

Food Security Improvement Model Through Social Forestry Program

Wartiningsih^{1*}, Nunuk Nuswardani², Rosita Indrayati³

¹² Faculty of Law Universitas Trunojoyo, Indonesia

³ Faculty of Law Universitas Jember Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: wartiningsih@trunojoyo.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Covid 19 has hit all countries including Indonesia. This disaster hit all sectors of people's lives, including the strategic sector, namely food security. This is raising concerns because in the end the production and distribution of community food will also be disrupted, in this regard FAO states that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic could lead to new food crisis. While forests are not the solution to global hunger by themselves, in many circumstances they play important additional role, especially during unpredictable periods (such as long dry seasons). In some areas, forest food plays central role in providing caloric staple. It is also increasingly recognized that food from forests provides micronutrients and contributes to dietary diversity, thereby supporting food security. In this regard, this article will examine several laws and regulations that allow the Social Forestry program to be more implementable. Considering that the implementation of Social Forestry has not been fully realized, especially in Madura. This article used statute approach and qualitative analysis. The results showed that it needs local regulation that able to foster political commitment and political will in the form of building understanding from stakeholders at the regency, sub-district and village government levels with Perum Perhutani as the implementer of Social Forestry. It is the government (local) that can form social capital through statutory regulations in this case the Bangkalan Regency Local Regulation. The Local Regulation in question contains an obligation for villages that have LMDH to take advantage of Social Forestry by establishing partnership with Perum Perhutani KPH Madura.

Keywords: Food Security Improvement Model, Social Forestry.

1. INTRODUCTION

The need for food availability has become global issue with the inclusion of the food security issue or “zero hunger” in the global development agreement called SDGs/ Sustainable Development Goals [1] At the national level, the Government through the Nawacita program (Jokowi Program) has also raised issue of food security as one of the priorities of national development. In line with national priority programs, forest buffer zones have multifunctional role, one of which is as food reserves source for communities around the forest.

Almost 50% of Indonesia's agricultural land is dry land which has the potential to be used as national food production [2]. In this regard, Pasandaran et al. states that the development of dry land agriculture to support national food production should be taken into account in the agricultural development agenda to support national food security. It is further stated that national food production could no longer rely solely on paddy fields.

This is because in line with the economic development of rice field expansion, there are various obstacles that not easily to overcome [2]. On the other hand, the quality and potential of dry land production has decreased. In 2008, FAO pointed out that the causes of dry land resource loss are complex, mainly due to policy failures and market failures that greater than farmers' failures to manage dry land. In general, the government does not pay enough attention to efforts to manage dry land in a sustainable manner. [2]

Dry land management will experience severe obstacles, especially those from forest areas which have different potential problems and conflicts. This condition requires regulatory approach and collaboration from various parties. This problem has actually been attempted by Perum Perhutani, as institution at the site level, namely rolling out various programs including Social Forestry and Community Forest Management Program (PHBM). Referring to the PHBM program, the Social Forestry Program has also not been realized in Madura.

This is easy to understand because the Social Forestry program is the Ministry product, so it requires complicated procedures and requirements. Social forestry is participatory-based management of forest resources, but its implementation is often complicated [3]. This complexity can also be understood, because the state has the authority to determine where, to whom and by whom control rights are allocated [3]. What Peluso, Ribot, Sikor and Lund state that rights to resources may not be fully clear or well understood in certain locations, is also the case in Madura. It is said that of the 62 Forest Village Community Institutions (LMDH) in Madura, only 1 (one) applied, namely... even that did not succeed in obtaining certificate of permit for the Social Forestry program. In this study, I want to review why the PHBM program is not also implemented in Madura. This study gives hope because the PHBM program is Perum Perhutani product which is procedurally simpler. While the PHBM program has not yet been implemented, the Minister of Environment and Forestry Regulation Number: P.83/MENLHK/SETJEN/KUM.1/ 10/ 2016 concerning Social Forestry then the issue of community involvement in the management of forest resources "as not expected". It is said so because the requirements and procedures in it are complicated.

The paper purpose was to find a model to improve food security through the Social Forestry program in Madura. In this paper, various relevant laws and regulations will be analysed. This analysis by reviewing PHBM and Social Forestry programs, from this analysis it is hoped that regulations can be found that facilitate and involve institutions at the Regency level that can partner with Perum Perhutani. To be able to take lessons on participatory-based forest resource planning and management, the key is the development of strong networks and partnerships between various stakeholders from the state forestry sector, academia, local and regional authorities and local communities [4]. Conditions in Madura are in line with research conducted by Kelly et al that the failure to reduce forest degradation is due to the lack of local political will and civil action at the local level which ultimately results in sense of powerlessness and frustration among stakeholders in the community [4].

Based on the description above, the research problem formulation is: can the utilization of Social Forestry program be used as model for increasing food security for communities around the forest in Madura?

2. RESEARCH AND METHOD

As legal research, the approach used is the laws and regulations relevant to the Social Forestry program. Using primary legal materials in the form of laws and regulations and secondary legal materials in the form of research results from experts. Prescriptive analysis was used and the analysis results will be used to build

arguments and proposed recommendations. This analysis was by reviewing the PHBM program and Social Forestry. This analysis was expected to find model for improving regulatory food security that facilitates and involves institutions at the regency level that can partner with Perum Perhutani.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Food Security in the Forestry Sector

The centralized policy of agricultural development programs in rice paddy during the period 1969-1997 (Pelita I-VI), caused less attention to dry land farming. Meanwhile, many dry land agricultural development projects have been implemented but did not show encouraging results, where the causes include the lack of community self-reliance and unsustainable development [5].

The impact of Covid 19 which has hit various aspects of life has raised fears of new food crisis. As a result, some experts focus their attention on efforts to improve food security. In terms of forest resources, long before this situation, the Government through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry issued various programs that seek that forests greatly contribute to increasing food security. Various programs with command and control nuances towards the prosperity approach, namely through Mama (Malang-Magetan), MaLu (Manteri-Lurah) (Nurjaya, no year).

Through Ministerial Regulation No. P.83/MENKLH/SETJEN/ KUM.1 /10/2016 (Permen KLHK 83/2016) concerning Social Forestry, the Social Forestry program was born. This program is "product" of the Ministry which in its implementation there are still many weaknesses. However, this program is seen as representing paradigm shift in forest resource management from state-based forest management to community-based forest management. Social Forestry raises hope for communities to gain public trust in managing state forests. The government seeks to promote the welfare and empowerment of user groups, environmental conservation, and reduction of community-state conflict (Fisher et al., 2018; Resosudarmo et al.2019, Erbaugh2019). Social Forestry has 3 (three) pillars, namely land, business opportunities and human resources. Unfortunately, in Madura, none of the LMDHs have received Social Forestry certificates from the 162 LMDHs in Madura [6].

Based on these conditions, it is good in this study to refocus on the Community Forest Management (PHBM) program. This thinking based on the fact that PHBM is "product" of the Forest Management Unit (KPH), it can be ascertained that the process is simpler because KPHs at the site level can directly implement agreements with the community represented by LMDH.

136/Kpts/Dir/2001 concerning the Forest Resources Management with the Community (replacing the Decree of the Board of Directors No. 1061/Kpts/Dir/2000), then the Decree of the Board of Directors No. 268/Kpts/Dir/2007 concerning Guidelines for Community Forest Resource Management Plus (PHBM PLUS), and the last Decree No. 682/Kpts/Dir/2009 concerning PHBM Guidelines.

If you look at the development of the agricultural sector so far, in Pelita I-IV (period 1969-1997) the centralized policy of the agricultural development program focused on rice paddy. This causes dry land farming to receive less attention. However, many dry land development projects have been implemented but have not shown encouraging results. This is due to the lack of development of community independence and unsustainable development (Idjudin and Marwanto, 2008). Whereas in terms of land resources, almost 50% of Indonesia's agricultural land is dry land, including Madura, which has the potential to be used for national food products.

Dry land in Madura is characterized by barren natural conditions, lack of rainfall, and insufficient irrigation. Forcing people to choose adaptive plant species. Therefore, the response of the Madurese community in the end formed local knowledge in utilizing the lack of ecology in their nature. In general, there are 3 (three) types of crops grown by rotation every year, namely corn, rice and tobacco [7]. Hefni further explained:

"Facing such an ecological crisis, the Madurese are not silent. They conducted a series of experiments on various types of plants that may have the ability to adapt to the natural environment of Madura. Through the historical journey for a relatively long time, the Madurese community has local knowledge to cultivate several types of plants, both subsistence foodstuffs such as corn and rice and commercial crops, namely tobacco. However, moor ecology always demands uncomfortable compromises.

The persistence of the Madurese community is shown, for example, in Pamekasan Regency, the community carried out farming reform, which was originally tobacco farming as the spearhead of the community's economy to dry land sugarcane as new cultivation [8]. Another success is that at this time the Madurese herbal medicine well known to foreign countries such as Brunei, Saudi Arabia, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, Korea, and Japan [9]. Observing this success, it is worth to ask why LMDH does not use Perhutani's land through the PHBM program considering that forest land can be used for the use of non-timber forest products, such as the use of forest products in the form of medicines, honey, fruits.

Various studies have shown that the successful management of forest resources requires support from

stakeholders, especially the government at the regency level. In such framework, it is necessary to find a model for increasing food security through the use of the Social Forestry program for communities around forests in Madura.

B. Forest Resource Management with Prosperity Approach

Throughout the history of forest resource management in Indonesia, there have been different models and laws from the Dutch colonial period, Japan to the Indonesian people themselves as they are today. In general, the these resources management is handled by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and at the site level is Perum Perhutani which has social mission as well as profit.

Perum Perhutani was formed in 1972 through PP no. 15/1972 jo. PP No. 2/1978. actually has taken a prosperity approach in which there are intercropping programs, development/ guidance of forest village communities (PMDH) until the 1990s, and then forest management with the community (PHBM) in early 2000. Through the Supervisory Board Decree No. 136/Kpts/Dir/2001 concerning the Management of Forest Resources with the Community (replacing the Decree of the Board of Directors No. 1061/Kpts/Dir/2000), then the Decree of the Board of Directors No. 268/Kpts/Dir/2007 concerning Guidelines for Community Forest Resource Management Plus (PHBM PLUS), and the last Decree No. 682/Kpts/Dir/2009 concerning PHBM Guidelines. Apart from the various shortcomings, PHBM has been implemented in several areas such as KPH Kendal, KPH Cepu, KPH Pati, KPH Malang and many more. However, this program has not yet been implemented in Madura.

With regard to PHBM Awang describes:

"The Joint Community Forest Management System (PHBM) launched by Perum Perhutani in 2001 opens up opportunities for forest village communities to be actively involved in forest management. This active involvement began with the establishment of forest management cooperation between Perhutani and the Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH). In this PHBM system, empowerment process is carried out for forest village communities which aims to achieve sustainable forest resource management and improve the welfare of forest village communities..." [10]

Community empowerment must be interpreted as a process to share roles. By involving the community around the forest will give them a deep meaning. Motivation and shared responsibility in forest management will emerge from the processes that are passed in community empowerment. The idea of E.F. Schumacher that development does not start with goods, but starts with people. According to Schumacher humans

are the main source of all kinds of wealth, if society is not included then any development will not produce results. Community empowerment in villages to create independence, progress and prosperity as well as justice [11]

Furthermore, Awang suggests that in order to align the PHBM program with the socio-cultural context of the village communities around the forest, the capacity of the parties should be increased for the implementation of PHBM. It begins with the need to raise awareness in the community that they have a role in efforts to utilize forest resources and these opportunities are guaranteed by laws and regulations. This active involvement began with the establishment of forest management cooperation between Perhutani and the Forest Village Community Institution (LMDH).

C. Social Forestry Program

The government has included the social forestry program in the 2015-2019 RPJMN. The target is that in 2019 the Government will be able to open access to the community to manage 12.7 million hectares of forest for 5 years. Various circles welcomed the policy.

Ministerial Regulation Number: P.83/MENKLH/SETJEN/KUM.1/10/2016 (Permen KLHK Regulation 83/2016) concerning Social Forestry. In the "considering" section it is written that the regulation aims to reduce poverty, unemployment and inequality in forest management /utilization, it is necessary to carry out Social Forestry activities through providing legal access to communities around forests. Social Forestry includes the following schemes: (1) Village Forest Management (HD); (2) Community Plantation Forests (HTR/IPHPS); (3) Customary Forests (HA); (4) Forestry Partnership. Based on the provisions of Article 65 letter k which states that "management activities with the community, which carried out in the Perhutani area are carried out in accordance with this Ministerial Regulation".

The maximum use of village funds is the mainstay of the Djoko Widodo government. This is evidenced by the establishment of priorities for the village funds use which are stated annually in the Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Disadvantaged Villages Development and Transmigration.

As further implementation, the Governor of East Java has issued Letter on the Synchronization and Implementation of Social Forestry in East Java. The letter dated August 30, 2020 was issued in order to increase the commitment of the Local Government to accelerate East Java Social Forestry as effort to improve the community economy in the Forest area. In the letter it is stated that the Regency/ City Government needs to observe and follow up, among others, as follows:

1. The Regency/City Population and Civil Registry Offices are expected to take part in the process of submitting and realizing Social Forestry Decrees (SK) especially related to data on population domiciles in forest areas for the smooth issuance of SK;
2. OPD and relevant stakeholders in the Regency/City immediately form collaborative strategy for empowering Social Forestry groups that are packaged in the form of field schools in sustainable manner, including being involved in supervising the process of submitting Social Forestry Decree to minimize problems that occur;
3. The Working Group for the Acceleration of Social Forestry (POKJA PPS) which has been established by the Governor of East Java will immediately formulate and implement sustainable empowerment strategies for Social Forestry groups in their respective mentoring areas.

For villages adjacent to forest areas managed by Perum Perhutani, they have the opportunity to develop and prosper their communities through the Cooperation Agreement (PKS) scheme. However, many are not yet implemented because they have not found third party who able to finance the program being launched. The research results in the field [6] reveal that this program don not work in Madura. This is understandable because one of them is long process [12].

The failure of Social Forestry program in addition to the long and complicated procedure, there are several things:

1. In the FGD conducted [6] one of the LMDH Chairmen states that the mainstream Madurese, whatever their activities, if they do not see the results (money), people are reluctant to do it. This kind of behavior in general also occurs as stated by Muttaqin when researching the community's interest in the REDD+ program stating that the low interest seems to be related to the community's limited understanding of the concept and the invisible benefits of the program. In addition, most of them expect to get financial rewards immediately [13].
2. Weak social capital, namely the trust level, togetherness, active participation and social networking, the village community will be empowered. This will have impact on hampering the community potential development. In addition, the implementation of Social Forestry activities is less than optimal which leads to community empowerment activities. Mubarak further states that the weak social capital is also caused by the low community initiative and innovation in forest resource management activities which resulted in the community becoming passive and less

independent. Mubarak adds again that there is a lack of role and synergy among stakeholders such as the local government, government agencies/institutions, PPL, Toga and Tomas, NGOs and LMDH, so that the management of forest resources is less effective and efficient and the pace of community empowerment is hampered. [14]

3. Barriers from the HR side, namely delays in delivering slow access to information and slow willingness to be "empowered" especially in efforts to increase productivity, and increase the creativity of community members [15]
4. Regarding the interesting process, what stated by Setiadi that the process design is also not a problem because it has given the roles and functions of each actor according to their capacity and portion. In fact, normatively, the existing roles have been well formulated as follows: Local governments play the function of facilitating the synergistic process between the state, society and the private sector in the realm of local governance [16].

The provisions of Article 65 letter k which states that "management activities with the community, which carried out in the Perhutani area are carried out in accordance with this Ministerial Regulation". The regulation in question is the Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry Number P.83/MENLHK/SETJEN/ KUM.1/ 10/2016 concerning Social Forestry. This provision of course negates the PHBM program. In order for the Forestry Program to be implemented optimally, it is necessary to simplify procedures and give greater role to Perum Perhutani and stakeholders at the Regency level. Establishing Local Regulations that contain the principles of transparency, accountability and participation. In accordance with the determination to build understanding, it is necessary to increase the capacity of local government units in particular to better serve the local community needs.

The report by Vira states that although forests are not the solution to global hunger in themselves, in many circumstances they play important additional role, especially during unpredictable periods (such as long dry seasons). In some areas, forest food plays central role in providing caloric staple. It is also increasingly recognized that food from forests provides micronutrients and contributes to food diversity, thereby supporting the food security [17]

Based on the lessons that can be drawn from the Philippines, it is necessary to review the LMDH failure in Madura in obtaining benefits from the Social Forestry program. In fact, the Ministerial Regulation No. P.83/MENKLH/SETJEN/KUM.1/10/2016 (Permen KLHK 83/2016) concerning Social Forestry. Supported by the Minister of Village Regulation, Disadvantaged Villages Development and Transmigration, namely

Permendes PDTT No. 11 of 2019 concerning Priorities for the Use of Village Funds in 2020 and Letter on Synchronization and Implementation of Social Forestry in East Java. The letter dated August 30, 2020 was issued in order to increase the commitment of the Local Government to accelerate East Java Social Forestry as effort to improve the economy of the community in the Forest area. These legal instruments have not been able to encourage the success of the Social Forestry program in Madura. Therefore, to support the implementation of this Social Forestry program, there needs to be Bangkalan Local Regulation regarding the obligation for villages that have LMDH to take advantage of the Social Forestry program. The formal rules in the form of the Bangkalan Local Regulation contain obligations as well as expectations, which require the trust of all stakeholders, as well as the smooth flow of information from policy makers. Norms set forth in Local Regulations need to be accompanied by sanctions. This is in line with the concept of social capital as explained by Coleman, that social capital can be identified into 3 (three) things, namely: (1) obligations and expectations that are highly dependent on trust from the environment; (2) the ability to flow information from the social structure; and (3) norms accompanied by sanctions [18].

Robert Putnam suggests that social capital has 3 (three) important elements, namely social normality, trust and social networks. Putnam further explains that the social norms that need to be built in public-government relations are trust, accountability, partnership, participation and responsiveness. Meanwhile, in relations between communities, it is solidarity, tolerance, trust and cooperation [20]. As for trust, Santoso quotes from Fukuyama that trust is social capital to create the flexible organization needed to compete. Social networks within the community in the form of local associations and organizations. Social networks in community-government relations in the form of formal DPRD and informal citizen forums. Further analysis, Santoso states that the state has great ability to generate social capital through institutions and education.

Referring to Coleman, Putnam and Santoso, the Local Government can encourage the implementation of the Social Forestry program through regulations that stimulate the birth of social capital that "binds" Perum Perhutani as an institution, local government, sub-district and village levels.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the dynamics of forest resource management arrangements in Indonesia and analysis of the relevant laws and regulations, the Social Forestry program is expected to become a model to increase food security. The model to increase food security through the use of the Social Forestry program is by establishing Local Regulations that can encourage the birth of social

capital in the form of trust, accountability, partnership, participation and responsiveness, solidarity, tolerance and cooperation. It is believed that trust, accountability, partnership and others can encourage mutual commitment in implementing the Social Forestry program. State (local government) that is able to give birth to social capital.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Research and membership at the International Conference on Social Science (ICSS) of 2021 can be held with financial assistance from the Faculty of Law, Universitas Trunojoyo, Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bambang Heriyanto, et.al, 2018, "Contribution of Forestry Buffer Areas for Sustainability of Forest Society Community: Case Study in Enclave Lindu National Park Lore Lindu", *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 226, ICSS, 2018 (Atlantis Press).
- [2] Faisal Kasryno and Haryono Soeparno, "Dryland Agriculture as Solution to Realize Future Food Self-reliance" in *Prospects of Dry Land Agriculture in Supporting Food Security*, Research and Development Agency of the Ministry of Agriculture, 2012. Downloaded from <http://www.litbang.pertanian.go.id/en/books/Dryland-Resilient/>
- [3] James T. Erbaugh, "Responsibilization and Social Forestry in Indonesia", *Forest Policy and Economics*, Vol.109, Dec.2019, 102019 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.102019>.
- [4] Claire Kally et al, "Community Resilience and Land Degradation in Forest and Shrubland Socio-ecological System: Evidence from Gorgogline, Basilicata, Italy". This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Elsevier in *LAND USE POLICY* (Vol. 46 pp.11-20) on 30th January 2015, available online: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837715000307> *Forest Policy and Economics*, Vol.109, Dec.2019, 102019 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.102019>.
- [5] A. Abas Idjudin and S. Marwanto, "Reformation for Dryland Management for Support Food-Self Sufficiency", *Journal of Land Resources*, Vol.2, December 2008, ISSN 1907-0799
- [6] Wartiningih and Nunuk Nuswardani, 2020, *Model for Optimizing the Use of Village Funds through Fulfillment of Cultural Rights of Forest Village Communities*, Scopindo, Surabaya.
- [7] Moh. Hefni, *Local Knowledge of the Madurese Community: A Strategy for Utilizing Tegal Ecology in Madura*, Karsa, Vol. XIV No. October 2, 2008.
- [8] Nashar, "Farming Reform of the Madurese Community (Study on the Behavior of Tobacco Farmers to Dry Land Sugarcane Farming in Pamekasan Regency)", *Iqtishadia*, Vol. 1 No. 2 December 2014
- [9] Mudjojono et al, 2014, *Madurese Local Wisdom on Herbal Medicine for Maternal and Child Health*, Ministry of Education and Culture Center for Preservation of Cultural Values, Yogyakarta.
- [10] San Afri Awang, et.al, 2008, *Guidebook for Forest Village Community Empowerment, LMDH*, Center for Community Forest Studies, Faculty of Forestry UGM.
- [11] Khairul Rahman, "Empowerment of Community Participation in Village Development", *WEDANA-Journal of Government, Politics and Bureaucracy*, Vol. II Number 1 October 2016.
- [12] Ministry of Finance, 2018, *Village Fund Pocket Book*
- [13] Muhammad Zahrul Muttaqin, 2019, et.al, "Developing Community-based Forest Ecosystem Service Management to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation", *Research and Development Center for Socio-economics Policy and Climate Change, Forestry and Environmental R&D and Innovation Agency (FOERDIA)*, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Bogor.
- [14] Sigit Mubarak, "Improving Social Capital Capacity Through PHBM and Social Communication", *Bina*, Edition 07 September 2013/Th. XL is downloaded from https://petakhutan.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/edisi_september-2013.pdf
- [15] Rofi Wahanisa, "Community Forest Management Model", *Yustisia*, Vol. 4 No. May 2 – August 2015.
- [16] Rahmanta Setiadi, 2013, "Photographing Perhutani Concepts and PHBM", downloaded from *Javlec Indonesia | 31/01/2013 | Opinion | 1 Comment* <https://javlec.org/memotret-concept-dan-reality-phbm-perhutani/>
- [17] Bhaskar Vira et al, 2015, *Forests, Trees, and Landscapes for Food Security and Nutrition, A Global Assessment Report*, International Union of Forest Research Organization (IURO), World Series Vol. 33.
- [18] James S. Coleman, "Social Capital in The Creation of Human Capital", *The American Journal of*

Sociology, Vol. 94 Supplement: Organizations and Institutions: Sociological and Economic Approaches to The Analysis of Social Structure (1988), pp. S95-S120, The University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2780243>. Accessed: 06/12/2010. (Mark Granovetter, Susan Shapiro, Christopher Winship).

[19] Thomas Santoso, 2020, Understanding Social Capital, Saga Library, Surabaya