is 100%, and the total weight of indicators in one criterion is 100%. If one indicator has more than one verifier, the total weight of those verifiers is also 100%.

The stage following the ranking was the assessment of the principles, criteria, and the indicators. With the presence of representatives from Perhutani and the provincial forestry department who provided the information and knowledge, the ranking and the assessment were done without much problem. The score that can be given for the criteria and indicators was between 1-5.

4. Output

The results of the assessment produced at the workshop were outlined below.

The participatory development of the criteria and indicators for the evaluation of
sustainable forest management in Glandang Village.

INSTITUTIONAL ASPECT

P.2  [B: 36] PHBM institution

K.2.1  [B:100] Equality between institutions involved in PHBM.

I.2.1.1  [B: 23] There is inter-institutional agreement in forest management.
   a. [N:5] The agreement is written and has legal aspect.
   b. [N:3] The agreement is written and does not have legal aspect.
   c. [N:1] The agreement is not written

I.2.1.2  [B: 20] There are efforts to share information and knowledge among institutions.

   V.2.1.2.1  The mechanism of information and knowledge sharing.
   a. [N:5] Verbal, written and being practiced
   b. [N:4] written and being practiced
   c. [N:3] verbal and being practiced
   d. [N:2] being practiced
   e. [N:1] written or being practiced

   V.2.1.2.2  [B: 17] The scope of information sharing (planning, planting, maintenance, harvesting, security).
   a. [N:5] 5 aspects
   b. [N:4] 4 aspects
   c. [N:3] 3 aspects
   d. [N:2] 2 aspects
   e. [N:1] 1 aspect

I.2.1.3  [B: 14] There is multi-stakeholder coordination
   a. [N:5] monthly
   b. [N:4] three monthly
   c. [N:3] per semester
   d. [N:2] yearly
   e. [N:1] not scheduled

I.2.1.4  [B: 11] There are inter-institutional meetings
   a. [N:5] 5x/month
   b. [N:4] 4x/month
   c. [N:3] 3x/month
   d. [N:2] 2x/month
   e. [N:1] 1x/month

I.2.1.5  [B:  8] There is a space for negotiation among institutions.
   a. [N:5] planning, planting, maintenance, harvesting, security
   b. [N:4] planning, planting, maintenance, security
   c. [N:3] planning, planting, security
   d. [N:2] harvesting, security
   e. [N:1] harvesting

I.2.1.6  [B:  8] Mechanisms for inter-institutional decision making.
   a. [N:5] consensus
   b. [N:3] voting
   c. [N:1] by force

I.2.1.7  [B:  5] Perhutani’s role as facilitator
   a. [N:5] runs well
   b. [N:3] in the process
   c. [N:1] does not run

I.2.1.8  [B:  2] The simplicity of the system and procedure in forest management.
   a. [N:5] decentralization at KRPH level
   b. [N:4] decentralization at BKPH level
   c. [N:3] decentralization at KPH level
   d. [N:2] decentralization at the unit/provincial level
   e. [N:1] centralized at the director’s level
P.3  [B: 28] Arrangements for the implementation of internal functions of the institution run well.

K.3.1  [B: 23] The process of establishing the institution

I.3.1.1  [B: 56] The initiator of the establishment of the institution.
   a. [N:5] the community
   b. [N:3] the community with the facilitation of other groups (NGO, university, etc)
   c. [N:1] Policy-makers (the government, Perhutani)

I.3.1.2  [B: 33] The legality of the institution.
   a. [N:5] has the legal status
   b. [N:3] in the process of getting a legal status
   c. [N:1] does not the legal status

I.3.1.3  [B: 11] There is an organizational structure that suits the needs.
   a. Satisfies the requirements
   b. meets some of the requirements
   c. does not meet the requirements

K.3.2  [B: 20] Membership in the institution

I.3.2.1  [B: 31] The clarity of the membership
   a. [N:5] is arranged in the internal rule
   b. [N:4] is arranged by the institutional agreement
   c. [N:3] is arranged by external agreement
   d. [N:2] is arranged with external rule
   e. [N:1] membership is not clear

I.3.2.2  [B: 25] The mechanisms for accepting members.
   a. [N:5] participatory
   c. [N:3] Through appointment
   d. [N:2] Unilateral acknowledgment
   e. [N:1] By force

I.3.2.3  [B: 19] The rights and responsibilities of the members.
   a. [N:5] There is a balance between rights and obligations
   b. [N:3] The obligations are bigger than the rights
   c. [N:1] The rights are bigger than the obligations

I.3.2.4  [B: 14] Participation of the members.

V.3.2.4.1  Motivation of the members.
   a. [N:5] Personal’s initiative
   b. [N:3] because of the invitation or influence of other person
   c. [N:1] Follow others

V.3.2.4.2  Level of participation.
   a. [N:5] bigger or equal to 80% participated
   b. [N:4] 60% – 79% participated
   c. [N:3] 40% - 59% participated
   d. [N:2] 20% - 39% participated
   e. [N:1] less than 20% participated

I.3.2.5  [B: 12] The percentage of the members.

V.3.2.5.1  The percentage of the members from the total number of forest farmers.
   a. [N:5] bigger or equal to 80%
   b. [N:4] 60% – 79%
   c. [N:3] 40% - 59%
   d. [N:2] 20% - 39%
   e. [N:1] less than 20%
V.3.2.5.2 The percentage of the member from the total number of villagers.
   a. [N:5] more than 70%
   b. [N:4] 60% – 69%
   c. [N:3] 50% - 59%
   d. [N:2] 40% - 49%
   e. [N:1] less than 40%

K.3.3 [B: 17] Leadership in the institution.
I.3.3.1 [B: 56] The limit of the leadership period
   a. [N:5] There is a limitation in accordance to the internal rule
   b. [N:3] There is a limitation, based on the agreement in the institution
   c. [N:1] No limitation
I.3.3.2 [B: 33] There is a regeneration process.
   a. [N:5] the process of regeneration is in accordance to ART
   b. [N:4] the process of regeneration in the leadership period in accordance to ART
   c. [N:3] the process of regeneration in the leadership period is not in accordance to ART
   d. [N:2] the process of regeneration in the leadership period is inappropriate with ART
   e. [N:1] there is no process of regeneration
I.3.3.3 [B: 11] The basis of selecting the leader.
   a. [N:5] capability
   b. [N:3] personage
   c. [N:1] blood line

I.3.4.1 [B: 23] The work program of the institution.
   a. There is a work program and has been carried out by all of them
   b. There is a work program and has been carried out by some
   c. There is a work program, in the process of the implementation
   d. There is a work program, but has not been carried out
   e. There is no a work program, is not planned
I.3.4.2 [B: 20] The frequency of regular meeting held by the institution
   a. monthly
   b. three monthly
   c. four monthly
   d. per semester
   e. not scheduled
I.3.4.3 [N:75] The officials understand their tasks and their functions.
   a. [N:5] The officials understand and apply the task and the function on the whole
   b. [N:4] Several officials understand and apply the tasks and the functions
   c. [N:3] The officials can't understand and apply the task and the function as a whole
   d. [N:2] The official less understand, and able to apply some task and function
   e. [N:1] The officials can't understand
   a. [N:5] all functions run well
   b. [N:3] some of the functions run well
   c. [N:2] does not run well
I.3.4.5 [B: 8] The mechanism for electing officials.
   a. [N:5] The election takes place in a democratic manner
   b. [N:3] voting
   c. [N:1] by means of appointment
I.3.4.6 [B: 8] There is a mechanism for decision making
K.3.5 [B: 11] The completeness of the administration
I.3.5.1 [B: 44] All activities in institution are documented
a. [N:5] All activities are documented
b. [N:4] Several activities are documented
c. [N:3] The activities are documented but not orderly
d. [N:2] in the process of the compilation
e. [N:1] is not documented
I.3.5.2 [B: 31] The documentation of membership (card/member book)
a. [N:5] more or equal to 80%
b. [N:4] 60% – 79%
c. [N:3] 40% - 59%
d. [N:2] 20% - 39%
e. [N:1] less than 20%
I.3.5.3 [B: 19] The existence of the information board at the secretariat.
a. [N:5] the board contains the name of the organization, organizational structure, potency of forest compartments, map of the village administered forest compartment, photographs of the activities.
b. [N:4] the board contains the name of the organization, organizational structure, potency of forest compartments, map of the village administered forest compartment
c. [N:3] the board contains the name of the organization, organizational structure, map of village administered forest compartment
d. [N:2] the boards contains of the name of the organization and organizational structure
e. [N:1] the board contains the name of the organization
I.3.5.4 [B: 6] The existence of the secretariat of the institution.
a. [N:5] the institution has its own secretariat
b. [N:4] co-secretariat with other agency
c. [N:3] piggyback other institution
d. [N:2] at the house of the official
e. [N:1] does not have a secretariate
K.3.6 [B: 8] communication
I.3.6.1 [B: 56] The mechanism for internal communication.
a. [N:5] is documented by all
b. [N:3] is documented by some
c. [N:1] is documented but not orderly
d. [N: ] in the process of the compilation
e. [N: ] is not documented
I.3.6.2 [B: 33] Transfer of information and knowledge within the institution.
a. [N:5] verbal and written
b. [N:3] written
c. [N:1] verbal
I.3.6.3 [B: 11] The meeting can accommodate all the members’ interests.
a. [N:5] accommodate all
b. [N:3] accommodate some interests
c. [N:1] does not accommodate
K.3.7 [B: 5] Basic internal rules of organization (ART).
I.3.7.1 [B: 75] There are basic internal rules of organization (ART)
a. [N:5] are documented
b. [N:3] in the formulation process
c. [N:1] do not exist

I.3.7.2 [B: 25] The internal rules are used as reference for the institution
a. [N:5] All are used as reference
b. [N:3] Some are used reference
c. [N:1] Not used as reference

K.3.8 [B: 5] The capacity of organization to develop network.

I.3.8.1 [B:100] Cooperate with other institutions
a. [N:5] Has co-operated and increased the organisation’s performance
b. [N:3] Has co-operated and not increased the performance
c. [N:1] In the process of developing the network

K.2.8 [B: 2] The understanding of the member about PHBM

I.2.8.1 [B:100] The level of the understanding of the member about PHBM
a. [N:5] more than 90%
b. [N:3] 75 – 89 %
c. [N:1] 60 – 74 %
d. [N:2] 45 – 59 %
e. [N:1] less than 45 %

ECOLOGY ASPECT

P.3 [B: 20] The physical balance and the environment of forest resources is increased

K.3.1 [B: 75] The continuity of forest function

I.3.1.1 [B: 12] The speed of which the empty land is planted.
a. [N:5] more than 80% of the empty land
b. [N:4] 61% - 80%
c. [N:3] 41% - 60%
d. [N:2] 21% - 40%
e. [N:1] 0 – 20%

I.3.1.2 [B: 11] The involvement of forest farmers in forest management.

V.3.1.2.1 [B: 44] The involvement in the planting process.
a. [N:5] all activities (land clearing, stake, hole making, planting, maintenance)
b. [N:4] land clearing, planting, maintenance
c. [N:3] land clearing, maintenance
d. [N:2] land clearing,
e. [N:1] stake and hole making, maintenance

V.3.1.2.2 [B: 31] The involvement in the maintenance process.
a. [N:5] all activity (pruning, forest cleaning, thinning)
b. [N:3] pruning, forest cleaning
c. [N:1] thinning

V.3.1.2.3 [B: 19] Initiative in securing the forest.
a. [N:5] Personal’s initiative
b. [N:3] upon the request of the outsider
c. [N:1] under the force of the outsider

V.3.1.2.4 [B: 6] The involvement in harvesting process (1. Tree census and volume estimation, 2. drying, 3. cutting, bucking and administering, 4. skidding, downloading, transportation, 5. forest protection).
a. [N:5] activity 1 - 5
b. [N:4] activity 1 - 4
c. [N:3] activity 1, 2, 4
d. [N:2] activity 1 and 2
e. [N:1] activity 5

I.3.1.3 [B: 9] The success of planting.
a. [N:5] more than 95%
b. [N:4] 90% - 95%
c. [N:3] 80% - 89%
d. [N:2] 70% - 79%
e. [N:1] 60% - 69%

I.3.1.4 [B: 8] Soil fertility is maintained.
a. [N:5] Fertile
b. [N:3] more infertile
c. [N:1] infertile

I.3.1.5 [B: 7] There is consideration and knowledge of the kind and the planting system that are suitable to the location.
a. [N:5] Has been appropriate to the structure of the land and the type of the crops.
c. [N:1] Appropriate to the kind of the crops.

I.3.1.6 [B: 5] Access to forest management for the community is guaranteed.
a. [N:5] Guaranteed by the legal rule (the certificate, AD/ART)
b. [N:3] Guaranteed by the policy of the local officials
c. [N:1] Guaranteed by the acknowledgment with the community

I.3.1.7 [B: 4] Level of forest destruction is reduced.
a. [N:5] more than 80%
b. [N:4] 60% - 79%
c. [N:3] 40% - 59%
d. [N:2] 20% - 39%
e. [N:1] less than 20%

I.3.1.8 [B: 2] The planting system.
a. [N:5] mix cropping
b. [N:3] daily labour
c. [N:1] hole

I.3.1.9 [B: 1] The use of suitable fertilizer.
a. [N:5] Organic fertilizer, chemical fertilizer
b. [N:3] Organic fertilizer
c. [N:1] chemical fertilizer

I.3.1.10 [B: 12] The maintenance of water spring.
a. [N:5] Maintained
b. [N:3] only some is maintained
c. [N:1] not maintained

I.3.1.11 [B: 11] The availability of water to fulfill the need of the community.
a. [N:5] Enough
b. [N:3] declining
c. [N:1] Not enough

a. [N:5] 24°c – 28°c
b. [N:3] 22°c – 24°c or 28°c - 30°c
c. [N:1] less than 22°c or more than 30°c

I.3.1.13 [B: 8] The diversity of the flora and the fauna is maintained.
a. [N:5] more than 25 kinds
b. [N:4] 20 – 24 kinds
c. [N:3] 15 – 19 kinds
d. [N:2] 10 – 14 kinds
e. [N:1] less than 10 kinds

K.3.2 [B: 25] The planning of forest management is done in a participatory manner.

I.3.2.1 [B: 56] Participatory planning covered all aspects of forest management including activities, schedule, and budget.
a. [N:5] all of aspect (activities, schedule, and budget)
b. [N:4] the activity and budget
c. [N:3] the activity and schedule
d. [N:2] activity only
e. [N:1] schedule only

V.3.2.1.1 [B: 33] Stakeholders engaged in the formulation of forest management plan.

a. [N:5] multistakeholder
b. [N:3] Two sides
c. [N:1] One side

V.3.2.1.2 [B: 11] Stakeholders engaged in the implementation of forest management plan.

a. [N:5] multistakeholder
b. [N:3] Two stakeholders
c. [N:1] One stakeholder

SOCIAL ASPECT
P.4 [B: 12] The strengthening of the community's capacity in forest management

K.4.1 [B: 44] The awareness of the community in forest management

I.4.1.1 [B: 44] The increase in the understanding of the community of PHBM

a. [N:5] higher than or equal to 80%
b. [N:4] 60% – 79%
c. [N:3] 40% - 59%
d. [N:2] 20% - 39%
e. [N:1] less than 20%

I.4.1.2 [B: 31] The values (religion, culture, law) held by the community promote forest conservation.

a. [N:5] promote effectively
b. [N:3] promote but not in a big way
c. [N:1] does not promote

I.4.1.3 [B: 19] The existing social organizations promote the awareness of the community in forest management.

a. [N:5] Social organizations have some positive influence
b. [N:3] Social organization support forest management
c. [N:1] Social organizations hinder forest management

I.4.1.4 [B: 6] The growth of local wisdom in forest management

a. [N:5] There is local wisdom and is nurtured
b. [N:3] there is local wisdom but not trusted
c. [N:1] there is local wisdom but is not nurtured

K.4.2 [B: 31] The mechanism for the conflict resolution in PHBM

I.4.2.1 [B:100] The mechanism for conflict resolution

a. [N:5] Negotiations take place in accordance to the law
b. [N:3] Done unilaterally
c. [N:1] By force

K.4.3 [B: 19] Land system

I.4.3.1 [B: 56] The clarity of the boundaries of the forest compartment.

a. [N:5] There is administrative clarity and the boundaries are marked in the field
b. [N:3] There is administrative clarity
c. [N:1] the boundaries are marked in the field

I.4.3.2 [B: 33] Fairness in the distribution of the forest compartment.

a. [N:5] Has a basis the administrative territory the village
b. [N:3] Has a basis the social condition (the nearness forest farmer or the security)
c. [N:1] Has a basis consideration of economics (the potential for the standing stock)

I.4.3.3 [B: 11] Fairness in the distribution of the crop land within the compartment.
  a. [N:5] Exists, and is in accordance to the internal rule
  b. [N:3] Exists, and is in accordance to the agreement
  c. [N:1] The existence of unilateral claim

K.4.4 [B: 6] Gender Issue

I.4.4.1 [B: 44] The involvement of women in PHBM
  a. [N:5] higher than or equal to 50%
  b. [N:4] 25% – 49%
  c. [N:3] 15% - 24%
  d. [N:2] 5% - 14%
  e. [N:1] less than 5%

I.4.4.2 [B: 31] Fair access for women in all aspects of forest management (planning, planting, maintenance, harvesting, security)
  a. [N:5] 5 aspects
  b. [N:4] 4 aspects
  c. [N:3] 3 aspects
  d. [N:2] 2 aspects
  e. [N:1] 1 aspect

I.4.4.3 [B: 19] The acknowledgement of the roles of women in forest management
  a. [N:5] The rights and the obligations are balanced
  b. [N:3] The obligations are higher than the rights
  c. [N:1] The rights are bigger than the obligations

I.4.4.4 [B: 6] Fairness in labor wage in forest management activities.
  a. [N:5] The work pay is appropriate to the work load
  b. [N:3] The work pay is based on the local standard
  c. [N:1] The work pay is set unilaterally

ECONOMIC ASPECT

P.5 [B: 4] The welfare of the community is guaranteed

K.5.1 [B: 56] Benefit sharing allocation between Perhutani and LMDH.

I.5.1.1 [B: 11] Benefit sharing allocation is carried out in accordance to the internal LMDH rule
  a. [N:5] Arranged in the internal rule
  b. [N:3] Arranged by institution agreement
  c. [N:1] Arranged by the board of the institution

I.5.1.2 [B: 56] The allocation of the profit-sharing from Perhutani to LMDH is in accordance to their respective contribution
  a. [N:5] Appropriate
  b. [N:3] Not yet appropriate
  c. [N:1] inappropriate

I.5.1.3 [B: 33] There is transparency in the calculation of the profit sharing
  a. [N:5] calculation is done by multistakeholders
  b. [N:3] calculation is done by the two parties
  c. [N:1] calculation is done by one party.

K.5.2 [B: 33] The marketing of inter-cropping products

I.5.2.1 [B:100] There is a system that promote the marketing of inter-cropping products
  a. [N:5] Marketing to small traders
  b. [N:3] marketing in the traditional market
  c. [N:1] marketing to the brokers

K.5.3 [B: 11] Alternative economic activity is increased
I.5.3.1  [B:100] The emergence of home industry from the processing of non timber forest products.
   a. [N:5] More than 10 types of home industries emerged
   b. [N:3] 5 - 10 types of home industries emerged
   c. [N:1] Less than 5 types of home industries emerged
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1. Participant Registration

The participants of the workshop began to show up at 08 o'clock. They were the participants who participated in the previous day. The composition of the workshop participants is listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhutani</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMDH</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum at the village level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLPS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key person</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Review the workshop of the previous day

The workshop was begun by reviewing the outputs of previous day. The facilitator used the brainstorming method. The participants revealed the criteria and indicators that were agreed in the previous day. The review took around 10 minutes only.

3. The Evaluation of Forest Management under PHBM System.

This was the core of the workshop which took place after the participants reviewed yesterday’s activities. The evaluation took place in two steps. The first step involved dividing the participants according to their institutions for data verification purposes. The step second was done in a plenary so other institutions could provide their inputs. There were several differences in which the institution assessed the conditions, such as:

- The speed in which the empty land is planted.
- The involvement of forest user group in forest management: Perhutani gave the score of 5 while LMDH gave the score of 2, and after cross check

The standard scoring system for the assessment that was agreed by the participants was:

- Score less than 1 : very poor
- Score of 1 – 2 : poor
- Score of higher than 2 and less than 3 : sufficient
- Score of 3 – 4 : good
- Score of higher than 4 and less than 5 : very good
The total score generated during the evaluation of sustainable forest management in Glandang village was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Output of Evaluation</th>
<th>Perfect score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>The balance between the environment of forest resources</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Cooperation between institution</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrangements for the implementation of internal functions of the institution run well.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>The welfare of the community is guaranteed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>The strengthening of the community’s capacity in the forest management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total score given by the participants was 3.21. There was still a difference of 1.79 that still needs to be pursued by Glandang village in the management of the forest.

4. Follow-up Plan

A follow-up plan was formulated after the result of the evaluation was produced. The results of the evaluation were analyzed so as the institutions understand the things that have been done or achieved so far and which issues that must be improved in the future. The results of the analysis were used to formulate the follow-up plan (RTL). The follow-up plan includes the next evaluation of the activities listed in the plan. The follow-up plan specifies the evaluation time, activities that will be carried out, activities that must be enhanced, and appoints the evaluation team. The future plan of PHBM in Glandang Village include:

1. Undertake the plans specified in the forest management plan based on the joint forest compartment of LMDH Glandang in the period 2005 – 2014.
2. Increase communication and coordination among PHBM institutions by holding quarterly meetings.
3. Enhance community’s economy by engaging them in marketing, i.e. as traders.

5. Closing Ceremony

The workshop was closed by the chairman. He expressed his gratitude that the evaluation of forest management under PHBM system in Glandang village took place successfully. He hoped that the results of the evaluation would encourage relevant stakeholders to move forward and improve forest management.
The list of participants of the criteria and indicators workshop at Glandang village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sri Budi Priyanto</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ali Murtopo</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ekit Lukito</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tasori</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rasmono</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supandi</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yahyo</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suratno</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dukhaeri</td>
<td>Communication Forum of PHBM at village level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tarono</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dakir</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Takwid</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sudarno</td>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum at village level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Agus Winata</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Budi Pranoto</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ali Murtadho</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Didit D.S.</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Anis Riyanto</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teguh Purnomo</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Basir</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Herniwati</td>
<td>PLPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Eni Suswanti</td>
<td>Village government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Maisah</td>
<td>BPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Warsito</td>
<td>Prominent figure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Participant Registration

The workshop participants arrived at around 09 a.m. The participants were representatives of LMDH (4 persons), Forest User group (3 persons), LPMD (1 person), village level PHBM Communication Forum (4 persons), Perhutani (3 persons), PLPS (1 persons). There was no representative from the village government. The composition of the workshop participants is listed in the following table.

Table 1. The composition and gender distribution of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPMD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhutani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMDH</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village level Communication Forum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLPS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Farmer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Opening Ceremony

The workshop was opened at 10.00 AM by the LMDH chairman as the organizer. He explained the intention and the aim of the activity. He also apologized for the absence of the representatives of the agency and the delay start of the workshop. Moreover, the chairman LMDH also expressed his expectation that this activity would be useful for the PHBM implementation in Glandang Village, especially for forest farmers or forest user group. The chairman LMDH requested the participants to participate fully because the workshop is strategic for several reasons: 1) LMDH Wanajaya, Surajaya Village had been considered by the Unit I Central Java as a representative of KPH Pemalang but its performance was considered poor, 2) LMDH Wanajaya of Surajaya Village also tried to formulate the criteria and indicator-based participatory evaluation of PHBM which could be used as a reference by other LMDHs.

3. The formulation of the aim of the workshop

Method: Brainstorming

The facilitator explored the participants’ understanding of the intention and the aim of the evaluation. The method the facilitator used was brainstorming. The participants were asked to reveal quickly what evaluation was about and the aim of the evaluation. The participants expressed their views and agreed that an evaluation was: an assessment, measurement, and
review. And the evaluation was carried out with the aim to: 1) assess how far the work program has been carried out, 2) review what has been achieved and what has not been achieved by the program so far; 3) come up with a new work program to improve the situation.

4. The introduction of the criteria and the indicators

Method: Game, Brainstorming

This session aimed to increase participants’ understanding of the principle, the criteria and the indicators. The participants were divided into groups to draw the conditions of the forest that is still in good conditions. The pictures drawn by the participants were brought together and the participants selected the best picture. The groups naturally considered the pictures drawn by their respective group as the best one because the pictures contained special characteristics. This showed that there were difference views among groups with regards to the assessment. After the game, the facilitator used brainstorming method to draw out the reasons used by the participants in evaluating the pictures. The measurements used in selecting the best picture, among others, were: the tree stands are numerous, there was diversity of the forest class, the success of the crop exceeded 90%, sand mining activities, existence of the graveyard of the village elders, there was river, there were animals, existence of mix-cropping activities. The measurements generated from this exercise were afterwards labeled as the principle, the criteria and the indicators. The participants understood the principle, the criteria and the indicators as follows:

Principles : values that are believed as the truth
Criteria : signs
Indicators : facts that could be measured

After the participants understood what is meant by principles, criteria and indicators, they were facilitated to understand the aim of developing principle, criteria and indicators of successful of PHBM implementation.

5. Formulation of the principles, criteria and indicators

Method : Brainstorming

In this exercise, the participants were asked to identify the principles, criteria and the indicators of forest management under the PHBM system at the village level. The participants could also say the existing diversity in their territory as the indicators of sustainable forest management. The method used in this exercise was brainstorming, using metacards. Each participant was asked to write the measurement that could indicate the success of the implementation PHBM. The participants mentioned the following:

- Forest protection is declined
- timber theft
- land destruction
- existence of the sand excavation
- Benefit sharing for the village development
- Routine meeting
- Diversity of the flora and fauna
- Water requirement is met
- Efforts outside the forestry sector
- LMDH membership book exists
- Co-operation with other institutions
- livestock feed is available in the dry season
- The results of mix-cropping is increased
6. Clustering the principles, criteria and indicators

The Method: plenary discussions

After the measurements were gathered, through plenary discussions the participants
distinguished whether each measurement can be categorized as criteria or indicators. The next step was to cluster the indicators in accordance with their criteria, and to group the criteria according to their principles. Finally, the principles were grouped according to their aspects: Ecology, Institutional, Economics, or Social.
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1. Participant Registration

The participants of the workshop started to arrive at 9 o'clock. The participants of this workshop were the same with those who attended the previous workshop. The composition of the workshop participants is listed in the table below.

Table 1. The composition of the participants and the gender distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPMD</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhutani</td>
<td>3 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMDH</td>
<td>7 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum at Village Level</td>
<td>4 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLPS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Farmer</td>
<td>3 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong> 95</td>
<td><strong>1</strong> 5</td>
<td><strong>16</strong> 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Review of the previous day

The workshop began with the review of the outputs of the previous day. The facilitator used brainstorming method in facilitating the participants. The participants were asked to reflect on the discussed and the outcome of the previous day workshop.

3. Introducing Rank and Scoring

Method: Plenary Discussion

The participants were divided into 3 groups. Each group was asked to spend Rp. 1,000,000,-. The groups were asked to compile, within 5 minutes, a shopping list and ranked them according to their interests.

4. Introducing Rank and Scoring

Method: Plenary Discussion

The participants as a whole were asked to decide how to spent a total of Rp 500,000,-. They were asked to discuss among themselves how to allocate the money according to their needs. The results of discussions were:

Pay the school fee Rp 200,000,-
Buy rice Rp 100,000,-
Buy other household requirements Rp 100,000,-
Buy school uniform Rp 100,000,-

The facilitator explained to the participants that prioritization of the above items represents weight, while the amount allocated for each item represents the value or the score.

5. The scale of ranking and scoring

The next stage was the ranking of the principle, the criteria and the indicators. Ranking was in accordance with the level of interest or priority.

The ranking was done to make the level regular, so as item in same level. The level covered each indicator in one criterion and each criterion in one principle. In the hierarchy, one principle can consist of one or several criteria, one criterion can consist of one or several indicators. One indicator can consist of one or several verifiers. The total weight of one principle is 100%, the total weight of the criteria in one principle is 100%, and the total weight of indicators in one criterion is 100%. If one indicator has more than one verifier, the total weight of those verifiers is also 100%.

The stage following the ranking was the assessment of the principles, criteria, and the indicators. With the presence of representatives from Perhutani and the provincial forestry department who provided the information and knowledge, the ranking and the assessment were done without much problem. The score that can be given for the criteria and indicators was between 1-5.

6. Output

The participatory development of the criteria and indicators for the evaluation of sustainable forest management in Surajaya Village.

(N: 3.884) the sustainable forest management (SFM)

ECOLOGY ASPECT

P.1 [B: 20] The physical balance and the environment of forest resources is increased
K.1.1 [B: 75] Continuity of forest function
   I.1.1.1 [B: 12] The speed of which the empty land is planted.
      a. [N:5] more than 80% of the empty land
      b. [N:4] 61% - 80%
      c. [N:3] 41% - 60%
      d. [N:2] 21% - 40%
      e. [N:1] 0 – 20%
   I. 1.1.1 [B: 23] The success of planting
      a. [N:5] Growth percentage of > 90 %
      b. [N:4] Growth percentage of 81-90 %
      c. [N:3] Growth percentage of 71-80 %
      d. [N:2] Growth percentage of 61-70 %
      e. [N:1] Growth percentage of 51-60 %
   I.1.1.2 [B: 20] The level of timber theft
      a. [N:5] 0 – 8 %
      b. [N:4] 9 – 16 %
      c. [N:3] 17 – 24 %
      d. [N:2] 25 – 32 %
      e. [N:1] 33 – 40 %
   I.1.1.3 [B: 17] The extent of forest destruction (for example: sand mining) is reduced
      a. [N:5] 0 - 2 Ha
      b. [N:4] >2 - 4 Ha
      c. [N:3] >4 - 6 Ha
The area of the empty land in comparison with the area of forest compartment

- 0 - 2% (5)
- 2.1 – 4 % (4)
- 4.1 – 6 % (3)
- 6.1 – 8 % (2)
- 8.1 – 10 % (1)

Diversity of forest class

- KU I, II, III, IV, V, TJKL, TK (5)
- KU I, III, V, TJKL, TK (4)
- KU III, IV, TJKL, TK (3)
- KU I, II, TK (2)
- KU I, TJKL, TK (1)

The existence of water springs

- Is maintained (5)
- Only some is maintained (3)
- Is not maintained (1)

The availability of water to fulfill the need of the community

- Sufficient (5)
- Can meet the need of some members only (3)
- Not sufficient (1)

The diversity of the flora and the fauna is increased

- >10 species of flora/fauna (5)
- 5 – 10 species of flora/fauna (3)
- < 5 species of flora/fauna (1)

Co-operation between institutions

- The agreement is written and has legal aspect (5)
- The agreement is written and does not have legal aspect (3)
- The agreement is not written (1)
I.2.1.2  [B: 20]  Coordination with government agency or other institutions related to PHBM
   a. [N:5]  monthly
   b. [N:4]  3 monthly
   c. [N:3]  6 monthly
   d. [N:2]  yearly
   e. [N:1]  is not scheduled

I.2.1.3.  [B: 17]  There are routine meetings among institutions
   a. [N:5]  >12 times in a year
   b. [N:4]  9-11 times in a year
   c. [N:3]  5-7 times in a year
   d. [N:2]  2-4 times in a year
   e. [N:1]  once in a year

I.2.1.4.  [B: 14]  Learning process among among institutions in PHBM
   V.I.2.1.4.1  [B: 56]  the willingness to share information in the learning process
      a. [N:5]  often
      b. [N:3]  sometimes
      c. [N:1]  not at all
   V.I.2.1.4.2  [B: 33]  The mechanism to share information in the learning process
      a. [N:5]  verbal, written, and hands-on
      b. [N:4]  verbal and hands-on
      c. [N:3]  written and hands-on
      d. [N:2]  hands-on
      e. [N:1]  verbal/written
   V.I.2.1.4.3  [B: 11]  The scope of information sharing (planning, planting, maintenance, harvesting, security).
      a. [N:5]  5 aspects
      b. [N:4]  4 aspects
      c. [N:3]  3 aspects
      d. [N:2]  2 aspects
      e. [N:1]  1 aspect

I.2.1.5  [B: 11]  There is a space for negotiation among institutions.
   a. [N:5]  planning, planting, maintenance, harvesting, security
   b. [N:4]  planning, planting, maintenance, security
   c. [N:3]  planning, planting, security
   d. [N:3]  harvesting and security
   e. [N:1]  harvesting

I.2.1.6  [B: 8]  Mechanisms for inter-institutional decision making
   a. [N:5]  consensus
   b. [N:3]  voting
   c. [N:1]  by force

I.2.1.7  [B: 5]  Perhutani's role as facilitator
   a. [N:5]  runs well
   b. [N:3]  in the process
   c. [N:1]  does not run

I.2.1.8  [B: 2]  The simplicity of the system and procedure in forest management.
   a. [N:5]  decentralization at KRPH level
   b. [N:4]  decentralization at BKPH level
   c. [N:3]  decentralization at KPH level
   d. [N:2]  decentralization at the unit/provincial level
   e. [N:1]  Centralized at the director's level

P.3  [B: 28]  Arrangements for the implementation of internal functions of the institution run well

K.3.1  [B: 23]  The process of establishing the institution
I.3.1.1  [B: 75] The initiator of the establishment of the institution
   a. [N:5] The community
   b. [N:3] The community with the facilitation of other groups (NGO, university, etc)
   c. [N:1] Policy maker (government, Perhutani)
   a. [N:5] has legal status
   b. [N:3] in the process of getting a legal status
   c. [N:1] does not have legal status
K.3.2  [B: 20] Membership in the institution
I.3.2.1  [B: 31] the clarity of the membership
   a. [N:5] is arranged in the internal rule
   b. [N:4] is arranged by the institutional agreement
   c. [N:3] is arranged by the external agreement
   d. [N:2] is arranged with the external rule
   e. [N:1] membership is not clear
I.3.2.2  [B: 25] The percentage of LMDH members from the total population
   a. [N:5] > 80%
   b. [N:4] 60% – 79%
   c. [N:3] 40% - 59%
   d. [N:2] 20% - 39%
   e. [N:1] < 20%
I.3.2.3  [B: 19] The mechanism for accepting members
   a. [N:5] participatory
   b. [N:3] unilateral acknowledgment
   c. [N:1] by force
I.3.2.4  [B: 14] the rights and responsibilities of the members
   a. [N:5] are arranged in the internal rule
   b. [N:3] are arranged by the institutional agreement
   c. [N:1] the rights and responsibilities are not clear
I.3.2.5  [B: 12] Participation of the members
   a. [N:5] > 80% participated
   b. [N:4] 60% – 79% participated
   c. [N:3] 40% - 59% participated
   d. [N:2] 20% - 39% participated
   e. [N:1] < 20% participated
I.3.2.6  [B: 3] The PHBM understanding of the members
   a. [N:5] > 90% of members understand
   b. [N:4] 75% – 89% of members understand
   c. [N:3] 60% - 74% of members understand
   d. [N:2] 45% - 39% of members understand
   e. [N:1] < 45% of members understand
K.3.3  [B: 17] Type of leadership
I.3.3.1  [B: 75] There is regeneration process
   a. [N:5] the process of regeneration is in accordance to ART
   b. [N:4] the process of regeneration in the leadership period is in accordance to ART
   c. [N:3] the process of regeneration in the leadership period is not in accordance to ART
   d. [N:2] the process of regeneration in the leadership period is inappropriate with ART
   e. [N:1] there is no regeneration process
I.3.3.2  [B: 25] The type of institutional leadership
   a. [N:5] capability
   b. [N:3] personage
c. [N:1] blood line

K.3.4 [B: 14] The management of the institution
   I.3.4.1 [B: 23] The structure of the organization that is in accordance with the needs
      a. Meets the needs
      b. Partially meets the needs
      c. Does not meet the needs

I.3.4.2 [B: 20] The work program of the institution
   V.3.4.2.1 [N:75] The existence of the work program
      a. [N:5] documented
      b. [N:4] Exists but not documented
      c. [N:3] in the process of formulation
      d. [N:2] the work program is unplanned
      e. [N:1] the work program does not exist
   V.3.4.2.1 [N:25] The period covered by the work program
      a. [N:5] 6 – 10 years
      b. [N:3] 3 - 5 years
      c. [N:2] 1 – 2 years

I.3.4.3 [B: 17] there is routine meeting of the institution
   a. [N:5] monthly
   b. [N:4] 3 monthly
   c. [N:3] 6 monthly
   d. [N:2] yearly
   e. [N:1] unscheduled

I.3.4.5. [B: 14] each officials understand their duty and function
   a. [N:5] understood and work fluently
   b [N:3] understood but not work fluently
   c. [N:1] didn't understand but work fluently

I.3.4.6 [B: 14] The management functions well.
   a. [N:5] all functions run well
   b. [N:3] some functions run well
   [N:1] does not run well

I.3.4.7 [B: 8] The mechanism for electing officials
   a. [N:5] The election takes place in a democratic manner
   b [N:3] voting
   c. [N:1] by means of appointment

I.3.4.8 [B: 8] There is a mechanism for decision making
   a. [N:5] deliberation to achieve consensus
   b. [N:3] voting
   c. [N:1] by force

I.3.4.9 [B: 3] The frequency of field activity
   a. [N:5] >10 time/month
   b. [N:4] 7-10 times/month
   c. [N:3] 5-6 times/month
   d. [N:2] 3-4 times/month
   e. [N:1] <2 times/month

K.3.5 [B: 11] The completeness of the administration and secretariat
   I.3.5.1 [B: 44] Documentation of the activities
      a. [N:5] Exists, documented
      b. [N:3] In the process
      c. [N:1] Does not exist

I.3.5.2 [B: 31] The documentation of membership (card/member book)
      a. [N:5] > 80%
      b. [N:4] 60% – 79%
      c. [N:3] 40% - 59%
d. [N:2] 20% - 39%
e. [N:1] < 20%

I.3.5.3  [B: 19] The secretariat of the institution
a. [N:5] the institution has its own secretariat
b. [N:4] co-secretariat with other agency
c. [N:3] piggyback other institution
d. [N:2] at the house of official
e. [N:1] does not have a secretariat

I.3.5.4  [B: 6] The existence of the information board at the secretariat.
a. [N:5] the board contains the name of the organization, organizational structure, potency of forest compartments, map of the village administered forest compartment, photographs of the activities.
b. [N:4] the board contains the name of the organization, organizational structure, potency of forest compartments, map of the village administered forest compartment
c. [N:3] the board contains the name of the organization, organizational structure, map of village administered forest compartment
d. [N:2] the boards contains of the name of the organization and organizational structure
e. [N:1] the board contains the name of the organization

K.3.6  [B: 8] communication
I.3.6.1  [B: 56] the mechanism for internal communication
a. [N:5] routine meeting
b. [N:3] informal communication
c. [N:1] communication through media

I.3.6.2  [B: 33] The mechanism to share information and knowledge
a. [N:5] Verbal and written
b. [N:3] written
c. [N:1] Verbal

I.3.6.3  [B: 11] The meeting can accommodate all the members’ interests.
a. [N:5] accommodate all
b. [N:3] accommodate some interests
c. [N:1] Does not accommodate

K.3.7  [B: 5] Basic internal rules of organization (ART)
I.3.7.1  [B: 75] There are basic internal rules of organization (ART)
a. [N:5] exist and have been legalized
b. [N:3] exist but have not been legalized
c. [N:1] the rules are being formulated

I.3.7.2  [B: 25] Basic internal rules are used as reference for the institution
a. [N:5] All are used as reference
b. [N:3] Some are used as reference
c. [N:1] Not used as reference

K.3.8  [B: 5] The capacity of organization to develop network.
I.3.8.1  [B:100] Cooperation with other organization
a. [N:5] Has co-operated and increased the organisation’s performance
b. [N:3] Has co-operated and not increased the performance
c. [N:1] In the process of developing the network

ECONOMIC ASPECT
P.4  [B: 4] The welfare of the community is guaranteed
K.4.1.  Benefit sharing allocation between LMDH and Perhutani
I.4.1.1  [B: 56] The percentage of the benefit sharing achieved
a. [N:5] 25 %
b. [N:4] 20 – 24 %
c. [N:3] 15 – 19 %
d. [N:2] 10 – 14 %
e. [N:1] 5 – 9 %

I.4.1.2 [B: 56] There is transparency in the calculation of the profit sharing
a. [N:5] calculation is done by multistakeholders
b. [N:3] calculation is done by the two parties
c. [N:1] calculation is done by one party.

I.4.1.3 [B: 33] The allocation of the profit-sharing is carried out in accordance with the notary's certificate
a. [N:5] appropriated
b. [N:3] it is not fully appropriate
c. [N:1] inappropriate

K.4.2 [B: 33] The allocation of the internal LMDH benefit-sharing

I.4.2.1 [B: 75] There was the transparency about counting for profit sharing
a. [N:5] The counting was carried out by many parties
b. [N:3] The counting was carried out by two parties
c. [N:1] The counting was carried out by one parties

I.4.2.2 [B: 25] Benefit sharing allocation is carried out in accordance to the institutional rule
a. [N:5] Arranged in the internal rule
b. [N:3] Arranged by institution agreement
c. [N:1] Arranged by the officials

K.4.3 [B: 11] Income of the community is increased

I.4.3.1 [B:44] The utilization of the land for mix-cropping
a. [N:5] > 80% of the total forest compartment area is used for mix-cropping
b. [N:4] 60% – 79% of the total forest compartment area
c. [N:3] 40% - 59% of the total forest compartment area
d. [N:2] 20% - 39% of the total forest compartment area
e. [N:1] < 20% of the total forest compartment area

I.4.3.2 [B:31] The land is managed effectively
a. [N:5] Suits the soil structure and crops
b. [N:3] Suits the soil structure
c. [N:1] Suits the crops

I.4.3.3 [B: 11] The emergence of home industry from the processing of non timber forest products.

S O C I A L A S P E C T

P.5 [B: 12] The strengthening of the community's capacity in forest management
K.5.1 [B: 44] The awareness of the community in forest resource management

I.5.1.1 [B: 36] The increase of the community's understanding of PHBM
a. [N:5] Increase in quality and quantity.
b. [N:3] Increase in quality
c. [N:1] Increase in quantity

I.5.1.2 [B: 28] Participation of the community in forest management
a. [N:5] Personal’s initiative
b. [N:3] under the invitation or the influence of the other person  
c. [N:1] Follow others

I.5.1.3 [B: 20] The values (religion, culture, law) held by the community promote forest conservation.
   a. [N:5] promote effectively  
b. [N:3] promote but not in a big way  
c. [N:1] does not promote

I.5.1.4 [B: 12] The existing social organizations promote the awareness of the community in forest management.
   a. [N:5] promote effectively  
b. [N:3] promote but not in a big way  
c. [N:1] do not promote

I.5.1.5 [B: 4] The growth of local wisdom in forest management
   a. [N:5] Exist and is nurtured  
b. [N:3] Exist and is not nurtured  
c. [N:1] Does not exist

K.5.2 [B: 31] The mechanism for conflict resolution in PHBM

I.5.2.1 [B:100] The mechanism for conflict resolution in PHBM
   a. [N:5] Negotiations take place in accordance to the law  
b. [N:3] Through consensus  
c. [N:1] By force

K.5.3 [B: 19] Land system

I.5.3.1 [B: 75] The clarity of the boundaries of the forest compartment
   a. [N:5] There is administrative clarity and the boundaries are marked in the field  
b. [N:3] There is administrative clarity  
c. [N:1] the boundaries are marked in the field

I.5.3.1 [B: 11] Fairness in the distribution of the forest compartment.
   a. [N:5] The distribution is done in accordance to the rules  
b. [N:3] The distribution is done in accordance to the agreement  
c. [N:1] The distribution is done not in accordance to the rules and agreement

K.5.4 [B: 6] The women role in forest management

I.5.4.1 [B: 44] The acknowledgment towards the role of women in forest management
   a. [N:5] Exists as a whole  
b. [N:3] Exists partially  
c. [N:1] Does not exist

I.5.4.2 [B: 31] [B: 44] The involvement of women in PHBM
   a. [N:5] > 30%  
b. [N:4] 25% – 30%  
c. [N:3] 20% - 24%  
d. [N:2] 15% - 19%  
e. [N:1] < 15%

I.5.4.3 [B: 19] Fair access for women in forest management
   a. [N:5] Exists as a whole  
b. [N:3] partially  
c. [N:1] Does not exist

I.5.4.3 [B: 6] Fairness in labor wage in forest management
   a. [N:5] The work pay is appropriate to the work load and hours  
b. [N:3] The work pay is appropriate to the work load  
c. [N:1] The work pay is appropriate to the work hours
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1. Participant Registration

Participants of the workshop began arriving at the venue at 0900 WIB. They were the same participants who attended the previous day workshop. The composition of the workshop participants is listed in the following table.

Table 1. The composition of the participants and the gender distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPMD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhutani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMDH</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village level PHBM Communication Forum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Farmer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The previous day review

The workshop was begun by reviewing the outputs of previous day. The facilitator used the brainstorming method. The participants revealed the criteria and indicators that were agreed in the previous day. This exercise only took around 10 minutes.

3. The Evaluation of Forest Management under PHBM System.

This was the core of the workshop which took place after the participants reviewed yesterday’s activities. The evaluation took place in two steps. The first step involved dividing the participants according to their institutions for data verification purposes. The second step was done in a plenary so other institutions could provide their inputs. There were several differences in which the institution assessed the conditions, such as:

1. The extent of forest destruction
2. The involvement of forest user groups in the forest management.
3. Transparency of the benefit-sharing provided by Perhutani to LMDH

The standard scoring system for the assessment that was agreed by the participants was:

- Score less than 1 : very poor
- Score of 1 – 2 : poor
- Score of higher than 2 and less than 3 : sufficient
- Score of 3 – 4 : good
The total score generated during the evaluation of sustainable forest management in Surajaya village is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>score</th>
<th>output of Evaluation</th>
<th>Perfect score</th>
<th>differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>The balance between and the environment of forest resources</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Cooperation between institution</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrangements for the implementation of internal functions of the institution run well.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>The welfare of the community is guaranteed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>The strengthening of the community's capacity in forest management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total score given by the participants was 3.88. There was still a difference of 1.12 that still needs to be pursued by Surajaya village in the management of the forest.

4. Follow-up Plan

A follow-up plan was formulated after the result of the evaluation was produced. The results of the evaluation were analyzed so as the institutions understand the things that have been done or achieved so far and which issues that must be improved in the future. The results of the analysis were used to formulate the follow-up plan (RTL). The follow-up plan includes the next evaluation of the the activities listed in the plan. The follow-up plan specifies the evaluation time, activities that will be carried out, activities that must be enhanced, and appoints the evaluation team. The future plan of PHBM in Surajaya Village include:

1. Undertake the plans specified in the forest management plan based on the joint forest compartment of LMDH Surajaya in the period 2005 – 2014.
2. Increase communication and coordination among PHBM institutions by holding quarterly meetings.
3. Enhance community’s economy by engaging them in marketing, i.e. as traders.

5. Closing Ceremony

The workshop was closed by the chairman of LMDH. He expressed his gratitude that the evaluation of forest management under PHBM system in Surajaya village took place successfully. He hoped that the results of the evaluation would be used as a stepping stone for relevant stakeholders to improve forest management.
Appendix 7

Levelling the Playing Field: Fair Partnership for Local Development to Improve the Forest Sustainability in Southeast Asia

Workshop Formulation of Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management
LMDH Langgeng Jati, Tanggel Village, Randublatung

University of the Philippines Los Banos (UPLB)
Centre de Cooperation Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Developpment (CIRAD)
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Workshop Formulation of Criteria and Indicator for Sustainable Forest Management
LMDH Langgeng Jati, Tanggel Village, Randublatung

A. Time of the workshop
The workshop was carried out on Thursday, 20 July 2006

B. Location
The workshop was held at the office of Tanggel Village Government

C. Participant
The workshop was attended by 16 people. The list of participants is provided in the table below.

Table 1. List of participants of the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication Forum on PHBM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Religious Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sub-village Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Perhutani Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Facilitators
The facilitators of the workshop were Wahyu Tri Widayati, Ambar Astuti and A. Novenanto

E. The Goals of Workshop:

1. The participants can formulate the principle, criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management in Tanggel Village area
2. Community members understand the process of formulating the principle, criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management
3. Stakeholders recognise that evaluation models of forest sustainability is formulated by the parties
F. Workshop Processes

F.1. Formulation of the Goal of the Evaluation
Wahyu Tri Widayati asked the participants to formulate the aims of the PHBM evaluation, i.e. why the evaluation of forest management implementation in Tanggel Village must be done? The participants came up with 10 reasons why such an evaluation is necessary:

1. To know improvement in forest conditions
2. To know the LMDH work
3. To know the activities which have been planned
4. To know what have been achieved
5. To learn about the implementation of the program
6. To know the results of the activity
7. To know the hindrance during program implementation
8. To know what follow up activities should be done
9. To encourage the achievement of LMDH
10. To increase co-ordination and consolidation among the stakeholders

F.2. Figured Forest Management in Tanggel Village
The above ten reasons referred to the ultimate goal, i.e. forest sustainability, that could be achieved from the success in PHBM implementation. Subsequently, the participants were asked to depict forest sustainability in Tanggel Village. The participants were divided into three groups. Each group drew a picture describing sustainable forest on a piece of paper, and then presented the picture at the plenary.

The drawing of the 1st group consisted of:

- Teak plantation was in good condition, tall and flourish
- Grass grew well; some area was used as herding place
- Roads are in good condition
- Forest guard post was in good condition
- River irrigated paddy-fields
- Health and arrange housing

The drawing of the 2nd group consisted of:

- Teak trees grew well
- Street in good condition
- Beautiful houses
- Sustainability of animal (fauna)

The drawing of the third group consisted of:

- Big timber trees were available; teak thinning
- LMDH was involved in forest management especially in the tree cutting process
- LMDH coordinated with Perhutani
- The streets were asphalted
- Good communication among community members

The above elements found in those pictures were classified as criteria. Criteria were used to formulate forest management sustainability. Participants were subsequently asked to group those criteria according to the principle and the aspect.
F.3. Formulation of the Criteria and Indicators

The facilitator explained the aspect, principle, criteria and indicators because they were new concepts for the participants. Up to now, evaluation has always been carried out unilaterally by Perhutani using their own evaluation framework. The method introduced by LPF project was participatory. It engaged different stakeholders in the process.

The framework used in this evaluation was the criteria and indicators. Indicators are situations experienced and felt by participants or the situations in Tanggel village. Criteria are conditions in more general. They are the “umbrella” of several indicators. Indicators and criteria relations can be described as hierarchical in which indicators explain the criteria.

![Diagram of Criteria and Indicators]

After indicators were found, the criterion could be formulated. Some criteria were identified by the participants when they formulated the indicators. The participants nevertheless found it difficult to formulate several criteria due to their unfamiliarity with Indonesian language. Facilitator helped the participants in finding the right terms so that they could formulate Criteria and Indicators that are easy to understand. Principles are the truth that is accepted by the groups. They describe the criteria in general.

After reviewing the pictures and their meanings, and listening to the facilitator’s explanation of the principle, criteria and indicators, the participants felt they can only formulate the aspect, principle, and criteria but they can’t formulate the indicators.

![Diagram of Principle, Criteria, and Indicators]
The results of the clustering that was done by participant were:

a. The Institutional aspect, which consists of the following criteria:
   1. Forest fire
   2. No wood theft
   3. The success of plantation
   4. No herding in young plantation
   5. Organizational rule
   6. Co-ordination among institutions
   7. Agreement on the rules in forest management
   8. Clarity of the roles and responsibilities among institutions
   9. Empowerment from Perhutani
   10. Regeneration process in each institution

b. Ecology and Environment aspect, which consist of the following criteria:
   1. Wood production continues
   2. There are reforestation; continuity between harvesting and planting
   3. Water sources are available
   4. Fauna can be sustained

c. Economics aspect, which consists of the criteria below:
   1. Optimal use of land under teak stands
   2. House quality is improved
   3. Utilisation (allocation) of benefit sharing to forest user groups and other related parties.

d. Social aspect, which consists of the criteria below:
   1. Forest sustainability motivates people to improve the quality of their life
   2. Knowledge of forest management

   The criteria were subsequently scored. The score were based on the agreement reached by the participants. They decided that the scores should range between 10 (indicating the best condition), and 0 (indicating the worst condition).

   Ambar Astuti asked the participants to score the criteria that have been formulated. Each participant scored the criteria based on their knowledge and the conditions they observed around them. Scoring was first done on the indicators. The total value of the scores were then calculated and averaged.

   Each participant was then asked to score the criteria that they formulated. Similarly, the total score was calculated and averaged. The facilitator then presented the score of the criteria and gave the participants an opportunity to comment on it. As the participants had different institutional background and knowledge, they had different views of the formulation and scoring results. Several participants viewed the scores rather negatively. The roles of certain stakeholders in forest management became a main topic of discussion. The participants discussed the involvement of LMDH in protecting the forest, and the role of Perhutani in building the knowledge of LMDH and in developing the institutions in Tanggel village.

F.4. Closing

Wahyu Tri W. closed the workshop and asked the participants to process the workshop results in the subsequent meeting.

G. Workshop Results

1. Formulation of Criteria, principles, and aspects by the participants
2. A learning process for the participants
3. Negotiation among parties which are involved in forest management
### H. Annexes

#### List of Workshop Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mulyoto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mujiyat</td>
<td>Communication Forum on PHBM at the Village level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sadi</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rubi</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sunardi</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wadjiran</td>
<td>Head of sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Suyadi</td>
<td>Perhutani Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suyatno</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Suroso</td>
<td>Perhutani Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mahmud</td>
<td>Perhutani Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pardjo</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Subiyanto</td>
<td>Staff of village government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ladiyo</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Suparti</td>
<td>Religious Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Munindar</td>
<td>Head of Tanggel Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sri Hartati</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Second Workshop on The Development of the Criteria and Indicators (Review and Ranking of the Principles and Criteria) LMDH Langgeng Jati, Tanggel

University of the Philippines Los Banos (UPLB)
Centre de Cooperation Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Developpment (CIRAD)
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
A. Time of the workshop

The workshop was carried out on Sunday, August 6, 2006

B. Location

The workshop was held at the office of Tanggel Village Government

C. Participants

A total of 17 people participated in the workshop: 6 women and 11 men.

Table 1. The list of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Women’s Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Village government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Staff of village government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Head of sub-village government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Communication Forum on PHBM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Facilitator

The facilitators of the workshop were Wahyu Tri Widayanti, Ambar Astuti dan A. Novenanto

E. Goal

The goals of the workshop were:

- To review the Principle and Criteria of forest sustainability in Tanggel Village which have been formulated during previous meeting.
- To formulate an agreement of the evaluation model (C&I) at the Tanggel village level that was agreed by multistakeholders
- To provide a learning forum for the stakeholders to formulate participatory evaluation of forest resource sustainability
F. Processes

F.1. Review Processes

The facilitator opened the meeting and thanked the participants. The facilitator then asked the participants to review the processes that they underwent and the results produced in the last meeting. In the last meeting, the participants successfully grouped the criteria, the principles and scored them. Using brainstorming method, the facilitator asked each participant to briefly mention what they remembered about the processes and the results of previous meeting. The chairman of LMDH pointed out that the meeting produced drawings of forest sustainability.

The secretary of LMDH “Langgeng Jati” noted the economic problems faced by community which is related to land utilization. The issues remembered by the secretary of LMDH were institutional ones, such as: the institution that co-operates with Perhutani, institutional management, rule of the institution. Facilitator reminded the participants that they have also successfully formulated the objectives of PHBM evaluation:

1. To know improvement in forest conditions
2. To know the LMDH work
3. To know the activities which have been planned
4. To know what have been achieved
5. To learn about the implementation of the program
6. To know the results of the activity
7. To know the hindrance during program implementation
8. To know what follow up activities should be done
9. To encourage the achievement of LMDH
10. To increase co-ordination and consolidation among the stakeholders

Through evaluation, it was expected that forest sustainability in Tanggel village could be reached. By evaluating the current conditions, the participants should be able to assess whether such expectation could be realized or not. In the previous meeting, the participants also formulated 4 aspects:

1. Institution
2. Environment and ecology
3. Economy
4. Social

The facilitator asked the participants whether the criteria formulated in the last meeting were sufficient to determine to success of forest management. The participants asked about the criterion on the board of the institution because this criterion was scored very low. The facilitator explained it was scored low because although the board and the organizational rules existed, they have not functioned satisfactorily. The board was scored 4.9 (out of 10). This indicated that it was necessary to improve the performance of the board of LMDH. The participants agreed that discussions about the criterion in the success of the forest management were doing in each criterion that has been formulated. They could review the criteria formulated so far and they could add some more if necessary at later stage.

For the institutional aspect, 2 principles were formulated:

1. Forest security, with the following criteria:
   • There is no forest fire, Score: 5.82
   • There is no wood theft, Score: 6.38
   • The success of the plantation, Score: 5.86
   • No herding taking place in young plantation, Score: 7.00
   (Under this principle, participant added one criterion: The awareness of forest user groups to take part in protecting the main crop)

2. There is institution that co-operates with Perhutani
• The institution has the management, member and organizational rule, Score : 4.91
• There is co-ordination among institutions, Score : 5.79
• There is agreement on the rule in forest management (the system of the forest management: strips or alley cropping), Score : 6.38
• There is co-operation among institutions, Score : 6.33
• Clarity of the duty and role of the institutions, Score : 5.36
• LMDH empowerment by Perhutani, Score : 4.89
• Regeneration process taking place in each institution, Score : 4.50

(Under this principle, the participant added one criterion: The agreement between Perhutani and the community on forest boundaries)

For the Environment and Ecology aspect, 4 principles were formulated:

1. Sustainability of teak stands
   • Wood production is continuous, Score : 7.08
   • Continuity between harvesting and planting, Score : 6.85

2. Water sources are available
   • The fulfillment of water daily requirement, Score : 7.29
   • Agricultural need is fulfilled, Score : 4.84

3. Fauna is maintained (bird, deer, peacock, snake, tiger)
   • Number of fauna is increased, Score : 5.22
   • Diversity of animal species in the forest is increased, Score : 5.04

4. Agricultural land is continually used
   • The types of agricultural crops are increased, Score : 7.53
   • The innovation of the type of the crop (orange fruit, corn pioneer, traditional medicinal plant), Score : 7.01
   • Planting of fodder, Score : 2.24

(There is no criterion added under this Aspect)

The Economic Aspect has 2 principles:

1. Land under the teak stands is used to support the income of the households, Score : 3.79
2. Community’s livelihood is increased:
   • Houses are clean and healthy, Score : 5.6
   • Cattle pens are separated from the house, Score : 6.6
   • The income of the community is increased, score : 6.64
   • Shared benefit is allocated for road construction and village development, Score 6.45

Social Aspect has 2 principles:

1. Give the motivation to improve the quality of life
   • Education for youth is increased, Score 8.15
   • Community’s awareness of the importance of education is increased, Score 7.28
   • Community is encouraged to develop the village, Score : 6.71

2. Community’s knowledge of forest management is increased
   • Community is directly involved in forest management, Score : 6.11
   • Create awareness of forest management formally or informally, Score : 5.35
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F.2 Ranking and Scoring

After the additional criteria were agreed by the participants, they scored the criteria. The scoring process gave the opportunity to all participants to use their knowledge and interests.

Scoring was done for the following criteria:

1. Awareness of forest user groups to take part in protecting the main crop,
2. An agreement between Perhutani and community on forest boundaries.

After all the criteria were scored, they were subsequently ranked. The aim of ranking was to determine the influence of a criterion towards a principle or the influence of a principle towards an aspect. The bigger the influence on forest sustainability, the higher the principle would be ranked. Each principle has 100% value. The 100% value of the rank will be distributed among the criteria under each principle. The total value of the rank of each aspect is 100%. The 100% value of the rank will be distributed to the principles of that aspect.

Brainstorming method was used in ranking exercise. Ranks given to the criteria were as follows:

a. Institution:
   1. Forest security, with the following criteria:
      • There is no forest fire, 30%
      • There is no wood theft, 40%
      • The success of teak plantation, 15%
      • No herding taking place in young plantation, 7%
      • The awareness of forest user groups to take part in protecting the main crop 8%
   2. There is institution that co-operates with Perhutani
      • The institution has the management, member and organizational rule 15%
      • There is co-ordination among institutions 10%
      • There is agreement on the rule in forest management (the system of the forest management: plong-plongan) 15%
      • There is co-operation among institutions 20%
      • Clarity of the duty and role of the institutions, 12.5%
      • LMDH empowerment by Perhutani, 12.5%
      • Regeneration process taking place in each institution, 10%
      • An agreement between Perhutani and community on forest boundaries 5%

b. Environment and Ecology Aspect:
   1. Sustainability of teak stands
      • The production of wood is continuous, 40%
      • Continuity between harvesting and planting, 60%
   2. Water source is available
      • The fulfillment of water daily requirement, 75%
      • Water for agriculture is fulfilled, 25%
   3. Fauna is maintained (birds, deer, peacock, snake, tiger)
      • Number of fauna is increased, 50%
      • Diversity of animal species in the forest is increased, 50%
   4. Agricultural land is used continually
      • Type of agricultural crops is increased, 60%
      • Innovation of the crop kind (orange fruit, corn pioneer, traditional medicinal plant), 35%
      • Planting of fodder, 5%
c. Economic Aspect:
1. Land under teak stand is used to support the income of the households, 100%
2. Community livelihood is increased:
   - Houses are clean and healthy, 35%
   - Cattle pens are separated from the houses, 5%
   - Community income us increased, 40%
   - Benefit sharing is allocated for road construction and village development, 20%

d. Social Aspect:
1. Give the motivation to encourage the quality of life
   - Education for youth is increased, 60%
   - Community’s awareness of the importance of education is increased, 30%
   - Community is encouraged to develop the village, 10%
2. Community’s knowledge of forest management is increased
   - Community is involved in forest management directly, 70%
   - Create awareness of forest management formally or informally, 30%

After the participants finished ranking the criteria, they ranked the principles using similar processes. The results of the ranking exercise of the principles were:

Institution aspect:
1. Forest security, 55%
2. There is institution that co-operates with Perhutani, 45%

Environment and Ecology aspect:
1. Sustainability of teak stands, 30%
2. Water source is available, 30%
3. Fauna is maintained (birds, deer, peacock, snake, tiger), 20%
4. Agricultural land is used continually, 20%

Economic Aspect:
1. Land under teak stand is used to support the household income, 25%
2. Community’s livelihood is increased, 75%

Social Aspect:
1. Give the motivation to encourage the quality of life, 50%
2. Community’s knowledge of forest management is increased, 50%

The final scores of the principle and criteria were generated by multiplying the scores and the ranks. The score given to the criterion was multiplied with the rank given to that criterion. The values given to all criteria under one principle were then added up and multiplied with the rank of the principle to generate the final score for that principle. The value of the Aspect was the total number of values of the principles in the respective aspect. To know results of the evaluation of forest resource sustainability in Tanggel village, the number of values of the aspects was divided with the number of aspects.

The facilitator stressed the meaning of the rank and score. The evaluation could not be done by scoring only, but it must also take into account the importance of the principle or criteria to the overall sustainability. This importance is indicated by rank.

The merge of actual situation (score) with the importance (rank) makes the evaluation more comprehensive and objective. The facilitator aimed to the transfer the knowledge of this evaluation method so the evaluation of forest management can be done in participatory way and will not be done by one stakeholder only. Another benefit of participatory evaluation model
is that the method could be adopted by the other parties.

The facilitator closed the meeting by asking the participants to express what they think of the workshop. The participants mentioned that:

- It could become a good benchmark to assess how the activities have been implemented
- It could become a learning method for village development
- It was the first experience in undertaking evaluation of forest sustainability
- Participant knew that awareness is important in managing the institutions
- Increase participant’s experience
- Participants realized their weakness in forest management, so this realization burdened some participants

G. Workshop Result

1. There are some learning processes in ranking and identifying the issues in community
2. There are enrichment processes in the method for evaluating forest resource sustainability
3. The formulation of the evaluation framework and the final score indicating forest resources sustainability in Tanggel Village

H. Annexes

List of the participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mulyoto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sri Hartati</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sugiyanto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sri Rejeki</td>
<td>Woman Groups in Tanggel Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Megawati</td>
<td>Woman Groups in Tanggel Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Suparti</td>
<td>Woman Groups in Tanggel Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mujiyat</td>
<td>Communication Forum on PHBM in Village Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Trimo</td>
<td>Perhutani Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Suyadi</td>
<td>Perhutani Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Muslih</td>
<td>Community informal Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pardjo</td>
<td>Head of Subvillage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kamsuri</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Marsam</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ladiyo</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Titin</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Retno</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sugiarto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Workshop on the Action Plan of LMDH Langgeng Jati Tanggel Village, KPH Randublatung

University of the Philippines Los Banos (UPLB)
Centre de Cooperation Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Developpment (CIRAD)
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Workshop on the Action Plan of LMDH Langgeng Jati
Tanggel Village, KPH Randublatung

A. Time

The workshop was held on Friday, August 25, 2006.

B. Location

The office of Tanggel Village Government

C. Participant

The participants of workshop came from several institutions in Tanggel Village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication Forum on PHBM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Head of Sub-Village</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community Informal Leader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Facilitators

The facilitators of the workshop were Ambar Astuti and A. Novenanto

E. Goal of Workshop

- To formulate the follow-up action plan following the evaluation of forest resources sustainability in Tanggel Village
- To accommodate the interests of several parties that are related to forest management

F. Workshop Processes

The workshop had 3 agendas:
1. Financial and activity report of LMDH Langgeng Jati
2. Discussion on the loan of Suru Sub-Village
3. Discussion on the follow-up action plan.

F.1. Opening

The workshop was opened by the Chairman of LMDH, Mulyoto. He thanked the participants for attending the workshop. The head of LMDH revealed the agenda of the meeting that had been agreed beforehand by participant. The first was financial and activity report of LMDH Langgeng Jati. The second was about the loan of Suru Subvillage. People of Suru Sub Village is planning
to build a bridge that will connect Suru Sub Village with other villages, and they need some loan to realize their plan. The third was to discuss about the follow-up Plan (action plan) of forest management in Tanggel Forest. The report was presented by Ms Titik. The second agenda will be discussed together among workshop participants. The third agenda will be facilitated by UGM team.

F.2. Financial and Activity Report of LMDH Langgeng Jati

Secretary of LMDH asked for the participants to always attend the meeting when they received an invitation from the LMDH board. This meeting was important because it would discuss the responsibility report of LMDH. The report is put together every 3 months. The report is aimed at the community, which in this case, was represented by the village-level Communication Forum on PHBM in Tanggel Village. This report become a routine activity of LMDH, in order to avoid misperception that LMDH fund was used by the board of LMDH. The Board of LMDH always document how the fund is used, with their supporting financial receipts. The financial reports have been put together twice. The first one had been done in March.

The report showed that the financial balance at end of July was Rp.28.768.392, and the total expenditure up to 25 August 2006 was Rp 6.283.300. The balance up to date was Rp.22.485.092,-. The secretary of LMDH allowed the participants to read and review the report carefully. The participants accepted the routine report presented by the LMDH board.

F.3. Discussions about Suru Sub-village Loan

The bridge that connects Suru Sub-village to other villages needs to be built. The damages of the existing bridge were too serious but Tanggel Village Government had no financial resource. The government consequently can not improve the situation. According to the head of Tanggel Village, the inhabitants of Suru Sub-village needs approximately 65 million rupiahs. Suru Sub village government will get 50 million rupiahs if they sell the old bridge. If this is the case, they still need a total of 10 million rupiahs to build the new bridge. The Village government has promised to provide a total of 5 million rupiahs. They would like to borrow the remaining 5 million rupiahs from LMDH because only LMDH has the money to meet the need of Suru People.

The Board of LMDH responded that they could not spend the money for the loan, because they have provided the village government with their shared benefit allocation. LMDH management has the policy that the loan should be taken by the village government and not by people of Suru Sub-village or the committee of bridge construction. The responsibility for returning the fund would lie in the hand of the village government. The money lent can be deducted from the shared benefit allocation for village government in 2007. Because sharing allocation for village government is managed by Village government, the Head of LMDH pointed out that the decision about the loan would depend on the head of sub villages in Tanggel Village. This is because the loan would affect the next year’s allocation.

Other participants proposed that the responsibility to return the loan should be placed to the three sub-villages affected by the bridge improvement. It shouldn’t be put on all sub-Village heads in Tanggel village. Delegation from Suru Sub-Village should bear the loan themselves as long as their benefit sharing allocation is guaranteed in the long term. The debate occurred because the head of Village felt that his authority was intervened by LMDH management as the latter began to agree with the arrangement that the responsibility to return the loan should be placed to sub-villages. According to the head of village, the responsibility is a part of Head village authority, i.e. both the loan and the responsibility to return the loan were his responsibilities. The obligation of LMDH’s management was only to decide whether or not the loan will be granted.

The facilitator pointed out that legally, as expressed in the protocol (AD/ART) of LMDH, the management of LMDH is not permitted to lend money or LMDH’s property to other institutions. If the board of LMDH lends the money on behalf of the institution, the management has violated the rule. But if the bridge of Suru Sub-village really needs rebuilding, all parties could come up with a strategy to raise funds. May be the shared benefit allocation for village development in 2007 can be selected as the strategy. The allocation for the village for 2007 that was handed over in 2006 could become an alternative solution.

The facilitator asked the head of the village to give the Board of LMDH an opportunity to
negotiate and make the agreement in a clear manner. The decision that was taken by the LMDH's board was to give the money that was needed by the Suru sub-village community, and the loan will be returned by using the shared benefit allocation for Village development in 2007.

F.4. Formulation of Action Plan

The action plan is formulated based on the results of the evaluation of forest resources sustainability in Tanggel Village. To formulate the action plan, the facilitator asked the participants to review the results of the evaluation, in particular to pay attention to the aspect, principles and criteria that were scored the lowest. They should become the target of the action plan of the institution involved in forest management. Criteria scored low in the evaluation of forest resources sustainability in Tanggel village are:

a. Institutional Aspect
   Principle: Forest security
   • The success of the plantation
   • There is no herding taking place in young plantation
   • The awareness of forest user groups to take part in protecting the main crop
   Principle: There is institution that co-operates with Perhutani
   • The institution has the management, member and organizational rule
   • There is co-ordination among institutions
   • There is agreement on the rule in forest management (the system of the forest management: strip or alley model)
   • Clarity of the duty and role of the institutions
   • Empowerment of LMDH by Perhutani
   • Regeneration process in each institution
   • The agreement between the Perhutani and community on forest boundaries

b. Environment and the Ecology Aspect
   Principle: Agricultural land is used continually
   • Planting of fodder

c. Economic Aspect
   Principle: Community livelihood is increased
   • Cattle pens are separated from the houses

d. Social Aspect
   Principle: Give the motivation to encourage the quality of life
   • Community is encouraged to develop the village

After reviewing the criteria with the lowest score, the facilitator divided the participants into 3 groups appropriate with the nearness of the institutions. Each group was asked to formulate the work program to improve the situations. Composition of the groups:

• Group 1, consisted of village level-Communication Forum on PHBM, the staff of village government, and other members of village government
• Group 2, consisted of the Board of LMDH Langgeng Jati
• Group 3, consisted of Perhutani Staff

The work program produced by the participants for LMDH and other institutions related to forest management are:

1. To increase forest protection (protecting the teak stands, ensuring the success of the plantation, protecting young plantation from damages)
2. Increase awareness of the forest users to involve in forest management
3. Increase the quality of LMDH and its board
4. Increase community’s livelihood by involving community in forest management either directly or indirectly

Those work programs were further broken down into activities as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Who are involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3 : Perhutani</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase the support of Perhutani extension</td>
<td>To direct LMDH to achieve their goals and targets.</td>
<td>Perhutani extension workers or other parties who are interest in forest management. To be conducted every month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forest protection activities such as: tree protection, protection against forest fire, illegal logging, etc</td>
<td>To engage LMDH in forest protection</td>
<td>Community and Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree planting</td>
<td>Transfer of knowledge to community related to plantation and forest sustainability</td>
<td>Community and Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 : LMDH Langgeng Jati</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raising community’s awareness</td>
<td>Transfer of knowledge of forest management and activities that are related to forest management</td>
<td>Perhutani, LMDH, Village government, Communication Forum on PHBM, and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>To arrange the work plan and all activities of LMDH</td>
<td>LMDH, Village government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training on skills and forest management</td>
<td>Increase community’s livelihood and the quality of human resources</td>
<td>LMDH, Perhutani staff and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social Activities (Outside the 20% from shared benefit allocation for village government)</td>
<td>a. To help the poorest villagers, b. To increase fairness in nature resource utilization in Tanggel Village</td>
<td>LMDH, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>a. To provide education for poor people b. Increase the quality of human resource</td>
<td>LMDH, Community and education organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>To provide fund for religious activities such as religious celebration, reading the holy qur’an</td>
<td>LMDH and Religious Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LMDH’s shop</td>
<td>To help farmers in obtaining agricultural equipment</td>
<td>LMDH and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Forest weeding</td>
<td>a. To provide new job opportunities for local community b. To increase the involvement of community and LMDH in forest management</td>
<td>LMDH, Community and Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Protection: Keep forest protected</td>
<td>To increase the involvement of LMDH and community in forest management activities</td>
<td>LMDH, Community and Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Who are involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Give reward forest users</td>
<td>To increase the income of the farmers</td>
<td>Forest Farmers, LMDH and Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Regeneration of LMDH Board</td>
<td>To implement regeneration process</td>
<td>LMDH, village government, Communication Forum on PHBM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group 1: Communication Forum on PHBM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Who are involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conduct meetings among communication forums on PHBM around of Sub-District of Randublatung</td>
<td>To coordinate among communication forums on PHBM at the sub-district level</td>
<td>Boards of Communication Forums on PHBM around Sub-District of Randublatung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Routine meeting once every 4 months</td>
<td>To coordinate between board members of the village-level communication forum on PHBM</td>
<td>Members of the Board of village-level communication forum on PHBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation meeting</td>
<td>To convey community issues related to forest management to LMDH and Perhutani</td>
<td>LMDH and Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presentation was followed by group discussion. One of the issues discussed was forest protection and patrolling. It became the agenda of LMDH. Everyone realized the difficulties in dealing with this issue and it required intensive discussions between related stakeholders. Perhutani was willing to fully engage the community and LMDH in forest protection. There would be several members of LMDH board to patrol the forests every day. LMDH has a working group on forest protection. This working group is given the responsibility to help Perhutani in protecting the forest. The sub-village headmen are also given the responsible over forest areas which are managed by LMDH.

At the end of the meeting, the facilitator reminded the participants that the participants have produced a work plan. This should be used as a basis in formulating strategic plans and budgets of LMDH and village level CF-PHBM of 2007.

**F.5. Closing**

The head of LMDH thanked all participants and formally closed the workshop.

**G. Results**

1. There is a learning process during the formulation of the work plan
2. The action plan and work plan for each institution involved in forest management are formulated
3. Negotiations process took place among LMDH and village government in making decision related to institution
4. There is a learning process that responsibility should be carried out in an orderly and transparent manner.
### List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mulyoto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sadi</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tarmuji</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lastono</td>
<td>Communication Forum on PHBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mardi</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sadi</td>
<td>Community Informal leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rami</td>
<td>Community Informal leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Samidi</td>
<td>Community Informal leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ranto</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pardjo</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ngusman</td>
<td>Communication Forum on PHBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Giman</td>
<td>Communication Forum on PHBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sugianto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Muliyat</td>
<td>Communication Forum on PHBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pujianto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mulyono</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ladiyo</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Piyo</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wadjiran</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Suparjo</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sugianto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Minanto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sri Hartati</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yamin</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kadarusman</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Suroso</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mahmud</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Trimanstoro</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Temok</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sulistiyono</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mulyono</td>
<td>Head of Sub-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nasullah</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Munindar</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Workshop on the Formulation of the Principle, Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest management under PHBM LMDH Wana Bersemi, Gempol Village

A. Time

The workshop was carried out on Saturday, 22 July 2006

B. Venue

The workshop was done in the Office of Gempol Village Government

C. Participants

The workshop was attended by the participants from Perhutani, Gempol village government, the board of FVCI (LMDH) Wana Bersemi, PHBM Communication Forum at the Gempol Village, the board of the Co-operative of FVCI Wana Bersemi, women’s group, Village Representation Institution, Forest Farmer Group, Community Health Care Center, Community informal leader, Youth organization.

Table 1. List of the participants of the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (FVCI)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forest Farmer Group (FFM / KTH)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cooperation of FVCI (LMDH)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Informal Leader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Youth Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Women’s Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Association of Children Health Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community Representation Association</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Facilitators

The facilitators of the Workshop were Wahyu Tri Widayanti, Ambar Astuti, and A. Novenanto.

E. Goals of the Workshop

- To formulate the Principle, the Criteria and Indicators of the success of the sustainable forest management organized and implemented by FVCI at Gempol Village;
- To share lessons learnt with all parties involved in the monitoring and evaluation of sustainable forest management at Gempol village.
F. Workshop Processes

F.1. Formulation of the Goal of the Evaluation

The workshop was opened by Wahyu Tri W. He greeted the participants and prayed to the God almighty for the safety of all the participants who attended the workshop. Wahyu Tri W explained that CCFM has been implemented for a long time and that an evaluation was also carried out by other parties, such as Perhutani. The evaluation, to be developed in the workshop, would take into account the participants’ expectations and aims. The expectations and the aims need to be reviewed for the purpose of improving the situations, and not of looking for the mistake of the program. This spirit and understanding must be developed during the next two or three days of the workshop. To do the evaluation properly, one must have the appropriate tools to measure progress. When one of the stakeholders stated that forest management in Gempol Village did well, what indicators were used to measure the performance of forest management. The measurement tools for this evaluation will be developed by the workshop participants in the next two days. The facilitator explained that the same process has also been carried out by Tanggel Village community in accordance to the specific situations in their village. For this reason, the results produced by Tanggel community can not be used in Gempol Village.

Most of the participants attending the workshop nevertheless were rarely involved in LMDH activities. This was because most of LMDH board members are newcomers. The facilitator therefore requested the participants to introduce themselves. The facilitator was the team member of the LPF Project, a project that has been facilitating LMDH, especially at Gempol Village, to develop cooperation with Perhutani under the CCFM umbrella.

Before formulating the Principle, Criteria and Indicators, the facilitator asked the participants to formulate the aims of the evaluation, i.e. why the evaluation of forest management implementation in Gempol Village must be done? The participants confirmed that the evaluation of forest management implementation in Gempol Village should be done. The evaluation was carried out to formulate actions to improve the situations, and not to look for mistakes. The aims of the evaluation expressed by the participants were:

- to review CCFM program
- to maximize CCFM program
- to explore human resource potentials
- increase the achievement of LMDH management
- to identify the strength and weaknesses of LMDH for their improvement in the future
- to identify LMDH achievement
- as a control of LMDH program realization
- to assess whether or not planning fits the particular situations
- as a tool to measure how a system has been be implemented
- to assess whether all of the CCFM aspects have been undertaken (forest conservation, social and economic aspects).

The facilitator asked the participants whether the above formulations were enough or others should be added. The participants confirmed that they were enough. Nevertheless, if during the workshop process the participants identified other things related to the aims of the evaluation, they would add them to the list. So there are 11 aims of the evaluation of the implementation of CCFM. CCFM has 3 aspects with regards to sustainable forest management. Conservation aspect of the forest will have an impact on the economic aspect, i.e. community’s well-being. The welfare of the community will benefit the social aspect of the community. This hopefully would provide a basis for cooperation in forest management. This evaluation was to assess how much has been achieved in forest management at the Gempol Village. Has the forest management in Gempol village provided the economic and social benefits for the community? How much economic and social impacts it has generated for the community? Each stakeholder will give different scores. Consequently, a joint agreement has to be reached on the evaluation benchmark or framework. This framework will be formulated by the stakeholders.
F.2. Formulation of the Principle, Criteria and Indicators

To facilitate the formulation of an evaluation framework that will be used in evaluating sustainability of Forest Management at Gempol village, the facilitator asked the participants to draw the situations of the surrounding forest. The situations must include three aspects that were categorized during the formulation of the evaluation objectives. The participants were divided into 3 groups: 1) Group 1 consisted of Perhutani and PHBM Communication Forum, 2) Group 2 consisted of Gempol Village Government, 3) Group 3 consisted of LMDH and the members of forest farmer group. The grouping was made based on the interests of the participants on the aspects of forest management. Each group discussed in different rooms. After the participants completed their pictures, each group presented their picture and discussed it.

1) Group 1 (represented by the Head of RPH Kuwojo)

The Head of RPH Kuwojo was the new staff of BKPH Selogender. He took this opportunity to introduce himself to Gempol villagers. KRPH Kuwojo presented the results of Group 1 by first reviewing how forest is viewed in the academic theory. Forest is an ecosystem that is composed of plants and dominated by timber trees. Therefore, when trees are no longer available, then the field can not be acknowledged as forest anymore. The forest is as the alliance of biological natural life, such as trees, water, animals. All live together there. Likewise, human always interact with trees and animals. According to Head of RPH Kuwojo, understanding about forestry act No.41/1999. Gempol villagers have optimized teak by planting traditional medicinal herbs under the tree stands. These herbs were used by the community. Animals that lived in the forests, such as birds, cattle, lizard, etc., also need alliance with nature. All those animals can live as long as the forests are available. The animals and human who live around the forest interact. Forest also maintains water springs. The water from the springs will flow to the river. This water is used by the community who lived around the forest. The water is also used by the people who live in the settlement for their own consumption and for irrigation of agricultural crops. Hopely the economy of people will increase as well. For example, on July this year 2006 the paddy in the rice field can’t be grown well due to water shortage. The community could also plant fruit trees such as bananas, mangoes etc around the house. This can be done because of water from the forest is still available.

The Head of RPH Kuwojo explained that the existence of the forest enabled the community to be more prosperous, because they could receive a large number of benefits from the forest. CCFM (PHBM) is a form of the co-operation between villagers and Perhutani. CCFM is a good system. With CCFM, conservation of the forest could be revived and relations between Perhutani and the community could be improved. The system also created good social relations. The economic function of the forest was indicated by the existence of employment opportunities in forest management, where the community often received some income for their involvement in forest management. These relations were acknowledged as partnership or cooperation.

According to the government rule, land around the river can not be utilized. Moreover, KPH Randublatung will go through a process to get a certification for Sustainable Forest Management. The land around the river must be planted by mixed forest crops or with fast growing species. The trees will not be cut down to maintain their function as water absorption area. This was the explanation provided by the Head of RPH Kuwojo.

With regards to the situation of the community's economy, although the Gempol Village is located in the middle of the forest, they obtained information from the television channels. Nowadays the motorcycle is an importance vehicle for transportation in the village. The social benefit from this co-operative forest management was the increase in education in Gempol Village. Community's religious activity also improved as indicated by the increased number of mosques.

KBKPH Selogender added that there were many genetic resources in the forest. When the river of Gempol Village became cloudy, it indicated that destructive activities occurred inside the forests, such as timber theft. Other benefit that was enjoyed by the community from forest management was the utilization of waste wood stumps. The community outside Gempol village also utilised waste wood to improve their livelihood.
2) Group 2 (The presentation was carried out by the Chairman of LMDH Co-operative)

The Chairman of the Cooperative explained about the sustainable forest. The Sustainable forest became a hope. This program must be supported by the cooperation between community and Perhutani under CCFM system. Under this system, Perhutani, the community and other interested parties agree to engage in mutually beneficial cooperation. At the moment, Perhutani has a program called “Sustainable Forest Management” (SFM). SFM is a forest management that considers three aspects:

1. Economics
2. Environment
3. Social

When these three aspect are implemented, then the objectives of forest management could be realised. The three aspects should be considered simultaneously. The SFM consist of activities i.e. planting, maintaining, fertilizing, and harvesting. Meaning that under scenario of SFM there is no empty forest land. Forest management brings about economic benefits for the community because they can optimize land under teak stands for mixed-cropping. This situation indicated that the forest management in the Gempol Village is good. The optimization of forest land is done for area containing 30 year old teak trees. The planting of traditional medicinal herbs is another example of the consideration of social aspect in forest management.

In the 2nd group drawing, animal and other cattle, which were drawn by participants, indicated that the Gempol community was quite prosperous. The LMDH Cooperative had 20 cattles that were managed by the community. In Gempol village, a new road was also built with the financial contribution from Perhutani’s profit sharing which LMDH allocated to the village social fund. This showed that cooperation between Perhutani and the community brought about positive impacts on several matters.

With regards to the physical conditions of the forest, old trees depicted in the drawing were also often found in Gempol Village. The availability of the old stands indicated that LMDH may receive substantial benefit sharing. This profit sharing had a positive impact on the economy of the community. The increase in economics could be gleaned from the increase in the income of the community members who used fuelwood. Currently they started to use fuelwood optimally and sold them to other villages. Because of this change the number of fuelwood traders outside Gempol Village began to decline.

3) Group 3 (consisting of representatives of the Gempol Village Government)

The third group hoped that LMDH could become the institution that bridge between the village government and Perhutani. The Gempol Village has a large number of resources, that is the existence of teak stubs and the riverside land (tanah gowokan) on which Perhutani has just started planting forest crops, while the community is also carrying out agricultural activity on this land.

The forest and water conditions in the Gempol Village were still good. The existing road in the village has also improved due to the profit sharing, which was increased every year, received by the community.

Economically the community’s conditions have also improved as indicated by the improved conditions of the community’s houses, i.e. better and bigger houses. If the community welfare increased then the community’s security would also increase. At the same time livestock and the environment will be increased. The community hoped that the increase in welfare would be followed by the improvement in education facilities and that tertiary institutions and forest education centre will be established near Gempol Village.

Valuable forest requires good security. It would be better if forests could be revitalised and maintained for the next 20 to 30 years. Perhutani expects that sharing is not interpreted as the sharing of cash only but also the share of roles and responsibilities in forest management.

Discussions continued with the clustering of components that appear in the three drawings. The facilitator grouped the components using different colors for each aspect so that the participants can easily distinguished each aspect easily. This grouping is based on the closest issue related.
1. Ecology
- It is related to forest utilization issue
- The quality of resources
- Rehabilitation of forest
- Wood production
- Biological diversity
- The source of water
- Soil conservation
- The maintenance of rivers
- Forest security
- Sustainable Forest Management
- There is no fallow land

2. Economy
- Increased welfare
- Increased number of motorcycle
- Improved communication technology

3. Institution in Forest Management
- Rules related to forest management are available in the community
- There are cooperation in forest management
- Community is empowered by Perhutani
- There are inter-institutional cooperation in sustainable forest management
- There is cooperation between PERHUTANI and LMDH
- There are multistakeholder co-operation in CCFM system

4. Social

After the clustering, the participants were asked to pay attention to the clusters that had been produced and to review these results. The participants were asked to add cultural aspect into social aspect, because there are connections between the two. The cooperation system in managing the forest could alter the community's culture. Finally, it was agreed that the culture aspect will be merged with social aspect and the fourth aspect became social and culture aspect.

The participants then discussed each aspect and the differences in the results presented by each group:

1. In the institution aspect of the 1st group, it was stated that there is the rule in the utilization of riverside lands, so there is no struggle for land in each sub-village.
2. Active role of forest farmer in implementing the mix-cropping system
3. The optimalization of land under teak stands
4. Regularity of interaction among community members

From the 2nd group 2 emerged:

- Increase of human resource capacity
- Increase of knowledge and technology
- Increase in the awareness of the importance of education
- Increase in the support for the community welfare (i.e. road construction)
- Increase in the community's motivation
- Budget sharing for social needs
- Increase in the understanding of CCFM cooperation among parties that were involved in (i.e. that sharing is understood not only as the sharing of money, but also the sharing of space and land)

The participants questioned the institution that could mediate between Perhutani and
the community. Until this time, there is no independent's institution that supervises the cooperation between the two parties. The role of the new institution is to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the collaborative forest management. This should be included in the institutional aspect. In the case, Perhutani as the party that cooperates with the community entersthe Communication Forum. From the LMDH side, until this time LMDH manages a large sum of money, amounting to hundreds of millions rupiah. LMDH thus also needs to be supervised in managing the organization.

The supervision should not be done to LMDH alone but also to Perhutani. Although Perhutani has had many experiences in forest management, with regards to CCFM system the supervision should be done on Perhutani as follows:

1. Implementation of the cooperation,
2. Financial management,
3. Organizational management,
4. Technical forestry development, etc.

With regards to the institutional aspect, it was agreed that there is a need for an supervisory institution in the implementation of CCFM cooperation.

Because the participants had not touched on the problem of the rights and the responsibilities as well as their respective roles as institutions in CCFM cooperation, the facilitator raised this issue. Clarity about the rights and the responsibilities of each party that engages in the cooperation is one of the issues that need to be assessed in CCFM evaluation. When the community considered that this is an important element to consider in CCFM implementation, then the institutional aspect must be included in the evaluation. The participants regarded the understanding of the rights and the responsibilities of each party as important matters to consider in forest management. Each party can only implement their rights and responsibilities fully if they understand them properly.

F. 3 Value interval and Scoring

The Facilitator explained about the value interval. The value interval was the value range that will be used to assess criteria or indicators in each aspect. The range of this value expands from the lowest value and the highest. The participants decided that the highest value would be 9 and the lowered value would be 0. If the party being evaluated did not do anything towards achieving the conditions indicated by the indicators, then the party will be given the value 0 for that indicator. If the best conditions are reached by the party, the value of 9 will be given.

After the participants understood about this value interval, the facilitator read out the framework of criteria and indicators that have been formulated. They were asked to review the framework and score them. The facilitator reminded the participants that poor conditions should be scored low while good conditions should be scored high.

Ecological aspect

1. Good rivers condition
2. Available water springs
3. Wood plantation for riverside lands
4. Absorption lands are planted with absorption plants
5. Forest for animal protection, or animal kinds and quantities are increasing
6. Forest are secured, indicated by:
   • the frequency of forest looting is decreased
   • There is no fallow land
   • good quality of forest land and villagers’ land
   • continuous flow of forest products, both timber and non timber

Institution aspect

1. Perhutani nurtures and supports the stakeholders
2. Cooperation between Perhutani and foresters/villagers
3. CCFM program is implemented successfully
4. There are rules of the game to secured forest
5. There is institution(s) to control CCFM program (supervisory institution)
6. Socialization of CCFM
7. Agreement on the roles and responsibilities between stakeholders
8. Good understanding of the rights and responsibilities among the stakeholders
9. Stakeholders implement forest management activities which fall under their responsibilities.
10. Involvement of the third party (parties) in forest management

**Economic Aspect**
1. Optimized land of teak understand for plantation
2. Large quantity of teak production and mature trees
3. Wood sharing could be used for productive activities
4. House conditions are improved
5. Communication and technology facilities are improved
6. Transportation, education, and health facilities are improved
7. Communities health is in good condition
8. There is alternative non forest economic generating activities.

**Cultures and Social Aspect**
1. Management of riverside land based on the regions
2. In-charge institution in forest management involves villagers in managing the forest
3. Community is involved actively in forest management
4. Religious activities and religious facilities are improved
5. Education for the children is improved
6. Better understanding of CCFM
7. Better cultures in the community
8. Collective active (gotong royong) culture in the community is maintained

After the all participants scored the criteria and indicators, the score was then collected and analyzed by using the Evaluation of Sustainable Forest Resources formulation. The facilitator explained that the process has not finished yet. There are several more steps that still should be done, i.e. the ranking and scoring of the principles, criteria and indicators. Then they could also review what they have been formulated.

To undertake the next step, the participants agreed that the process should be done by the representatives of their respective institutions. They would select who would come to the next meeting.

**F.4. Closing**
In the closing, the facilitator expressed the hope that what they formulated in the workshop would bring positive impacts on forest management in Gempol and the community.

**G. Workshop Results**
1. Learning process for the stakeholders involved in the collaborative forest management and the institutions in Gempol village on the participatory evaluation process.
2. The formulation of Aspects, Principles, Criteria, and Indicators as a tool to evaluate Sustainable Collaborative Forest Resources in Gempol village.
3. A platform for the stakeholders to reflect on their roles and conditions in managing the forest in Gempol village area.
### H. Annexes

#### List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Samsoeri</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Suwarjo</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nuning</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Siswanto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lasipan</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maryadi</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Supardjo</td>
<td>Community Informal Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Siswoto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yuyus W.</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Suparmin</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Suwardi</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Simodin</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ratmo</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Siman</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Parji</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Harto</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pandi</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Suleman</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jani</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Radi</td>
<td>Cooperation of LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Basri</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kamin</td>
<td>Head of Sub-Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lasidin</td>
<td>Head of Sub-Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pasiyo</td>
<td>Head of Sub-Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Head of Sub-Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lasdian</td>
<td>Head of Sub-Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sugeng</td>
<td>Head of Sub-Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sikatmo</td>
<td>Head of Sub-Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Suyatno</td>
<td>Community Informal Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sudjadi</td>
<td>Community Informal Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Suwarto</td>
<td>Young Adult Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tri Rahayu</td>
<td>Women’s Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sarmini</td>
<td>Women’s Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Wiwik</td>
<td>Association of Children Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Sutoyo</td>
<td>Community Representation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Farmo S.</td>
<td>Community Representation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Djumingun</td>
<td>Community Representation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Supermin</td>
<td>Community Representation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sutotok</td>
<td>Community Representation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Slamet</td>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Joko Pitono</td>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sutarno</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sardjono</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Suparwo</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sabar</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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University of the Philippines Los Banos (UPLB)
Centre de Cooperation Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Developpment (CIRAD)
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Workshop on the Formulation of the Principle, the Criteria and the Indicators of the Success of PHBM
LMDH Wana Bersemi, Gempol Village

A. Time
The workshop took place on Sunday, 23 July 2006

B. Location
The workshop was held in the Office of Gempol Village Government

C. Participants
The workshop was attended by the same participants who attended the workshop which was held a day earlier.

D. Facilitators
The facilitators of the workshop were Wahyu Tri Widayanti, Ambar Astuti and Antonius Novenanto.

E. The Goals of the Workshop
1. The participant understand of the aims of formulating the Principle, the Criteria and the Indicators of the Success of CCFM program (PHBM program)
2. A framework of the principle, criteria and indicators, and the assessment of those criteria and indicators which would indicate forest resource sustainability at Gempol Village.
3. The ability of the participants to rank and score the criteria and indicators.

F. Workshop Processes

F.1. Review of the Principle, Criteria and Indicators of Sustainable Forest Resources in Gempol Village.
The facilitator reviewed the processes that the participants went through so far and the Criteria and Indicator framework that they had produce in previous workshop. The formulation can still be revised and additions can be made if necessary. The next step would be the ranking process, in which the participants would rank every principle, criteria, and indicators which they have formulated in previous workshop. Ranking is very important because it shows the relative importance of an indicator to its criteria, and the relative importance of a criterion to its principle. Each criteria will have a number of different indicators, similarly, there will be several criteria under a principle.
F.2. The Ranking Process

On the ecology aspect, there were 6 principles. Each was ranked differently depending on the degree of which the principle can influence the aspect. The 6 principles were: sustainable production of timber and non-timber products, forest security, continuous water supply, soil conservation, forest rehabilitation, and lastly, the protection of animals. The participants then ranked those principles based on how strong a principle can influence forest quality. After that, they ranked the indicators under each criteria. Ranking was also done at the aspect level. The participants did so based on their knowledge and interest so that they discussed first the proper ranking of each principle and criteria. This allowed the participants to negotiate and understand the views! of other stakeholders.

Using this process, the participants can learn in every steps of the workshop. This C&I framework can be adapted to the conditions and interests of the stakeholders. The facilitator then explained about how to give the scoring. Scoring should be done after the participants ranked each principle and criteria. The value got from score was then multiplied with the corresponding rank. This should be done for each level, i.e. principle and criteria. The participants from Perhutani did not agree if ranking was done for each principle and criteria. They reckoned if ranking was done for principles, it was not necessary to rank the criteria anymore. Ranking both the principle and criteria would produce lower score and therefore will reflect badly on Perhutani.

The facilitator explained that the rank would affect the higher levels of indicators or criteria so it is necessary to rank both the principle and criteria. The rank was given based on the ideal conditions, and not based on the current actual conditions. The facilitator reminded the participants that the evaluation was done to determine the next steps and not to put the blame on any institution. If the evaluation was done in the latter spirit, every stakeholders would have different points of view about that and it would be impossible to find the same perspective. The facilitator then asked the participants on whether ranking is necessary to be done. The participants agreed that ranking should be done. The facilitator proposed a view that evaluation is the process to determine the best decision and not to put the blame for any mistakes found to any institution. The participants agreed, and they wanted to continue the process that have been done before.

After those agreements, the facilitator continued to the next step, i.e. scoring.

F.3. Closing

The facilitator closed the workshop and positively commented on the active participation of all the participants. The facilitator also reminded the participants that the results of today’s workshop will be reviewed in the next day’s workshop.

G. Workshop Results

1. The learning processes for all stakeholder involved in forest management in Gempol village.
2. A platform for stakeholders involved in forest management to express their interests and values.
3. A Criteria and Indicator framework and their ranks:

Environment and Ecology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Timber and non-timber products are maintained</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.1.1 Continuous flow of forest products for the next 30 years</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Forest is secured</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.2.1 Incidences of forest theft decrease</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Water availability</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.3.1 Rivers are maintained</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.3.2 Water springs are maintained</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Land conservation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.4.1 The quality of forest land and villagers’ land are maintained</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.4.2 There is no fallowland</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P5  Forest rehabilitation  
   K.5.1 Absorption lands are planted with plants that can effectively absorbed water (Riverside are planted with timber species)  
   100%  

P6  Animals are protected  
   K.6.1 The number of animal species increases  
   100%  

Institution  

P7  The involvement of stakeholders in forest management  
   K.7.1 Third party is involved in forest management  
   100%  

P8  The agreement benefits the involved stakeholders  
   K.8.1 There is an agreement about the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholders who are involved in the agreement  
   20%  
   K.8.2 Clarity of the rights and responsibilities for the parties who cooperate in CCFM  
   50%  
   K.8.3 Each stakeholder implement forest management activities that are under their responsibility.  
   30%  

P9  There is a system which regulate forest sustainability  
   K.9.1 CCFM can be implemented  
   10%  
   K.9.2 There are rules of the game to secure the forests  
   20%  
   K.9.3 There is an institution which monitor or supervise the implementation of the cooperation between Perum Perhutani and LMDH in CCFM Program  
   30%  
   K.9.4 Socialization to improve understanding of CCFM  
   40%  

P10 Relationships among stakeholders who are involved in forest management  
   K.10.1 Perhutani nurtures and supports the stakeholders  
   40%  
   K.10.2 There is co-operation between Perhutani and the society  
   60%  

Culture and Social  

P14  The society's cultural changes  
   K.14.1 The culture is improved  
   30%  
   K.14.2 The maintenance of collective action (gotong royong) culture in the society  
   70%  

P15  The quality of human resources are increased  
   K.15.1 An improvement in the quality and frequency of religious activities that improve moral values  
   30%  
   K.15.2 Improved education for children  
   60%  
   K.15.3 Increased understanding of CCFM (which is indicated by the sharing of space, lands, outcomes, role, and responsibilities)  
   10%  

P16  The interaction between people and forest  
   K.16.1 The institution which is in charge of forest management provided opportunities for the communities who live around the forest to participate  
   70%  
   K.16.2 Active participation of community in forest management  
   30%  

P17  Forest resources are managed by the community  
   K.17.1 Forest lands are managed by the community according to their region (Selogender, Bendo, etc.)  
   100%  

Economy  

P11  The well-being of the community is improved  
   K.11.1 The conditions of the houses are improved  
   10%  
   K.11.2 Communication and technology facilities (television, handphone) are improved  
   5%  
   K.11.3 Transportation, education and market facilities are improved  
   40%  
   K.11.4 The health of the community is maintained  
   20%  
   K.11.5 Alternative economic generating activities, apart than forest resources, are available  
   25%  

P12  Timber and non-timber forest products are available  
   K.12.1 Teak and waste wood products (mature trees) are still available  
   55%  
   K.12.2 There is a sharing of wood products which can be used for production activities  
   45%  

P13  Forests are utilised by community  
   K.13.1 Utilization of forest land  
   100%
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Review of Principle and Criteria, and the development of a work plan for Forest Management
LMDH Wana Bersemi Gempol

A. Time and Venue

The meeting was conducted on Saturday, 9 September 2006, at the office of Gempol Village Government.

B. Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forest Community Institution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LMDH Cooperative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Forest farmer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Representation Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Perhutani Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Facilitators

Wahyu Tri Widayanti, Ambar Astuti and A. Novenanto

D. Goals

1. To review the methods and the Criteria and Indicator framework which was developed in previous meeting.
2. To schedule the implementation of work plan for forest management that should be done by the stakeholders according to the evaluation results.

E. The Meeting Processes

The facilitator opened the meeting and explained the aims of that meeting, which was to review the results or agreement that was achieved in previous meeting on the evaluation methods which would be used and the evaluation results. The participants could review the results produced so far, criticize them, and revise them accordingly. The facilitator explained the results of the evaluation on the principle, criteria and indicators. To get to the final point, the next steps to follow were:

1. Calculating the averaged value of each criterion by dividing the total scores given by the total number of criteria.
2. The average value of the criterion was then multiplied with the weight of each criterion. This would produce the final value of each criterion.
3. To get the principle value, the total value in the each criterion within a principle was multiplied by the weight of principle.
4. To generate the aspect value, all principles values under each aspect were added together.
5. The value of forest sustainability is the figure generated from adding the values of all aspects. To see the value in percentage, the value was divided by highest interval value (9), then multiplied it with 100%.

The participants can see how well forest management has contributed to different aspects by looking at the values (in percentage) of each aspect. The values given to each aspect (from the highest to the lowest) were as follows: social, economy, ecology, and lastly, the institution. From the values, the participants can decide which aspect they want to address.

To focus the discussion, the participants were divided into 4 groups. Each group will discuss the principles from which they formulated a work plan to improve forest management in Gempol village. Each group consisted of participants from different institutions so that each group had representatives from different institutions.

The participants within each group were:

**Group I: Ecology**
1. Sutarno (KRPH Kuwojo)
2. Sudjadi (Development Division of Gempol Village Government )
3. SIman (LMDH)
4. Maryadi (LMDH)
5. Parji (Forest User )

**Group II: Intitution**
1. Radi (LMDH Cooperative)
2. Siswoto (LMDH)
3. Siswanto (LMDH)
4. Suwarjo (LMDH)
5. Suparno (Village Government)

**Group III: Economy**
1. Djumingun (BPD= village assembly)
2. N Juwari (LMDH)
3. Suwarto (Forest Farmer)
4. Basri (Village Government)
5. Tamin (Village Government)

**Group IV: Culture and Social**
1. Suwardi (LMDH)
2. Sabar (Perhutani Staff)
3. Priyanto (LMDH)
4. Samsoeri (LMDH)
5. Parmin (LMDH)

After the discussion was conducted, each group presented the results from their discussion and gave opportunities to other groups or participants to review their results. The work plans proposed by each group were as follows:

1. **Culture and Social (presenter: Priyanto).**

   **Principle:** The interaction between people and forest
   1. Encourage the active participation from the forest community in managing the forest
   2. The responsible stakeholders in forest management
   3. Socialization of forest management
   4. Improve the information and transportation facilities

   **Principle:** Forest resources are managed by the community
   1. Forest land is managed by the community
   2. The utilization of bare land to empower human resources
   3. Increasing human resources
4. Increasing the understanding of PHBM co-operation
5. Improve and increase the number of health facilities
6. Improve the availability of non-formal education (Kejar paket A B C)
7. Implement program to combat illiteracy.

Principle: The society’s cultural changes
1. Increase the traditional arts
2. Institutionalise ‘on-time’ culture

2. Ecology (Presented by Suyatno)
Principle: Animals are protected

Principle: Forest is secured
1. Socialisation of methods to secure forest
2. Individually, each stakeholder should prevent their own actions from disturbing the forest
3. Community to act together to combat illegal logging

3. Economy (Presented by Nuning Juwarni)
Principle: The well-being of the community is improved
1. Increase communication facilities
2. Healthy Housing (floored rooms and painted wall, bathroom and toilet are available)
3. Existence of alternative economies and forest resources
4. Continuous payment for workers
5. Availability of soft loan
6. The increase in road infrastructure, i.e. paved road.
7. There are Junior High School, Senior High School, and teachers
8. The village market is developed into proper market

Principle: Forests are utilised by community
1. Plant medicinal plants under old stand trees
2. Plant bamboo and tobacco in riverside lands
3. Plant elephant grass on the bare land

Principle: Timber and non-timber forest products are available
1. Establish timber shop
2. Timber and non-timber forest products can support wood industry
3. Plant sugar cane in the empty land within the forest

4. Institutional aspect (Presented by Radi)
Principle: Mutual agreement
1. All related agencies had the feeling of shared responsibilities
2. Increased clarity of their rights and responsibilities
3. The clarity of LMDH membership (the sign card of the member – the clarity of their rights and obligations)
4. Socialization to the hamlet periodically to increase the understanding of CCFM.

Principle: the Existence of the management and coordination among the stakeholders or institutions.
1. Increased mutual cooperation (that is mutually beneficial to all related parties)
2. Inventory and a clear boundary of the managed area (real condition in the field)

The presentation by the representative of each group was criticized by other participants in the discussion session. The Perhutani staff proposed that the local community pay more attention on the issue of forest protection, for example by collectively protect the forest against forest plundering at Gempol village. According to the Village Headman, the local community would engage in forest protection if Perhutani gives real attention to the welfare of forest farmers. If the latter occurs, the farmers would willingly and seriously guard the forests.
Special appreciation is given to the community members who have successfully planted trees within the forest area, and Perhutani gives them award and incentives such as paying their land tax.

The facilitator asked how well community and Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH) know about their right and obligation. Until now there had been the understanding that the members of LMDH were all villagers who live in Gempol village, but this assumption was confused with the village citizens. The basic problem is who are the members of Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH) at Gempol Village? It seems LMDH needs to develop a strategy to manage their members at Gempol Village. Several participants agreed to maintain the members by registering them permanently, but the rest of participants might not be registered. Assuming that all Gempol villagers are members of the cooperative which is established by LMDH, this means the members of the cooperative are also the members of LMDH.

The facilitator explained that LMDH and the cooperative are two different institutions, and they are related in term of the co-operative capital only, i.e. the capital of the cooperative comes from LMDH. One idea emerged that how the participants formulate the obligatory of capital which was used by co-operative members? What are the relationship mechanisms between LMDH and co-operative? An alternative is by creating a new body such as PHBM communication forum as a controller and supervisory body for cooperative. It is quite fair. The village headman agreed to use and maximize the function of the available institutions that exist such as PHBM Communication Forum at the village level.

Responses from the participants were requested on the proposals prepared by the board of LMDH on how to allocate the budget which will be allocated by Perhutani on the basis of 2007 benefits sharing. The proposals were:

1. About 40% of the budget will be allocated for productive business, in the form of the maintenance of porang (medicinal herb under teak stand) plantation, capital for cooperative activities, cattle fattening, wood carving industries, the improvement of the road from Telogo Tuwung to Kaliaren, and for office facilities.
2. About 30% of the capital will be used for supporting of the activity of the Indonesian Independent Celebration, sport activities, Health Service for children under 5 years old, charity for family whose member passes away, religious activities, education, the improvement of the road between hamlets, Al-Quran education, the welfare of the village administrators, religious groups, the tax for land and building, forest farmers within forest compartments.
3. About 20% of the capital will be used for institutional management such as: training, coordination to delineate the territorial boundaries, LMDH routine meetings, cross visit, building maintenance, office equipment, the gardener or the office guard, electricity costs, the security patrol, accommodation, health, membership cards, consumption of the guests.

The facilitator asked the participants to respond to the proposals that have been formulated by the board of LMDH, and at the same time considered the 3 proposals proposed by the participants early on. They were:

1. Budget allocation sharing for coconut trees plantation.
2. How to get the crop seeds easier
3. New regulation of the land and building tax payments

Participants warned that in the KPH level there is a reduction of capital for the cross subsidy, PHBM Communication Forum at the sub-district level, etc. This capital reduction will affect the sharing allocation fund. The mechanism that was compiled by KPH must be completed, including report and proposal along with other LMDH at the KPH level.

The discussions continued with the formulation of the sharing allocation during 2007, by paying attention to all aspects that were proposed based on the agreement of the budget allocation sharing of 2006.

The facilitators formally closed the workshop by thanking the participants for their participation and congratulated them for successfully completed the evaluation of forest resource management at Gempol village, KPH Randublatung.
F. The Results of Workshop

The Final Results of Evaluation of Forest Resources Sustainability in Gempol Village Area:
1. There is a learning process among stakeholders to undertake step by step evaluation of Sustainable Forest Resources Management.
2. There was a negotiation process done by the stakeholders to formulate the next work plan and the sharing allocations for Gempol Village.
3. Formulated the evaluation of Sustainable Forest Resources for Gempol Village
4. The formulation of the follow up work plan
5. The formulation of the 2006 shared allocation for 2007 activities based on the institutional agreements, as follows:

Sharing allocation according to the participants:
- Cross subsidy 5%
- Association 0.5%
- PHBM Communication forum at the sub-district level 1.5%
- PHBM Communication forum at the village level 3%
- Forest farmers (petani hutan/pesanggem) 5%
- Social allocations 10%
- Productive activities 20%
- Environment and biophysical 30%
- Operation 17%
- Incentives for LMDH board 8%

G. Annexes

Participants List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Samsoeri</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Radi</td>
<td>LMDH Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Suparno</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parji</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sudjadi</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuning Juwarni</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Suwarjo</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Siswanto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sabar</td>
<td>Perhutani Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sutarno</td>
<td>Perhutani Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Djumingun</td>
<td>Community Representative Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Basri</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tamin</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Suwanto</td>
<td>Forest User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Siswoto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Maryadi</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Siman</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Suwardi</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Priyanto</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Suparmin</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 13

Levelling the Playing Field: Fair Partnership for Local Development to Improve the Forest Sustainability in Southeast Asia

Workshop on Criteria and Indicator for Sustainable Forest Management in KPH Pemalang

University of the Philippines Los Banos (UPLB)
Centre de Cooperation Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Developpment (CIRAD)
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Workshop on Criteria and Indicator for Sustainable Forest Management in KPH Pemalang

Time: Monday, September 11, 2006 at 8AM – 2PM
Place: Tumpangsari Building, KPH Pemalang

1. The Participant Registration

The participants of the workshop started to arrive at 08.00 a.m at the Tumpangsari building at KPH Pemalang. The invited participants include the representatives of the PHBM institution coming from various KPH Pemalang such as from LMDH Glandang (5 people), LMDH Surajaya (5 people), LMDHs delegation coming from various KPH Pemalang (43 people), the Government of the village (2 people), PHBM Communication Forum at the village level (2 people), PHBM Communication Forum at the Sub-district level (2 people), PHBM Communication Forum in Pemalang district (2 people), district level forestry department (1 people), Perhutani (15 people, consisting of 6 people KBKPH, 3 people KRPH, 4 foremen, Administrator, the vice Administrator, Head of PSDH sector, Head of sub sector PHBM) and also PLPS addition (3 people). The distribution of the participants according to gender can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. List of participants and gender distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perhutani staff at the KPH level</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perhutani staff at the unit level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forest Village Community Institution more than one</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The village government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LMDH Glandang</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LMDH Surajaya</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum at subdistrict level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum at the village level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum at the district level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UGM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PLPS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Opening

a. The workshop was opened by ADM KPH Pemalang, Ananda Artono (ADM KPH Pemalang) that acknowledged the introduction and the invitation to think about "what has happened with regards to PHBM?" How much have been achieved so far? What is lacking and what are the opportunities that we have?" He also described the aim of the workshop, i.e. how the PHBM are implemented in the two villages: Glandang and Surajaya. He also stated that
RPH Glandang is a RPH model in KPH Pemalang, and as it proceeds it involves UGM as facilitator

b. The opening remark was continued by the Diki Yuana Radi (Head of PHBM section in Perhutani Unit I Central Java). He delivered the following:

- Apology for the absence of the Head of PHBM division at the unit level,
- PHBM is very beautiful at the conceptual level but its implementation in the field evidently has not been easy.
- Many hindrances occurred both from within Perhutani and from the outside. The hindrance from within Perhutani included the diverse understanding of PHBM and that the implementers at the field level still have an attitude which is difficult to change.
- The strategic Plan of PHBM/LMDH must be in synergy with the social and environment agenda which is stated in Perhutani’s strategic plan.

c. It was followed by San Afri Awang (Tim LPF UGM) that delivered:

- The aim of the workshop, i.e. to formulate the criteria and indicators in a participatory way.
- Descriptions of LPF project that was carried out in three countries and the goals of the program.
- The processes and the achievement of LPF project in Glandang Village and Surajaya village

d. The last welcome address came from the chairman PHBM Communication Forum at the district level, Eko Budi Priyanto. He mentioned the following:

- Apology for the absence of the chairman of PHBM Communication Forum at the district level.
- The support that the Communication Forum at the district level gives to the PHBM system.
- The evaluation activity that was carried out by PHBM Communication Forum at the district level.

3. LMDH Presentation

3.1. LMDH Wanajaya of Surajaya Village, delivered by Santoro, the treasurer of LMDH

Wanajaya

The Evaluation Model of Sustainability Forest Resource on PHBM System

Background:

- The implementation of the Forest management with the Community (PHBM) has been carried out since 2001.
- The existing criteria and indicators were formulated by one stakeholder only, i.e. the decision makers.
- The existing evaluation model was not able to capture the diversity of the existing problems or the issues assessed were irrelevant with the conditions at the field.

Participatory development of the criteria and indicators involved various stakeholders such as the forest community institution (LMDH), the village government, Perhutani, Communication Forum at the village level, and other elements at the village level in formulating and determining the criteria and indicators for sustainable forest that cover the ecology, institutional, social, economic aspects.

The rationale behind the evaluation model:
• As a reference for all stakeholders in evaluating forest sustainability under the PHBM system so that PHBM assessment and implementation can be improved.

The aim of the Evaluation Model:

- As a collaborative learning for PHBM stakeholders so that they know the development and the problems of PHBM.
- To assess the impacts of PHBM implementation in all related aspects: the ecology, institutional, economics, and social.
- To serve as materials for the formulation of the follow-up plan (RTL) to improve the processes of PHBM implementation.

The evaluation target of the participatory implementation of PHBM: covered all the activities that were carried out by PHBM stakeholders.

The evaluation process:

- Formulation of the Principle, the Criteria and the indicators, which is followed by the ranking and scoring process.
- Evaluation
- Formulation of a follow-up Plan (RTL)

Participatory Development of Criteria and Indicators for the assessment of Sustainable Forest Management in Surajaya Village:

(P=Principle; K = Criteria; I = Indicator; V = Verifier; B = weight)

**ECOLOGICAL ASPECT**

**P. 1 [B: 20]** The balance of both physical and the environment of forest resources could be maintained.

**K.1.1 [B: 75]** The Continuity of forest function.

  1. **I.1.1.1 [B: 23]** The success of planting.
  2. **I.1.1.2 [B: 20]** The level of timber theft.
  3. **I.1.1.3 [B: 17]** The reduction of land destruction activity (the example: sand mining).
  4. **I.1.1.4 [B: 14]** The area of the empty land compared to the area of forest compartment
  5. **I.1.1.5 [B: 11]** The diversity of forest class.
  6. **I.1.1.6 [B: 7]** The existence of water springs.
  7. **I.1.1.7 [B: 5]** The availability of water to fulfill the need of the community.
  8. **I.1.1.8 [B: 2]** The diversity of flora and fauna.

**K.1.2 [B: 25]** Forest management plan is formulated in a participatory way.

  1. **I.1.2.1 [B: 25]** The stakeholders engaged in the formulation of forest management plan.
  2. **I.1.2.2 [B: 31]** Participatory planning covered all aspects of forest management including activities, schedule, and budget.
  3. **I.1.2.3 [B: 19]** Level of realization of the plan.
  4. **I.1.2.4 [B: 19]** The stakeholders engaged in the implementation of forest management plan.

**INSTITUTIONAL ASPECT**

**P.2 [B: 36]** Co-operation between institutions

**K.2.1 [B:100]** Equality between institutions involved in PHBM.
I.2.1.1 [B: 23] Co-operation between institutions in forest management.
I.2.1.2 [B: 20] Coordination among government agencies and other institutions involved in PHBM.
I.2.1.3 [B: 17] Frequency of routine meetings between PHBM institutions.
I.2.1.4 [B: 14] The sharing of information and knowledge between institutions.
   V.I.2.1.4.1 [B: 56] There is a willingness to share information in PHBM learning process.
   V.I.2.1.4.2 [B: 33] The process of information sharing in PHBM learning process.
   V.I.2.1.4.3 [B: 11] The scope of information sharing (planning, planting, maintenance, harvesting, security).
I.2.1.5 [B: 11] Opportunities to negotiate between institutions exist.
I.2.1.6 [B: 8] Mechanisms for inter-institution decision making.
I.2.1.7 [B: 5] Perhutani’s role as facilitator.
I.2.1.8 [B: 2] The simplicity of the system and procedure in forest management.

P.3 [B: 28] Arrangements for the implementation of internal functions of the institution run well.
K.3.1 [B: 23] The process of establishing the institution
   I.3.2.1 [B: 31] The clarity of the membership.
   I.3.2.2 [B: 25] The percentage of the members from the total number of forest user group.
   I.3.2.3 [B: 19] The mechanisms for accepting members.
   I.3.2.4 [B: 14] The rights and responsibilities of the members.
   I.3.2.5 [B: 12] The participation of the members.
   I.3.2.6 [B: 3] Members’ understanding of PHBM.
K.3.3 [B: 17] Leadership in the institution.
   I.3.3.1 [B: 75] There is a regeneration process.
   I.3.3.2 [B: 25] The basis of selecting the leader.
   I.3.4.1 [B: 23] Organisational structure which meets the needs.
   I.3.4.2 [B: 20] The work program of the institution.
      V.3.4.2.1 [N:75] A work program of institution exists.
      V.3.4.2.1 [N:25] The period of the work program.
   I.3.4.3 [B: 17] There are routine meetings among institutions.
   I.3.4.5 [B: 14] The officials understand their duty and function.
   I.3.4.6 [B: 14] The management functions well.
   I.3.4.7 [B: 8] The mechanisms of electing officials.
   I.3.4.8 [B: 8] There is a mechanism of decision making.
   I.3.4.9 [B: 3] The frequency of field activity.
K.3.5 [B: 11] The completeness of the administration.
   I.3.5.1 [B: 44] The documentation of the institution’s activities.
   I.3.5.2 [B: 31] The documentation of the membership (memberships’ card or book).
I.3.5.3 [B: 19]  The existence of the secretariate of the institution.
I.3.5.4 [B: 6]  The existence of the information board at the secretariate.

K.3.6 [B: 8]  Communication.
I.3.6.1 [B: 56]  The mechanism of internal communication.
I.3.6.2 [B: 33]  Transfer of information and knowledge within the institution.
I.3.6.3 [B: 11]  The meeting can accommodate all the members’ interests.

K.3.7 [B: 5]  Basic internal rules of organization (ART).
I.3.7.1 [B: 75]  Basic internal rules of organization (ART).
I.3.7.2 [B: 25]  Basic internal rules are used as reference.

K.3.8 [B: 5]  The capacity of organization to develop network.
I.3.8.1 [B:100]  Cooperation with other organization.

ECONOMIC ASPECT

P.4 [B: 4]  The welfare of the community is guaranteed.
I.4.1.1 [B: 56]  The achievement level of benefit-sharing percentage.
I.4.1.2 [B: 56]  There is a transparency in the calculation of the profit sharing.
I.4.1.3 [B: 33]  The allocation of the profit-sharing is carried out in accordance to the notary's certificate.

K.4.2 [B: 33]  The allocation of the internal LMDH benefit-sharing.
I.4.2.1 [B: 75]  There is a transparency in the calculation of the profit sharing.
I.4.2.2 [B: 25]  The allocation of the profit-sharing is carried out in accordance to the basic internal rules of the institution.

K.4.3 [B: 11]  The income of the community is increased.
I.4.3.1 [B:44]  The utilization of the land for inter-cropping.
I.4.3.2 [B:31]  The land is managed efficiently and effectively.
I.4.3.3 [B: 11]  The emergence of the domestic industry from the processing of the non timber forest
I.4.3.4 [B: 11]  The availability of livestock feed

SOCIAL ASPECT

P.5 [B: 12]  The strengthening of the community's capacity in forest management.
K.5.1 [B: 44]  The awareness of the community of forest management.
I.5.1.1 [B: 36]  The increase in the understanding of community about PHBM.
I.5.1.2 [B: 28]  Participation of the community in forest management.
I.5.1.3 [B: 20]  The values (religion, culture, law, etc) held by the community promote forest conservation.
I.5.1.4 [B: 12]  The existing social organizations promote the awareness of the community in forest management.
I.5.1.5 [B: 4]  The growth of local wisdom in forest management.

K.5.2 [B: 31]  The mechanism of the conflict resolution in PHBM.
I.5.2.1 [B:100]  The mechanism of conflict resolution in PHBM.

K.5.3 [B: 19]  Land system.
I.5.3.1 [B: 75]  The clarity of the boundaries of the forest compartment.
I.5.3.1 [B: 11]  Fairness in the distribution of the crop land within the compartment.
K.5.4 [B: 6] The roles of women in forest management

I.5.4.1 [B: 44] The acknowledgment of the roles of women in forest management.

I.5.4.2 [B: 31] [B: 44] The involvement of women in PHBM.

I.5.4.3 [B: 19] Fair access for women in all aspects of forest management.

I.5.4.3 [B: 6] Fairness in labor wage in forest management activities.

The scoring system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 and &lt; 3</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 and &lt; 5</td>
<td>very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>score</th>
<th>output of Evaluation</th>
<th>perfect score</th>
<th>differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>The balance between and the environment of forest resources</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Cooperation between institutions.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrangements for the implementation of internal functions of the institution run well.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>The welfare of the community is guaranteed.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>The strengthening of the community's capacity in the forest management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM): 3.88
Maximal score : 5
Difference : 1.12
Score Category : Good

3.2. LMDH Karya Lestari of Glandang Village by Sri Budi Priyanto, the head of LMDH Karya Lestari

Participatory Development of Criteria and Indicators for the assessment of Sustainable Forest Management in Glandang Village:

INSTITUTIONAL ASPECT

P.2 [B: 36] PHBM institution

K.2.1 [B:100] Equality between institutions involved in PHBM.

I.2.1.1 [B: 23] There is inter-institutional agreement in forest management.
I.2.1.2 [B: 20] There are efforts to share information and knowledge among institutions.

V.2.1.2.1 The mechanism of information and knowledge sharing.
V.2.1.2.2 [B: 17] The scope of information sharing (planning, planting, maintenance, harvesting, security).

I.2.1.3. [B: 14] There is multi-stakeholder coordination.
I.2.1.4 [B: 11] There are inter-institutional meetings.
I.2.1.5 [B: 8] There is a space for negotiation among institutions.
I.2.1.6 [B: 8] Mechanisms for inter-institutional decision making.
I.2.1.7 [B: 5] Perhutani’s role as facilitator.
I.2.1.8 [B: 2] The simplicity of the system and procedure in forest management.

P.3 [B: 28] Arrangements for the implementation of internal functions of the institution run well. K.3.1 [B: 23] The process of establishing the institution

I.3.1.2 [B: 33] The legality of the institution.
I.3.1.3 [B: 11] There is an organizational structure that suits the needs.

K.3.2 [B: 20] Membership in the institution

I.3.2.1 [B: 31] The clarity of the membership
I.3.2.2 [B: 25] The mechanisms for accepting members.
I.3.2.3 [B: 19] The rights and responsibilities of the members.
I.3.2.4 [B: 14] The participation of the members.
V.3.2.4.1 The motivation of the members.
V.3.2.4.2 The level of participation.
I.3.2.5 [B: 12] The percentage of the members.
V.3.2.5.1 The percentage of the members from the total number of forest farmers.
V.3.2.5.2 The percentage of the member from the total number of villagers

K.3.3 [B: 17] Leadership in the institution.

I.3.3.1 [B: 56] The limit of the leadership period
I.3.3.2 [B: 33] There is a regeneration process.
I.3.3.3 [B: 11] The basis of selecting the leader.


I.3.4.1 [B: 23] The work program of the institution.
I.3.4.2 [B: 20] Routine meetings are held
I.3.4.3 [N:75] The officials understand their duty and function.
I.3.4.5 [B: 8] The mechanism of electing officials.
I.3.4.6 [B: 8] There is a mechanism of decision making

K.3.5 [B: 11] The completeness of the administration

I.3.5.1 [B: 44] All activities in institution are documented
I.3.5.2 [B: 31] The documentation of membership (card/member book)
I.3.5.3 [B: 19] The existence of the information board at the secretariate.
I.3.5.4 [B: 6] The existence of the secretariate of the institution.

K.3.6 [B: 8] Communication.
I.3.6.1 [B: 56] The mechanism of internal communication.
I.3.6.2 [B: 33] Transfer of information and knowledge within the institution.
I.3.6.3 [B: 11] The meeting can accommodate all the members’ interests.

K.3.7 [B: 5] Basic internal rules of organization (ART).
I.3.7.1 [B: 75] Basic internal rules of organization (ART).
I.3.7.2 [B: 25] Basic internal rules are used as reference.

K.3.8 [B: 5] The capacity of organization to develop network.
I.3.8.1 [B:100] Cooperation with other organization.

K.2.8 [B: 2] The understanding of PHBM
I.2.8.1 [B:100] The level of the understanding of the members about PHBM

ECOLOGY ASPECT
P.3 [B: 20] The physical balance and the environment of forest resources is increased

K.3.1 [B: 75] The continuity of forest Function
I.3.1.1 [B: 12] The speed of which the empty land is planted.
I.3.1.2 [B: 11] The involvement of forest farmers in forest management.

V.3.1.2.1 [B: 44] Their involvement in the planting process
V.3.1.2.2 [B: 31] The involvement in the maintenance process
V.3.1.2.3 [B: 19] Initiative in securing the forest.
V. 3.1.2.4 [B: 6] Forest harvesting (1. Tree census and volume estimation, 2. natural tree drying, 3. cutting, bucking and measuring, 4. skidding, downloading, transportation, 5. forest protection).

I.3.1.3 [B: 9] The success of planting.
I.3.1.4 [B: 8] Soil fertility is maintained.
I.3.1.5 [B: 7] There is consideration and knowledge of the kind and the planting system that are suitable to the location.
I.3.1.6 [B: 5] Access to forest management for the community is guaranteed.
I.3.1.7 [B: 4] Level of forest destruction is reduced.
I.3.1.8 [B: 2] The planting system.
I.3.1.9 [B: 1] The use of suitable fertilizer.
I.3.1.10 [B: 12] The maintenance of water spring.
I.3.1.11 [B: 11] The availability of water to fulfill the need of the community.
I.3.1.13 [B: 8] The diversity of the flora and the fauna is maintained.

K.3.2 [B: 25] The planning of forest management is done in a participatory manner
I.3.2.1 [B: 56] Participatory planning covered all aspects of forest management including activities, schedule, and budget.

V.3.2.1.1 [B: 33] The stakeholders engaged in the formulation of forest management plan.
V.3.2.1.2 [B: 11] The stakeholders engaged in the implementation of forest management plan.

SOCIAL ASPECT
P.4 [B: 12] The strengthening of the community's capacity in forest management

K.4.1 [B: 44] The awareness of the community of forest management
I.4.1.1 [B: 44] The increase in the understanding of the community about PHBM
I.4.1.2  [B: 31]  The values (religion, culture, law) held by the community promote forest conservation.

I.4.1.3  [B: 19]  The existing social organizations promote the awareness of the community in forest management.

I.4.1.4  [B: 6]  The growth of local wisdom in forest management

K.4.2  [B: 31]  The mechanism of conflict resolution in PHBM

I.4.2.1  [B:100]  Mechanism of conflict resolution in PHBM

K.4.3  [B: 19]  Land system

I.4.3.1  [B: 56]  The clarity of the boundaries of the forest compartment.

I.4.3.2  [B: 33]  Fairness in the distribution of the forest compartment.

I.4.3.3  [B: 11]  Fairness in the distribution of the crop land within the compartment.

K.4.4  [B: 6]  Gender Issue

I.4.4.1  [B: 44]  The involvement of women in PHBM

I.4.4.2  [B: 31]  Fair access for women in all aspects of forest management (planning, planting, the maintenance, the harvesting, the security)

I.4.4.3  [B: 19]  Acknowledgement of the roles of women in forest management

I.4.4.4  [B: 6]  Fairness in labor wage in forest management activities.

ECONOMIC ASPECT

P.5  [B: 4]  The welfare of the community is guaranteed

K.5.1  [B: 56]  Benefit sharing allocation between Perhutani and LMDH

I.5.1.1  [B: 11]  Benefit sharing allocation is carried out in accordance to the internal LMDH rule

I.5.1.2  [B: 56]  The allocation of the profit-sharing from Perhutani to LMDH is in accordance to their respective contribution

I.5.1.3  [B: 33]  There is transparency in the calculation of the profit sharing

K.5.2  [B: 33]  The marketing of inter-cropping products

I.5.2.1  [B:100]  There is a system that promote the marketing of inter-cropping products

K.5.3  [B: 11]  The alternative economic activity is increased

I.5.3.1  [B:100]  The emergence of home industry from the processing of non timber forest products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>score</th>
<th>output of Evaluation</th>
<th>perfect score</th>
<th>differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>The balance between and the environment of forest resources</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Cooperation between institution</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrangements for the implementation of internal functions of the institution run well.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>The welfare of the community is guaranteed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Aspect Principle rank score output of Evaluation perfect score differences
Social The strengthening of the community's capacity in forest management 4 2.84 0.17 0.2 0.27

Score of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM):  3.21
Maximal Score :  5
Difference :  1.79
Score category :  Good

4. Plenary Discussions
Facilitator: San Afri Awang

Discussions were preceded by listening to the comments made by the participants:

- Ananda Artono (ADM KPH Pemalang): First, this evaluation activity involved just two LMDH. We saw that the two LMDH had several differences and certainly there will be more diversity in the other 43 LMDH. The ADM of KPH Pemalang offered to make the evaluation model of LMDH Glandang and LMDH Surajaya as the standard in all LMDH. Second, the formulation of participatory forest management plan begun in the field, so as RPH and BKPH understood it well. The plans that were developed from the 2 villages have been very good.

- Diki Yuana Radi (Perhutani Unit I Central Java): the assessment results of the criteria and the indicators have been good but they were still far in comparison with the results of the evaluation of Unit I. This was because the standard is different from the unit I standard that saw the input, the process through to the output. The evaluation of the unit I is not only made based on the activities, but also the social impacts, for example the education, welfare, women’s participation, productive efforts related to investment. Now, Perhutani provides some money to LMDH as a capital for its bussines. Instead of PHBM evaluation at Unit I level, Perhutani’s criteria and indicator will refer to the experiences of Surajaya and Glandang.

- Eko Budi Priyanto (Communication Forum of PHBM in Pemalang District): First, there is a need to be honest in the evaluation so that the results are more objective and in accordance to the real conditions. Second, the standardization of the evaluation model. It is expected that the evaluation model can be formulated for all of LMDH in the Pemalang District, i.e the total of 83 LMDHs from 3 KPH. FK PHBM expected that the activities can be focused.

- Toni Suratno (vice Administrator in KPH Pemalang): As everybody know that the result of the evaluation of PHBM performance in KPH Pemalang done by Perhutani Unit indicated that the performance of PHBM in KPH Pemalang was poor. Nevertheless, the evaluation of PHBM performance done by villagers, facilitated by LPF, indicated that the performance was good. The different result was due to the difference in the criteria and indicator used in the evaluation.

- Suristo (Head of Surajaya village): regarding the use of criteria and indicators developed by LMDH, he stated that the PHBM performance was good. PHBM program, therefore, did not address forestry plantation only, but at the same time developed an agenda for village development within the Working Groups. Each working group has developed their own program and it is related to the program of the government at the district level.

- Kusnadi (Head of LMDH Association, KPH level): (1) One important criteria of success for PHBM should not be compromised with the indicator of violence. The indicator should be the use of non-violence in problem solving. (2) LMDH administration has to be completed. (3) The budget received should be used to improve LMDH activities; (4) Good relationship among LMDH association and Forestry office should be further
improved; (5) Propose a guide for the implementation of CF-PHBM at various levels; (6) Share the knowledge from Surajaya and Glandang to all LMDH in KPH Pemalang.

The topics that were often discussed were:

- The institutional evaluation was not focused to the physical aspect of the institution like the secretariat building only, but went beyond this.
- The evaluation is better emerged from the ground, because of their respective LMDH diversity, and policy-makers only provided the value and the norms.
- The ones that are linked with the Association must be able to represent the interests of the community, and could serve as the bridge between the community and Perhutani. The Association should not stay at the higher level and did not voice the real interests. The association must go down and listen to the voice of the grass root.
- The procedure to get PKBL?
- The fund from the regional government amounted to 73 million, how to liquidate it?

The response:

- According to Perhutani’s contract regulation, forest farmers, who are involved in the planting the tree, are also allowed to plant agricultural crops for 2 years only. After 2 years those farmers have to be moved out from forest compartment. Based on farmers’ point of view, however, this 2 year contract period did not match the long rotation forest management which was stated and agreed in the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between LMDH and Perhutani. This limitation made it difficult to ask the forest farmers to continue managing the forests. The use of violence in problem solving is not absolute, it is an option only.
- LMDH established the plantation according to the standard. The percentage of successful plantation of LMDH is higher than the standard of Perhutani. The purpose is to motivate forest farmers and LMDH so that they are more responsible.
- The response from Perhutani to those issues: first, if contractual farming is done more than 2 years, it will negatively impact the trees; second, PHBM evaluation is done after PHBM is implemented for a year.
- The budget of the Pemalang District Government was 73 million and was allocated for evaluation (11 million), training of 25 LMDH (62 million).
- PHBM Communication Forum at the district level will help LMDH by providing the fund for the total of 70 million for coffee and patchouli planting.

5. Conclusion

- Criteria and indicator are important as a basis to measure successful and failure of PHBM activities. Experiences from Glandang and Surajaya can be seen as a learning process among PHBM stakeholders. There is a need to further improve the role of CF-PHBM.
- All Perhutani’s staff must enhance their knowledge in respect to PHBM program.
- Stakeholder coordination must continue and carried out intensively.
- Equal forest utilization is supported by Perhutani. Every LMDH is expected to develop a plan and get support from Perhutani.
- PHBM implementation model in LPF program:

6. Closing

The workshop was closed by the administrator of KPH Pemalang. He expressed his gratitude that the workshop was completed successfully. The workshop was just a beginning of a major task in forest management. He emphasized that forest management must begin with a realistic plan so that it can be used as a reference in the actual implementation.
The list of the participant of the Workshop on the Criteria and Indicator of PHBM in Forest Pemalang District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rohib</td>
<td>LMDH Kreo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kamari</td>
<td>LMDH Kreo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teguh Purnomo</td>
<td>mandor RPH Glandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M. Ali Murtadho</td>
<td>mandor RPH Glandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gunawan</td>
<td>RPH Cipero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sarto Soedibyo</td>
<td>LMDH Penggarit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Casmito</td>
<td>Mandor RPH Sokawati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ruswadi</td>
<td>Mandor Slarang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sarinto</td>
<td>LMDH Cangak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Samaji</td>
<td>LMDH Sokawati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rahmat KP</td>
<td>KRPH Paduraksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ali Murtopo</td>
<td>LMDH Glandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tarono</td>
<td>LMDH Glandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Asmoro</td>
<td>LMDH Glandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kusnadi</td>
<td>LMDH Lenggerong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sri Budi Priyanto</td>
<td>LMDH Glandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Suwandi</td>
<td>LMDH Penggarit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Suwarso</td>
<td>KRPH Kramat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Supardo</td>
<td>LMDH Surajaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Slamet H</td>
<td>Sokawati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mulyorejo</td>
<td>Sokawati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sambeng</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Budi Wibowo</td>
<td>BKPH Bantarbolang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Suwandi</td>
<td>BKPH Jatinegara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sutikno</td>
<td>LMDH Kuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tangi</td>
<td>LMDH Surajaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Slamet W</td>
<td>LMDH Pegongsoran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Samiyo</td>
<td>KRPH Sokawati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nurwiharno</td>
<td>LMDH Kebon Gede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kuswadi</td>
<td>LMDH Kebon Gede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sucipto</td>
<td>LMDH Surajaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hilman</td>
<td>Kasi PSDH Perhutani Pemalang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Toni Suratno</td>
<td>Wakil ADM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Didid Purwoko</td>
<td>FK PHBM Kabupaten Pemalang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Santoro</td>
<td>LMDH Surajaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Endah. W, SIP</td>
<td>FK PHBM Kecamatan Bantarbolang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Suwarno</td>
<td>LMDH Kramat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Wasmo</td>
<td>LMDH Penggarit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Alip Winardo</td>
<td>FK PHBM Desa Surajaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sukim</td>
<td>LMDH Capar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Tasori</td>
<td>LMDH Glandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Suratno</td>
<td>LMDH Glandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Syamsudin</td>
<td>LMDH Lebak wangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Radjim</td>
<td>LMDH Wotgalih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>S. Dradjat</td>
<td>KBKPH Kedungjati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Salasin</td>
<td>LMDH Bantarbolang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Suranto</td>
<td>LMDH Sungapan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Suhadi</td>
<td>LMDH Paguyangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sukisno</td>
<td>LMDH Paguyangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Suwardi</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Suristo</td>
<td>Village Headman of Surajaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sri Puji Ambarwati</td>
<td>Village Headman of Glandang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Umar Subiyono</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>San Afri Awang</td>
<td>UGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ananda Artono</td>
<td>ADM KPH Pemalang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mugni</td>
<td>Asper Cipero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Lasimen</td>
<td>Humas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Dicky Yuana Radi</td>
<td>Unit I Semarang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Wahubi</td>
<td>LMDH Pegiringan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Sohirin</td>
<td>LMDH Pegonsoran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Jana. S</td>
<td>LMDH Pegonsoran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Suhardi</td>
<td>Perhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Rahnoto</td>
<td>LMDH Banjar Mulya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Budi</td>
<td>LMDH Banjar Mulya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Suripto</td>
<td>LMDH Tegalsari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Darmanto</td>
<td>LMDH Kreo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Turah Suparno</td>
<td>LMDH Payung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Kasmuri</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Kastari</td>
<td>LMDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Eko Budi Priyanto</td>
<td>FK PHBM Kabupaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Sarip</td>
<td>LMDH Sarwodadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Kasidin</td>
<td>LMDH Karangmalang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Mutakim</td>
<td>LMDH Mereng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Bariatul Himmah</td>
<td>UGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Ratih Madya Septiana</td>
<td>UGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Solehudin</td>
<td>UGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Herniwati</td>
<td>PLPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>PLPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Bambang</td>
<td>PLPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Waluyo</td>
<td>FK PHBM Kecamatan Bantarbolang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Mufatir</td>
<td>FK PHBM Kabupaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Ekit Lukito</td>
<td>LMDH Glandang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 14

Levelling the Playing Field:
Fair Partnership for Local Development to Improve the Forest Sustainability in Southeast Asia

Workshop on the Evaluation of Sustainable Forest Resource under PHBM Program at KPH Randublatung

University of the Philippines Los Banos (UPLB)
Centre de Cooperation Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Developpment (CIRAD)
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Workshop
on the Evaluation of Sustainable Forest Resources under PHBM Program at KPH Randublatung

A. Time
Saturday, 30 September 2006

B. Location
The office of KPH Randublatung

C. Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forest Village Institution</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perhutani staff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHBM Communication Forum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Facilitator
LPF Project team of Gadjah Mada University

E. Goal

1. As a media of learning for stakeholders on CCFM Program in order to know about the problems and the development of CCFM.
2. To understand the impacts of different aspects of CCFM implementation, i.e. ecology, economy, institution, and social.
3. To collect relevant materials to formulate a work plan to improve CCFM implementation.

F. Workshop Process

F.1. Opening
The Chairman of LMDH Association of Randublatung Subdistrict, Mr. Bambang, opened the meeting and informed the participants about the schedule of the activities that will take place during today’s meeting:
1. Opening
2. Briefing from ADM KKPH Randublatung,
3. Briefing from Gadjah Mada University team, Mr San Afri Awang,
4. Presentation from LMDHs
5. Discussion
6. Closing
Afterwards, Bambang asked the participant to pray so that the workshop would produce good results.

**F.2. Brief from ADM KPH Randublatung.**

Adm KKPH Randublatung, Mr. Satrio W, greeted the participants and expressed his appreciation to the participants. He expressed his gratitude that the participants attend the workshop despite the Moslem’s fasting period. He said that in fact this meeting was initiated by the LPF team, and KPH only provided a venue. He explained what he knew about LPF project, i.e. it is implemented in three stages: the baseline stage (collecting basic data), the intervention stage, taking place 2 years ago and facilitating LMDH to develop their own mission and points of view for the future, and lastly, the evaluation stage. The results of the evaluation will be presented by LMDH today. These results indicate that the processes facilitated by LPF project have produced tangible results. LPF could be seen as having an ideal combination of social and technical sciences. The LPF project not only took LMDH to the main gate, but took it all the way to a success. Lastly, he expressed his expectation that this workshop could produce significant inputs that can improve forest management in the area and are also applicable in other LMDH.

Suyudi, from the Unit I Central Java, gave his salutation and appreciation to Mr San Afri Awang, the Head of KPH Randublatung and other Perhutani staff. He also raised his gratitude to God Almighty. Suyudi informed the participants that several days ago, in August 31, Perhutani also held a meeting to reflect on the implementation of PHBM at the unit level. This will also be done at later stage at KPH level. The reflection has been undertaken in Randublatung, and at later stage, it will engage other stakeholders, ADM, and the community in Central Java.

**F.3. Briefing from Gadjah Mada University, Mr San Afri Awang.**

San Afri Awang, the National Coordinator of the LPF Project wished the participants, who were fasting, well and hoped that the fast could increase their religious belief. He also expressed his appreciation to the Head of KPH Randublatung, the delegation of the Unit 1 Central Java, LMDH, and LMDH Association. San Afri stated that the workshop was important for several reasons. First, it was done during the fasting month so it would enlight the spirit. Second, it was carried out on 30 September, the national day of “Kesaktian Pancasila” in which the Indonesian nation passed a test. Third, the workshop has been undertaken in each intervention stage and in every year. There are three stages in LPF project: baseline study, to collect physical and non-physical data, the intervention stage, and finally the evaluation stage. The latter stage is interesting because the community could evaluate PHBM system that has been implemented. LPF project adopts action research methodology in the hope that this research could also be applied to other LMDH. He pointed out the four aspects that will be evaluated: institution, social, economics and production, ecology and the environment. He stated that the principle was to have the world, and the criterion was specific, belongs to the community and Perhutani. He also emphasized that this evaluation will be done by LMDH themselves, and not by LPF or UGM, to evaluate their own conditions. For this reason, they should do the evaluation in an objective way. This was related to the fact that LPF conducted a participatory research that engages community in the process, and not a conventional research in which the results were taken home by the researchers to get academic degrees. He mentioned that he was aware of the fact that Perhutani has already had an evaluation mechanism, but the criteria used in the evaluation are not built from the ground. During this workshop, the criteria will be developed from the ground, i.e. by the community members and prominent figures. He mentioned that PHBM success has already reached 95%, and it is expected that the partnership becomes fairer and healthier through PBHM processes. This workshop was also timely since the unit and the management level were currently discussing the Criteria and Indicators.

**F.4. Presentation from LMDH and Discussion**

The next stage was the presentation from the LMDH from Tanggel and Gempol Villages:

**LMDH Gempol**

Presenter :  Nuning Juwarni
Priyanto
LMDH Tanggel
Presenter: Sri Hartati

Both of them presented the implementation and evaluation processes.

This discussion session was facilitated by San Afri Awang. San Afri Awang positively commented the participation of three new players in LMDH from Tanggel and Gempol Village. In 2004-2005, there were only several people who participated. Now there were newcomers which indicated that regeneration has occurred. He explained the reason why the project selected Gempol village and the Tanggel Village for the project sites. The best site at that time was Jegong village, that has had everything. He was nevertheless reluctant to select Jegong because many people had worked there and Jegong at the time has become the Perhutani’s showcase site. Beside Jegong, there were Gempol and Tanggel villages which were later selected as LPF project sites in KPH Pemalang. Gempol represents LMDH with good performance while Tanggel represents LMDH at early development.

The LPF team then entered the two villages to undertake research, collected data, and took the data back for further analysis. Based on the analysis, the LPF team then determined the interventions that can be applied by relevant agencies. Following the intervention, the evaluation will be conducted with active participation from the community. He pointed out that it is the community who would carry out the process of the evaluation. As the way of closing the presentation, San Afri Awang expressed his expectation that there will be constructive inputs to improve the process further.

Sumadi, LMDH of Bokorejo Village, expressed his expectation that the evaluation to be carried out by UGM could also be undertaken for other LMDH. He further asked whether the results of the assessment are reliable because he still had some doubts about the validity of this assessment.

Munindar, the Village Head Tanggel, pointed out that there are 2 BKPHs under his territory. He asked whether could be formed by the management of LMDH more than 1, because of the existence 2 BKPH earlier, afterwards asked LMDH Exchange the village land with the Perhutani land.

Suyudi, the Unit of I Central Java, informed the participants that during the LMDH Evaluation of 2005, based on the assessment by the unit, Wana Bersemi was ranked as one of the 10 best LMDH in Central Java. The result of assessment indicated that the class of teak was good and they would receive the reforestation fund for teak management. The evaluation of PHBM performance was based on several aspects (input, output). To undertake the evaluation, therefore, Perhutani implemented regulation No. 660. This regulation has been under revision since 2006. The PHBM evaluation should be done in mid 2006. Until now, the results of the field visit showed that some LMDH were still not rooted in the community. They were still perceived as Perhutani instrument for profit sharing. There were several cases in which the village government did not care about LMDH and viewed them as entities unrelated to village government. The community viewed LMDH board as representing the elites, and they felt that they were not engaged in LMDH processes.

San Afri Awang, the National Coordinator LPF Project, informed the participants of the findings from Ajun in 2004. They showed that the problem of the membership was a crucial issue. He pointed out that the issue of membership should be addressed immediately. Furthermore, PBHM concept should be communicated and explained to the community properly so that different groups within the community do not have different opinions of PHBM.

Sri Hartati, the Secretary LMDH Langgeng Jati Tanggel, said that in principle, there was no forest fire in the village, but forest fire should be included as one of the criteria in the PHBM evaluation framework.

Suparno, Asper KBKPH Selogender, proposed that in the evaluation of PHBM, the general criteria must be developed and implemented for all PHBM in KPH Randublatung. Afterward, ranking should be done for all aspects.

Satrio W., Adm of KPH Randublatung, responded to the head of Tanggel village. He explained that that Perhutani area should be divided based on the catchment area. As the consequence of this, the map of the village area is different with the map of Perhutani area. He emphasised that in the PHBM, there is only one LMDH per village. Regarding to the problem of land exchange, it was caused by geographic location of the land.

Rukmana, the Vice Head of KPH Randublatung, commented on the land exchange
problem. He explained that it has been handled the best they could. Perhutani has developed a 1:2 system to deal with the problem: 1 part for the forest land and 2 parts for the private land. But if Perhutani land consist of teak stand, the community have to compensate for the value of the teak stand.

Wahyu Tri Widayanti explained that differences in the Criteria and indicators framework produced by both villages indicated that the villages have site-specific characteristics. The conditions of both Tanggel and Gempol villages are different, so that we could make all criteria and indicators allowed to be implemented over the KPH. About the ranking, it was done at the levels of the criteria and principle. The ranking of aspect is just an accumulative sum of the ranks given to its respective principles. If ranking is done directly to the aspect level, it will affect the value.

Rukmana, Waka KPH Randublatung, said that not all that was of the same opinion if the criterion was different, that must be distinguished was how the LMDH condition was different, for example the benefit sharing. He pointed out that Perhutani in fact had different criterion for different area as reflected in the stratification system: LMDH sharing is large, LMDH sharing is small, and LMDH which does not receive any benefit sharing.

San Afri Awang explained that one of the PHBM rule is site specific. He reminded every body of PHBM basic act No. 136/2001. The criteria and location of PHBM area were not the same for all. Perhutani has adopted top down approach in undertaking the assessment for a long time. The LPF project tried to change the approach to the bottom up. This means that inter-village differences should be allowed. So, it should not be a problem if we find differences or variations among villages.

Asper KBKPH Ngliron asked for clarification on the level of understanding of the community of PHBM, and how it worked. This was because participatory evaluation is done by the community and not by elites only, for example on the issue of wood theft.

Sri Hartati explained that PHBM socialization has been conducted by LMDH to the community. Understanding of PHBM program will reduce the occurrence of destructive activities such as teak wood theft.

Mulyoto, the Chairman of LMDH Langgeng Jati Tanggel, explained that increasing the understanding of the community of PBHM will take time. The objective of PHBM is to increase the income of poor people who live in the surrounding forest. Right now, some of the poor people have already received the benefits from PHBM program through LMDH activities. So far, the constraint is the high dependence of LMDH on Perhutani, in term of forest management activities. There is an opportunity for the community members to get more jobs from harvesting activities because they know how to harvest the trees. He asked Perhutani to pay attention the foremen, particularly their salary, so that the community could not pay the foremen. LMDH requested Perhutani to improve the skills of the community through regular training and education.

Prianto, Vice Chairman of LMDH Wana Bersemi of Gempol, pointed out that without the co-operation and hard work of LMDH and Perhutani to improve the level of community’s understanding through socialization processes, positive results will not be produced. With regards to Gempol, he emphasized that the community’s level of awareness has reduced the occurrence of timber theft.

Sutarno, KRPH Kuwojo, said that Perhutani also gave several inputs to the progress of LMDH Wana Bersemi Gempol during the C and I formulation. He said that learning about PHBM has not been easy despite UGM continuous support to LMDH. But in each meeting, they could learn about their capabilities and weaknesses and to identify the root of problems they faced. He said after they developed the criteria, they also developed the indicators, so that they knew what should be done based on the list. He emphasized that through the socialization in each hamlet the understanding of the community of PHBM would be improved. He expected that through meetings, the behaviour and the understanding of the community with regards to PHBM could be improved and destructive activities in the forests could be reduced.

San Afri Awang, the National Coordinator LPF Project stated that all inputs gathered would be returned to the group to be processed again. This scheme will later be brought to the unit and the management.
Satrio W, Adm KKPH Randublatung stated that Perhutani will accommodate the proposal. He said that the proposal produced from the workshop will be proposed to the Unit I. He saluted the LMDH. Although the progress of LMDH capabilities can not be compared with those with formal education, he applauded their honesty. It will be excellent for Perhutani if this activity can be carried out to other LMDH. He said that the internal social changes within Perhutani could accommodate this.

Conclusion and Inputs from the participants:

1. The participants agreed that weighing was also done at the level of aspects, and not only limited to the principle and criteria only.
2. The uniformity of the principle and the criterion as desired by the Perhutani was achieved partly. It was only possible to produce uniform C&I for the ecology aspect as the C&I for other aspects are dependent on the community.
3. All related parties enhanced community’s understanding of PHBM by conducting intensive socializations.

F.5. Closing
The meeting was closed by Mr. Bambang. He hoped that the workshop would be useful for all LMDH of Randublatung Sub-District, because it employed a method which is new for LMDH.

F.6. Results of meeting
1. There are learning process for all LMDH and Perhutani staff to undertake participatory evaluation of PHBM implementation
2. Negotiation process that engaged all the stakeholders in forest management
3. Inputs are accepted to enhance the evaluation of sustainable forest management
About CIRAD
Centre de coopération Internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD) is a French scientific organisation specialising in agricultural research for development for the tropics and sub-tropics. It is a State-owned body, which was established in 1984 following the consolidation of French agricultural, veterinary, forestry, and food technology research organisations for the tropics and subtropics.

CIRAD’s mission is to contribute to the economic development of these regions through research, experiments, training and dissemination of scientific and technical information. The Centre employs 1800 persons, including 900 senior staff, who work in more than 50 countries.
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About CIFOR
The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) is a leading international forestry research organization established in 1993 in response to global concerns about the social, environmental, and economic consequences of forest loss and degradation. CIFOR is dedicated to developing policies and technologies for sustainable use and management of forests, and for enhancing the well-being of people in developing countries who rely on tropical forests for their livelihoods. CIFOR is one of the 15 Future Harvest centres of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). With headquarters in Bogor, Indonesia, CIFOR has regional offices in Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon and Zimbabwe, and it works in over 30 other countries around the world.

Levelling the Playing Field:
Fair Partnership for Local Development to Improve the Forest Sustainability in Southeast Asia

The project is working in contexts where multi-stakeholders with different views and power act on forest management. The project aims to improve the forest management by facilitating stakeholders’ coordination and capacity building. It will develop approaches and tools for stakeholders to share views and create conditions to manage the forest together.

Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD) and Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) are managing this project with three partners, universities well known for their involvement in forest management research, which are Gadjah Mada University (UGM), University of the Philippines Los Baños (UPLB), Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM).

http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/lpf

Collaborative Forest Management
Better partnership to benefit local community and sustainable teak forests
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