

Potential for integrated landscape approaches

A review of Indonesia's national environment and development policies

Alida O'Connor¹, Moira Moeliono² and Linda Yuliani²

Key messages

- This brief explores Indonesia's national environment and development policy climate and whether it is conducive to operationalizing an integrated landscape approach (ILA). The findings presented here complement a parallel infobrief by Maryani et al. (2021).
- We find policies and development plans such as the One Map policy, Social Forestry program, and Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil policy embody the overarching principles of a landscape approach (i.e. multiple land uses, multi-stakeholder collaboration, etc.). However, in many cases, these well-intended policies do not translate into practice at the local scale.
- Challenge areas include: identifying common concern entry points, clarifying rights and responsibilities, enhancing stakeholder capacity, meaningful engagement of multiple stakeholders, and identifying a negotiated and transparent change logic.
- We suggest that a greater commitment to these principles and the adoption of a landscape approach holds potential to enhance Indonesian policy performance and ensure that policy development is more representative of national and local concerns and practices.

Integrated landscape approaches

Integrated landscape approaches (ILA) are widely promoted as a strategy for addressing interconnected issues such as biodiversity loss, food security, and poverty. Broadly defined, a landscape approach is a participatory process for reconciling competing land uses for improved socioeconomic and environmental outcomes (Sayer et al. 2013). This process necessitates multiple stakeholders coming together to identify and negotiate synergies and trade-offs, ideally resulting in more sustainable and equitable land and resource management. A landscape approach is not prescriptive, it will vary depending on context-specific social and environmental needs defined by local stakeholders. However, Sayer et al. (2013) outline ten overarching principles to guide landscape approach implementation (see Figure 1). Some principles are likely to be

more relevant than others, depending on the landscape and as needs evolve over time.

With the ten principles in mind, it is important to examine whether existing policies enable collaboration between stakeholders and are conducive to a landscape approach. Landscapes are political spaces, meaning current governance structures and policies are indicative of potential challenges and opportunities for operationalizing a landscape approach.

As part of the Collaborating to Operationalise Landscape Approaches for Nature, Development and Sustainability (COLANDS) initiative, which seeks to operationalize landscape approaches in Ghana, Indonesia, and Zambia, a review of national environment and development policies was conducted for each landscape³. In this brief, we discuss the

¹ Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia

² Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

³ The review is available as a chapter in *Operationalizing Integrated Landscape Approaches in the Tropics* (2020): <https://www.cifor.org/knowledge/publication/7807>



Figure 1. Ten principles for a landscape approach.

Source: Sayer et al. 2013.

findings for Indonesia. The review focused on Indonesia's current development approach and several policies and plans designed to accomplish environment and development objectives. The Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil policy (ISPO), One Map policy, and the Social Forestry policy were selected for a more in-depth analysis of Indonesian policy in practice. These policies were selected based on their alignment with the goals of the current national development plan, as well as many of the objectives of a landscape approach. This review complements the findings of a parallel policy brief by Maryani et al. (2021), which explores some of the policies outlined here and other relevant legislation in more detail.

National planning and development in Indonesia

Indonesia's development is guided by the National Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPN) for the period 2005-2025. The RPJPN is broken into four, five-year stages, referred to as the National Medium-Term Development Plans (RPJMN). The most recent Medium-Term Development Plan for the period 2020-2024 identified an inclusive green economy as the pathway forward for development (Government of Indonesia 2020). Establishing a green economy requires overcoming Indonesia's longstanding challenges with transparency, inclusion, and regulation that have created a dichotomy between conservation and development and forest and non-forest areas. This has manifested as exploitation of natural resources, extreme biodiversity loss, and the marginalization of vulnerable groups.

In Indonesia, planning processes are regulated by three streams of rules: National Spatial Planning (RTRWN), Development Planning (RPJPN), and Strategic Environmental Assessment (KLHS). The KLHS is meant to underpin spatial planning and development to ensure sustainable land use; however, evidence of this in practice remains scarce. For example, RTRWN is regulated by Law 26/2007 which stipulates provincial and local land use policy should be formulated based on the region's environmental carrying capacity (Ardiansyah et al. 2015). Ongoing deforestation and peatland degradation clearly indicate a discrepancy between policy, law, and practice. Further, the separation of forest land (Kawasan Hutan) management from land uses outside forest areas makes comprehensive planning complicated.

In addition to the horizontal disconnect across sectors and planning streams, a vertical disconnect also exists. Decentralization in Indonesia is supported by a number of laws and policies devolving rights and responsibilities from central to local government (i.e. Law 32/2004 on regional administration, Law 33/2004 on fiscal decentralization, Law 23/2014 on the village level). Decentralization is important for giving local governments the authority to address their context-specific needs, but these decentralized roles and responsibilities must be clearly defined. Further, a lack of coordination and communication has resulted in policies issued at the national scale contradicting those formed by provincial and local governments and Adat (customary) law (Ardiansyah et al. 2015; Pisani 2014). When analyzing ISPO, Social Forestry, and One Map policy these vertical and horizontal disconnects become even more apparent.

Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO)

The ISPO policy is particularly relevant to landscape approaches because oil palm plantations can greatly influence a landscape and involve a key stakeholder: the private sector. The ISPO policy, adopted by the Ministry of Agriculture, aims to improve the competitiveness of palm oil on the global market, meet greenhouse gas reduction targets, and adhere to biodiversity conservation policies (ISPO 2013). In 2014, the policy was made mandatory for all oil palm plantations; however, smallholders were given until 2020 to comply (Jelsma and Schoneveld 2016). Yet, to date, less than 1% of smallholders are certified under ISPO (Jong 2018). ISPO certification requirements are difficult to meet for smallholders that manage their land without formal borders, have no proof of land ownership, and poor access to extension services. This shows a vertical disconnect between ISPO requirements designed at the national scale and on the ground realities. ISPO also illustrates a horizontal disconnect. Oil palm plantations for biofuel production are exempted from ISPO certification. Indonesia has one of the most ambitious biofuel blending targets in the world, predicated on the expansion of oil palm plantations and conflicting with the National Action Plan to Reduce Greenhouse

Gas Emissions (RAN-GRK) and other environmental policies (Anderson et al. 2016; Artati et al. 2019).

One Map policy

A closer look at the Social Forestry policy and One Map policy reveal a similar story. The One Map policy aims to reconcile land use conflicts through a single, unified map. The policy has reportedly reconciled 85 maps managed by 19 government agencies across the country (Gokkon 2018). However, there are critiques of the One Map policy and public participation. Requirements for reconciling the maps are rigidly prescribed by law, and as a result, map availability and the skills and knowledge needed to implement harmonization are a challenge. For example, communities often do not have access to mapping tools, but some have received support from the Participatory Mapping Network (JKPP). These maps were rejected by the Geospatial Information Agency (Badan Informasi Geospasial or BIG), because of the use of a less accurate GPS receiver, but the “standard” device was much more expensive (Shahab 2016). This begs the question: who and at what scale is this policy accessible? And what will these “reconciled” maps look like on the ground?

Social forestry

Social Forestry aims to devolve legal access to state forest land to improve land rights, support livelihoods, and achieve conservation outcomes through five different social forestry schemes (Fisher et al. 2018). The Social Forestry program is regulated by the Social Forestry decree P83/2016 and administered through the Forestry Agency. The policy is legally mandated by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) and thus regulated by forestry laws. However, Social Forests fall under the category of land use, meaning they are also bound by laws on villages, land, spatial planning and the national and regional development plans (Moeliono et al. 2017). This has made the program difficult to navigate and regulate. In addition, the Social Forestry permitting process is expensive and requires technical and fiscal capacity to map forest boundaries and provide the required documentation. This again highlights the vertical disconnect between policy and implementation.

A landscape approach for Indonesia

A number of the landscape approach principles (see Sayer et al. 2013) are reflected in Indonesia’s national policies and plans. Indonesia’s National Medium-Term Development Plan acknowledges multiple land uses (Principle 4) and the need to reconcile development and conservation objectives to enhance resilience (Principle 9) and climate change adaptation (Principle 1) through an inclusive green economy. To make this goal a reality, changes are needed to improve transparency, enhance regulation, and prevent the exclusion of marginalized groups.

The three policies discussed have sought to address these challenges. For example, the ISPO policy had potential to act as a regulatory framework for sustainable oil palm production. The One Map policy was designed to improve transparency and clarify land rights (Principle 7). One Map also recognizes the multi-functionality (Principle 4) and multiple stakeholders across a landscape (Principle 5). Finally, the Social Forestry policy aims to give rights and responsibilities (Principle 7) to communities in hopes of fostering community forest management that increases stakeholder capacity (Principle 10) and allows management of multiple land uses (Principle 4).

However, as the discussion of the three policy examples revealed, national policy has seldom led to implementation at the local scale. The ISPO requirements proved inaccessible for smallholders, though with the right support, the smallholder oil palm producers have potential to significantly impact conservation and development outcomes. Moreover, the objectives of the policy contradicted those from other sectors. Although the three streams of regulations are supposed to feed into each other, each is under the purview of a different ministry and in practice are implemented in parallel. In the case of the One Map policy technical capacity was a limiting factor for involvement of local governments as well as the participation of communities. Finally, the Social Forestry policy’s goal to devolve rights to communities was overshadowed by top-down and rigidly structured requirements for each Social Forestry scheme and permitting process. Furthermore, the different agencies responsible for regulation of the different land uses seldom talk to each other. Multi-stakeholder negotiations through the RPJM process are often more ritualistic than practical.

Recommendations

As highlighted in a parallel policy brief by Maryani et al. (2021), none of the policies highlighted here contradict landscape approaches; neither do they explicitly mandate its application. A closer look at these policies and the barriers to their implementation offers valuable insight on potential constraints and opportunities for operationalizing a landscape approach in Indonesia. These challenge areas are where the landscape approach could be of greatest assistance. Identifying common concern entry points (Principle 2), clarifying rights and responsibilities (Principle 7), and enhancing stakeholder capacity (Principle 10) are particularly necessary moving forward. Meanwhile, adopting a landscape approach that engages multiple stakeholders (Principle 5) to identify a negotiated and transparent change logic (Principle 6) would offer significant potential to enhance Indonesian policy performance and ensure that policy development is more representative of national and local concerns *and* practices. We suggest that a greater commitment to these principles and the adoption of a landscape approach holds potential for Indonesia to achieve national environment and development objectives.

Acknowledgements

This research is part of the COLANDS initiative. COLANDS is supported by the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) and a CIFOR-led consortium of partners consisting of the University of British Columbia (UBC), University of Amsterdam (UvA), the French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development (CIRAD), and local and political partners in the countries of implementation. In Indonesia, these include the NGO Riak Bumi and the Executive Office of the President of the Republic of Indonesia.

Funding for this study was provided by the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) grant 18_IV_084 and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Forest and Biodiversity Office.

References

- Anderson ZR, Kusters K, McCarthy J and Obidzinski K. 2016. Green growth rhetoric versus reality: Insights from Indonesia. *Global Environmental Change*, 38:30-40.
- Ardiansyah F, Marthen AA and Amalia N. 2015. *Forest and land-use governance in a decentralized Indonesia: A legal and policy review*. Vol. 132. CIFOR.
- Artati Y, Jaung W, Juniwati KS, Andini S, Lee SM, Segah H and Baral H. 2019. Bioenergy Production on Degraded Land: Landowner Perceptions in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Forests*, 10(2), 99.
- Fisher MR, Moeliono M, Mulyana A, Yuliani EL, Adriadi A, Judda J and Sahide MAK. 2018. Assessing the new social forestry project in Indonesia: recognition, livelihood and conservation? *International Forestry Review*, 20(3), 346-361.
- Gokkon B. 2018. One map to rule them all: Indonesia launches unified land-use chart. *Mongabay Series: Jokowi Commitments*. Retrieved from: <https://news.mongabay.com/2018/12/one-map-to-rule-them-all-indonesia-launches-unified-land-use-chart/>.
- Government of Indonesia. 2020. Indonesia Medium-Term Development Plan 2020-2024. The Ministry of National Development Planning Indonesia (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional/BAPPENAS). Jakarta, Indonesia.
- ISPO. 2013. Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil. <http://www.ispo-org.or.id/index.php?lang=en>
- Jelsma I and Schoneveld GC. 2016. *Towards more sustainable and productive independent oil palm smallholders in Indonesia: Insights from the development of a smallholder typology*. Vol. 210. CIFOR.
- Jong HN. 2018. Small farmers not ready as Indonesia looks to impose its palm oil sustainability standard on all. *Mongabay*. Retrieved from: <https://news.mongabay.com/2018/04/small-farmers-not-ready-as-indonesia-looks-to-impose-its-palm-oil-sustainability-standard-on-all/>
- Maryani R, Djaenudin D, Lugina M, Indartik, Moeliono M, Yuliani EL. 2021. Pendekatan Lanskap dalam Perspektif Kebijakan di Indonesia (*Perspectives on landscape approach in Indonesian policies*). Infobrief no. 1/2021. Center for Research and Development for Social, Economy, Policy and Climate Change of the Forestry Research Development and Innovation, Ministry Environment and Forestry (FOERDIA-P3SEKPI). Bogor, Indonesia.
- Moeliono M, Pham TT, Bong IW, Wong GY and Brockhaus M. 2017. Social Forestry-why and for whom? A comparison of policies in Vietnam and Indonesia. *Forest and Society*. 1(2): 1-20.
- Pisani E. 2014. The Downside Of Decentralization. *Foreign Affairs*, 93, 142.
- Sayer J, Sunderland T, Ghazoul J, Pfund J-L, Sheil D, Meijaard E, et al. 2013. Ten principles for a landscape approach to reconciling agriculture, conservation, and other competing land uses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*: 110(21), 8349-8356. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1210595110>
- Shahab, N. 2016. Indonesia: One Map Policy. Open Government Partnership. Retrieved from: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/case-study_Indonesia_One-Map-Policy.pdf



RESEARCH PROGRAM ON
Forests, Trees and
Agroforestry

The CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA) is the world's largest research for development program to enhance the role of forests, trees and agroforestry in sustainable development and food security and to address climate change. CIFOR leads FTA in partnership with ICRAF, the Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT, CATIE, CIRAD, INBAR and TBI.

FTA's work is supported by the CGIAR Trust Fund: cgiar.org/funders/



Federal Ministry
for the Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



THE UNIVERSITY
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

COLANDS

Collaborating to Operationalize Landscape Approaches
for Nature, Development and Sustainability

cifor.org/colands

forestsnews.cifor.org



Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

CIFOR advances human well-being, equity and environmental integrity by conducting innovative research, developing partners' capacity, and actively engaging in dialogue with all stakeholders to inform policies and practices that affect forests and people. CIFOR is a CGIAR Research Center, and leads the CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA). Our headquarters are in Bogor, Indonesia, with offices in Nairobi, Kenya; Yaounde, Cameroon; Lima, Peru and Bonn, Germany.

