

POLICY BRIEF

BEWILDERNESS OF FOREST MANAGEMENT UNIT DEVELOPMENT AFTER THE ENFORCEMENT OF LAW NO. 23/2014

A case study on Forest Management Unit-Protected (KPHL) of Unit XXX Sungai Wain dan Sungai Manggar in East Kalimantan, Forest Management Unit-Protected (KPHL) of Kulawi in Central Sulawesi, Forest Management Unit-Production (KPHP) of Kapuas Hulu in West Kalimantan.

Written by: Andi Chairil Ichsan, Anggi Putra Prayoga, Soelthon Gussetya Nanggara, Christian Bob Purba

FOREST WATCH INDONESIA

2018

Introduction

Indonesian government, through (then Ministry of Forestry), now Ministry of Environment and Forestry, has released Development Strategic Plan for Forest Management Unit (*Rencana Strategis Pembangunan Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan (KPH)*) with Forestry Ministerial Regulation (Permenhut) 51/Menhut-II/2010 on FMU zonation and the operation of 120 model FMUs throughout Indonesia. The model FMUs zonation was intended to accelerate the operation of FMUs all over Indonesia. Up to December 2013, 120 out of 530 units of total FMU have been appointed as model FMUs¹.

FMU, as a mandate of Indonesian law No. 41/1999 on Forestry, was expected to strengthen the institution and implementation of forest management on site-level. The role of FMU, as the smallest unit of forest development, has become significant in countering the unsettling forest degradation and deforestation. From management point of view, the lack of forest management unit in site-level is suspected to be one of the main causes that numerous forestry projects have failed; from marginal land rehabilitation to forest protection from encroachment, illegal logging, and tenurial conflict.

FMU will replace bureaucrats' dominant role from previously forest administrator to forest manager. FMU will also improve the accountability in forest management (Kartodihardjo & Suwarno, 2014). Moreover, FMU is expected to be transitional policy to decentralization and devolution of forest management in Indonesia.

In fact, however, the development and operation of FMU to this date still have to face challenges. New challenges emerged as a new regulation on regional government delegation of authority came into effect. Indonesian law No. 32/2004 was replaced by No. 23/2014, which consequently reconstructed the authority, institutional structure, and forest management zonation by regional authorities which have been built in municipal (town/city, *kabupaten/kota*) level.

As opposed to law No. 32/2004², the new regulation stated that the authority for forest management has been returned to provincial and central authorities, resulting in various responses from regional officials. Such effect is highly related to the regions (municipality and province) propensity to adapt to changes after the new regulations comes into effect. The shifts in relation and authority between provincial and municipal authorities in forest resource management have become one of the critical points to be addressed quickly and wisely. Otherwise, they may hinder the acceleration of development of FMU in Indonesia which have been operating for the last 7 years.

With law No. 23/2014 came to effect, the first implication to address is the regulation renewal, as the derivative implementations of Law No. 32/2004, such as Government Ordinance/Regulation No. 38/2007 and Ministerial Regulation No. 61/2010 as legal foundations for the development and operation of FMU cannot be referred to anymore (Suwarno *et al.* 2016). Those regulations should be immediately replaced by new government

ordinance and ministerial regulation referring to Law No. 23/2014. The shift in authority consequently made the protected-FMU (*kesatuan pengelolaan hutan lindung* (KPHL)) and production-FMU (*kesatuan pengelolaan hutan produksi* (KPHL)) initiative and formation by municipal officials put to a halt (Suwarno *et al.* 2016) as in production-FMU in Riau Province. Whereas the fundamental shift is on workflow/coordination system between government institutions which involves structure, authority, relation, and also capability of each party.

The Portrait of Development Performance of the Model FMUs

In order to obtain the latest update on FMU development performance, in 2016-2017, Forest Watch Indonesia (FWI) conducted a study on three model FMUs: KPHL of Unit XXX Sungai Wain dan Sungai Manggar in East Kalimantan, KPHL of Kulawi in Central Sulawesi, and KPHP of Kapuas Hulu in West Kalimantan. Each FMU represented unique characteristics and formation process. XXX protected FMU in East Kalimantan represented a multi stakeholder supported by municipal authorities/government. KPHL of Kulawi represented FMU which was initiated by municipal government. While KPHP of Kapuas Hulu was supported by both municipal and central government (FWI, 2017). The following are brief profile of these model FMUs:

KPHL of Unit XXX Sungai Wain dan Sungai Manggar in East Kalimantan has area of 14.832 ha which was divided into two regions: Wain river and Manggar watershed protected forests. The area was designated by then Ministry of Forestry in 2011⁶. The region was managed by Wain river – Manggar Watershed Protected Forests Management Agency (*Badan Pengelola Hutan Lindung Sungai Wain-DAS Manggar* (BPHLW- DM) with regulation of Balikpapan City No. 11/2004 on Wain River protected forest management. The agency was a multi stakeholder platform which consisted of government representatives, private companies, local people, and accompanying non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Government initiatives which founded the agency was an exemplary modality to develop and operate FMUs.

KPHL of Kulawi in Central Sulawesi covers a geographically strategic area with a hilly and mountainous contour which is the upstream area for Palu and Lariang rivers. These rivers flow through Sulawesi. The FMU area share the same landscape with Lore Lindu National Park which is home for endemic flora and fauna. With such characteristics, institutional functionalization in site-level is essential. KPHL of Kulawi was designated through Ministerial Decree by (then) Ministry of Forestry⁷ which implementation and organizational structure was followed through by Sigi municipal government⁸. Founding KPHL of Kulawi institution(s) by regional government was an essential effort to accelerate the establishment of site-level forest management.

KPHP of Kapuas Hulu in West Kalimantan comprises a highly geopolitically strategic area. Aside from being part of the “Heart of Borneo”, the FMU is directly adjacent to Malaysia in the borders. The FMU area of 458.025 ha was designated by Ministry of Forestry through Ministerial Decree (SK Menhut) No. 380/2011. From area designation point of view, the FMU was divided into three functional area: protected, production, and limited-production forest

areas. The organizational foundation of KPHP of Kapuas Hulu was built on Municipal Decree (*Keputusan Bupati*) of Kapuas Hulu No. SK.35/2011 on 16 November 2011 about the formation and organization structure of model KPHP of Kapuas Hulu. This FMU was financially supported by central government to accelerate FMU development.

This study used criteria guide and performance indicator for FMU based on FWI version 1.0 to assess the performance of three model FMU development particularly on the scope of main roles and the functions of FMU organization. This study also performed gap analysis on criteria and key indicators that FMUs must have fulfilled in managing forest resources (FWI, 2014). Among the indicators was the government readiness in supporting FMU development, related to region certainty, forest system, management planning, organization capacity, governmental relations, investment mechanism, people accessibility privilege, and management implementation. Fulfillment of these criteria and key indicators reflected the real condition of forest resource management in site-level of the three model FMUs.

Table 1. Assessment on Performance of Three Model FMUs Development

Assessment Aspect	KPHL of Unit XXX Sungai Wain dan Sungai Manggar in East Kalimantan	KPHL of Kulawi in Central Sulawesi	KPHP of Kapuas Hulu in West Kalimantan
Region Certainty	Demarcation was not finished	Demarcation was not started yet	80% of demarcation process was done
Institution/Founding	Definitive FMU institution was lacking. BPHLSW was still the autonomous agency formed by regulation of Balikpapan City No. 11/2004	Local Technical Implementation Unit (TIU) through Sigi Municipal Ordinance No. 34/2015	Local TIU through Kapuas Hulu Municipal Decree No. 35/2011
Management Planning	Long-term Forest Management Planning (LFMP) was drafted	None	LFMP was drafted
Governmental Relation & Regulation	Support from municipal authorities	Support from central and provincial government was lacking	Institutional support was stated to not be responsibilities of forestry provincial

			agency (Dinas Kehutanan Provinsi)
Local People Accessibility and Management Privilege	-Privilege and access for local people to manage was allocated and facilitated directly by FMU -1400 ha of community forest was designated	- Privilege and access were lacking as the FMU did not have management planning documents - An area of 490 ha was designated as village forest in Namo village which was facilitated by NGOs	- Privilege and access for local people to manage was allocated - An area of 2,825 ha was designated as village forest in 2 villages which was facilitated by NGOs
Forest Protection and Rehabilitation	Performed by Environment Service of Balikpapan City	None	A program existed previously. However, organizational nomenclature shift caused the support from central government through TIU could not be received

Long-term Forest Management Planning (*Rencana Pengelolaan Hutan Jangka Panjang*, RPHJP)

Source: Observations and Interviews by FWI, 2017

The following are additional explanations of findings on performance of the model FMUs.

Authority System in Forest Resource Management

Delegation of authority in forest management on site-level involved central and regional governments (municipal and provincial) and FMU. Central government through their TIUs (forest area consolidation hall (FACH), watershed and protected-forest management hall, production-forest management hall, and human resource development and counseling agency⁹) contributed in planning, budgeting, and operating activities related to area consolidation and forest management, such as demarcation, (inventory) stock taking, management planning, business plan preparation, and infrastructure facilitation. Whereas regional government (municipal/provincial) focused more on activities related to forest management planning in accordance with regional development planning. Meanwhile, FMU as site-level forest management unit organized technical activities such as conflict resolution,

work block arrangement, management access admission, and forest protection related activities.

Forest resource management authority by FMU was highly influenced by FMU institutional and regional systems. The FMUs in this study still had issues related to their legality and legitimacy. The shift in forest management authority from municipal government to provincial management have resulted in the policy to redesign FMU regionality and institutions, which was perceived as the adjustments with resource capacity of the provincial government themselves. With the persistence of institutional legality and regionality, the established FMUs were unable to authorize critical matters and consequently unable to optimally function and run their tasks.

Forest Resource Management Planning System

All of FMUs in this study had not yet LFMP (Table 1). Even though preliminary LFMP has been drafted for a while (except for KPHL of Kulawi case), its finalization was held back on the adjustment to law No. 23/2014. The lack of planning system has strained FMU from getting activity support from technical institutions such as watershed and protected-forest management hall and production-forest management hall.

Beside LFMP, FMU is expected to have a business plan to encourage independence as well as short-term program to ensure forest managing activities stay supervised and organized as designed. Nevertheless, those plans would only work when LFMP is established. Therefore, LFMP drafting and authorization has to be prioritized for FMU to optimally operate.

Forest Resource Management Zonation

Based on observations on the model FMUs, we discovered tenurial conflicts between government and local people around FMU. The main causes were the lack of both transparency in demarcation implementation and coordination with local people¹⁰. Gathered information indicated that demarcation was single-handedly done by officials from FACH and forestry service (*dinas kehutanan*). Local people were not involved in the process. Demarcation based on ministerial ordinance by Ministry of Forestry No. P.25/2014¹¹ and P.62/2013¹² did not accommodate local people privileges, particularly of accessibility and land ownership.

Financial support (or the lack of it) contributed to demarcation process which was expected to be adequate and participative. Limited government budget had caused demarcation in KPHP of Kapuas Hulu and KPHL of Kulawi remained unfinished. WG Tenure (2014) found that tenurial conflict could not be separated from the uncertainties surrounded village administration boundary, FMU territory, and in acknowledgment of land ownership based on customary law of indigenous people¹³.

Forest Resource Management Administrative System

All of observed FMUs did not have an adequate institutional operation, whether in terms of the availability of managerial standard of procedures (administration, decision making, field activity, information service, and investment) or regulation support on regional level¹⁴. FMU operations were highly depended on character of the person(s) in charge. The lack of systematic decision making, particularly in strategic issues, may lead to official misconduct such as abuse of authority and maladministration and should be addressed quickly.

Human Resources for Forest Resource Management

Human resources with technical qualifications are required for FMU, as stated in ministerial ordinance by Ministry of Forestry P.42/2011 about competency standards in technical forestry for protected- and production- FMUs. The adequacy of qualified human resources is vital in operating FMU in site level. Based on our assessment, the observed FMUs had inadequate human resources according to the required standards, both in quantity and quality. This was reflected in the capacity of the head of FMU KKPH¹⁵ and the staff, which was still limited in terms of technical skills and managerial competencies. In terms of quantity, inadequate human resources would increase the duty load of existing personnel in managing forest in site level¹⁶.

Information System for Forest Resource Management

As a public body, FMUs are obliged to serve information to the public, which they have done insufficiently. The available informative media was an outdated website which did not follow the principle of presenting information regulated by law No. 14/2008. Moreover, many essential technical documents were scattered in other related institutions, instead of being kept in FMU. Such condition would hinder proper administrative order and documentation. This finding was supported when our team found difficulties in accessing necessary data to gain a more comprehended information.

Complying public access to information needs more attention as information is citizens right to cultivate personal and social interests. The right was guaranteed in law No.14/2008 about public information accessibility, which: (a) it is everyone's right to access information; (b) public bodies are obliged to provide and serve information requests quickly, punctual, with low/proportionally cost, and straightforward; (c) exceptions are strict and limited; (d) public bodies are obliged to establish document management and information service. Every public body has obligation to make information related to their work publicly available.

The Implications of Law No. 23/2014

The law No. 23/2014 has become the new foundation for the implementation of forest development, including FMUs. Inherently, a comprehensive study is necessary to observe how this law affects the current and future FMU development process and operations, including more technical regulations derived from this law which will be referred to for FMU development.

The shift in relation and authority between provincial and municipal governments in managing forest resources is one of the critical points which should be addressed quickly and wisely in every level of governance. The shift in authority requires prompt rearrangement of structures, authorities and responsibilities, as well as resources and infrastructures in order not to hinder FMU development. Table 2 presents authority shifts between central, provincial, and municipal governments after law No. 23/2014 about regional government came to effect.

Table 2. Comparison on forest authority between law No. 32/2004 and law No. 23/2014 about regional government

Governance/Conduct	Law No. 32/2004			Law No. 23/2014		
	Levels of government			Levels of government		
	Central	Provincial	Municipal	Central	Provincial	Municipal
Forest inventory		v	v	v		
Forest gazettement	v	v	v	v		
Forest stewardship	v	v	v	v		
Establishment of forest management areas	v	v	v	v		
National forestry plan	v	v	v	v		
Forest management	v	v	v	v	v	
Forest management plan	v	v	v	v	v	
Forest rehabilitation and reclamation	v	v	v	v	v	
Forest protection	v	v	v	v	v	
Processing and administration of forest products	v	v	v	v	v	
Management of forest areas with special purposes	v	v	v	v	v	
Management of nature reserve areas and	v	v	v	v	v	v

nature conservation areas						
Conservation of wild plants and animals	v	v	v	v	v	
Sustainable use of environmental conditions in nature conservation areas	v	v	v	v	v	
Utilization of wild plants and animals	v	v	v	v	v	
Education, training, outreach, and community empowerment in forestry sector				v	v	
Watershed management	v	v	v	v	v	
Forestry supervision	v	v	v	v		

Source: extracted from law No. 32/2004 and law No. 23/2014

As seen from Table 2, significant changes have been made on the authorities each level of government has in managing forest resources. Aside from authority to manage nature reserve and nature conservation areas, especially forest park (*taman hutan raya*), all the other governances have been shifted from previously by all-levels government to only by central/provincial governments. The authorities of regional governments may be adjusted to their respective regional potency. Forestry was categorized as an elective governmental affair¹⁷. Therefore, legally speaking, it is still possible that forestry-related governance to be under the authority of regional government. However, in reality, almost all forestry operating authority has shifted to the provincial and central governments.

Since law No. 23/2014 was enacted, the derived government ordinance No. 18/2016¹⁸ was issued only two years later on August 2016 which then came to effect on early January 2017. Therefore, there was at least two-year gap until operational regulation was available. On the other hand, regional government was expected to immediately make major change in their governance. Adjustment to the new organizational structure (*susunan organisasi tata kerja*, SOTK) included asset and staff reallocation as well as medium-term regional development agenda in every level of government.

The shift in authorities presumably has generated apathy from some municipal officials regarding forest resource management. Moreover, several municipalities no longer allocated

budget for forest management. All responsibilities were acceded to provincial government, even though the law was meant to place municipal government as strategic partner to achieve fair and sustainable forest management.

Polemics that have arisen should have been contemplated and anticipated by central government before issuing a new law. Interrelations between government institutions and personnel/institutions swiftness in deriving operational procedures should be established to achieve a smooth transition.

Potential Setbacks in FMU Development

Similar situations were found in the observed site-level FMUs. Authority shift has risen controversies in FMU officials as the continuity of their positions became uncertain. However, they were expected to manage the forest even without operational support from provincial/central government¹⁹. This was what 120 personnel of KPHL of Unit XXX Sungai Wain dan Sungai Manggar had to face.

Territorial and institutional rearrangements were challenging for regional government. To ensure program and financial support, various aspects of FMU had to be assured: operational area, organizational structure, adjusted management planning, central-municipal government interrelation and coordination. Ideally, the shift should have only been in status level without affecting other aspects.

Provincial forestry service would now play the main role in FMU development. However, because the adjustment process had not been smooth and there was a conflict of interest in the observed provinces, forest management in site-level experienced a stagnancy. Municipal government complained that their constitutional rights were stripped by central government²⁰.

In West Kalimantan, KPHP of Kapuas Hulu which was newly formed in early 2017 had to undergo rearrangement of its institution as well as area. Consequently, the FMU was renamed to KPHP of Kapuas Hulu Utara²¹. This change has made financial support from TIU, production forest management hall, and BDASHL – Ministry of Environment and Forestry could not be distributed due to FMU institutional nomenclature. Consequently, forest rehabilitation and protection activities had to be halted.

Another implication was observed in inventory as the foundation for FMU area/block arrangement, which became irrelevant after the shift. Hence, the documents for forest management plan need major revisions.

Both provincial and municipal government should exchange valuable input and work together in the transition period. Provincial officials should be open to feedback. On the other side,

municipal as well as FMU officials should be willing to cooperate. There are works to be done and smooth transition is a must.

As previously mentioned, this study has discovered that there was a gap in fulfillment of FMU duties to operate optimally. With the additional gap between governments during transition period, FMU operation and development could be hindered and FMU would be like a new institution after the transition.

Table 3. Additional duties and challenges in forest management after the implementation of law No. 23/2014

Assessment aspect	Site-level challenges ²²	Consequences after the new law	Authorities
Area certainty	Demarcation has not been completed	The ongoing demarcation needs to be recalibrated according to the newly appointed area	Central government through their TIU: forest area consolidation hall
Institution	-Limited human resources, quantitatively and qualitatively -Some institutions were still undefined clearly	-Foundation for new policy for FMU institutions and operations. -Relocation of FMU personnel is possible -New FMU organizational structure	Provincial government through their forestry service
Forest planning	None. LFMP as reference	-New LFMP if there is a change in FMU region -May have to re-inventory	FMU, provincial and central governments
Government relations and regulations	Limited financial support for FMU operations	-Synchronized LFMP with provincial agenda	Provincial government

		-Budget shifted from municipal to provincial -financial support from municipality may cease	
Local People Accessibility and Management Privilege	Limited support from FMU	Limited budget	FMU and provincial government
Forest Protection and Rehabilitation	Inadequate related activities	Activities which was supported by TIU were halted due to legality and institutional nomenclature change	-Provincial government -Financial support from central government through TIU

From various resources, 2018

Conclusions and Recommendations

Law No. 32/2004 replacement by No. 23/2014 has significant changes in forest management in site-level, particularly shifting the authority to establish protected- and production- FMUs to provincial government, leaving the municipal government only with the authority to manage nature reserve areas and nature conservation areas.

Consequently, such authority shift would also change the legal foundation in protected- and production- FMUs establishment. The previous government ordinance No. 38/2007 and Ministerial Regulation from Ministry of Home Affairs No. 61/2010 on FMU operation are no longer valid. New regulations to accommodate law No. 23/2014 should be issued soon to avoid regulation gap which will hinder FMU development.

Authority shift had also put the initiation process of protected- and production- FMUs establishment by municipal government into a halt. The fundamental change was most

noticeable in government inter-relations, which involved organizational structure, authorities, and resource capacities.

Provincial government through their forestry service now has the most authority in managing FMU, even though some were not ready to claim such role. FMU operations were not yet included in their provincial forestry planning which was reflected in their medium-term development agenda and budget.

Polemics that could have arisen should have been contemplated and anticipated by central government when issuing a new law. Interrelations between government institutions and personnel/institutions swiftness in deriving operational procedures should be established to achieve a smooth transition. Failure to do so would raise uncertainty, such as personnel reallocation.

Implementation of law No.23/2014 had a huge impact on institutional and operational development of FMU. In order to return to original FMU development direction, provincial government should provide a policy breakthrough related to territory, organizational structure, and human resources which were previously established by municipal government. Therefore, currently established FMUs would still be a part of government structure which management activities are guaranteed. Moreover, provincial government should facilitate collaborations with stakeholders, such as municipal government, who have been involved in FMU development, particularly when redesigning territory and institutions while still complying with legal principles.

¹http://kph.menlhk.go.id/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=73&Itemid=222

² In Indonesian law No. 32/2004, the delegation of authority on forestry-related matters was not clearly specified, although was included specifically in Government Ordinance/Regulation (Article 14 Section 3).

³ Government Ordinance (*Peraturan Pemerintah*, PP) No. 38/2007 on Governance Division between Central, Province, and Municipal Government.

⁴ Ministerial Regulation from Ministry of Home Affairs No. 61/2010 about Guidance on Organization and Administration/Management of Protected-FMU and Production-FMU in Districts.

⁵ FWI. Factsheet-Penilaian Kinerja Pembangunan KPH dengan Menggunakan Indikator FWI 1.0; Studi Kasus: KPHL Unit XXX Kalimantan Timur, KPHL Kulawi Sulawesi Tengah, dan KPHP Model Kapuas Hulu Kalimantan Barat. Bogor.

⁶ Ministerial Decree from (then) Ministry of Forestry SK.674/Menhut-II/2011 about Area Designation (Zonation) of Protected- and Production- Forest Management Units in East Kalimantan Province.

⁷ Ministerial Decree from (then) Ministry of Forestry No. 79/2010 on Area Designation of FMU in Central Sulawesi Province.

⁸ Sigi Municipal Ordinance No. 34/2015 about the fourth amendment on Municipal Ordinance No.10/2011 about the foundation of Technical Implementation Unit (*unit pelaksana teknis*, UPT) in regional agencies/services and Sigi regional technical institution.

⁹ forest area consolidation hall (*Balai Pemantapan Kawasan Hutan*, BPKH) under Directorate General of Forestry Planology (now Directorate General of Forestry and Environmental Planning, watershed and protected-forest management hall (*Balai Pengelolaan Daerah Aliran Sungai dan Hutan Lindung* (BPDASHL)) under Directorate General of Watershed and Protected-Forest Management, production forest management hall (Balai Pengelolaan Hutan Produksi, BPHP)) under Directorate General of Sustainable Production Forest Management, and human resource development and counseling agency (*Badan Penyuluhan dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia*, BP2SDM)).

¹⁰ In Manggar watershed, there was a conflict between local people against FMU and FACH. The encroachment of people's land which was claimed by government as forest area. The people were unaware that the land they managed and certified was converted to be (government-owned) forest area.

¹¹ Ministerial ordinance by Ministry of Forestry No. P.25/Menhut-II/2014 on Committee of Forest Demarcation

¹² Ministerial ordinance by Ministry of Forestry No. P.62/Menhut-II/2013 on Amendment of ministerial ordinance No P.44/Menhut-II/2012 on designation of forest are.

¹³ WG Tenure, 2014. Konflik Tenurial dalam Pembangunan KPH: Pembelajaran dari Hasil Penilaian Cepat di KPHP Berau Barat dan Kapuas Hulu.

¹⁴ The lack of firm and clear policy to internalize FMU into medium-term development agenda (*Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah* (RPJMD)) in every government level.

¹⁵ Heads of FMUs (KKPH) in this study have not attended the assigned training for them as legally required to lead FMU.

¹⁶ KPHP of Kapuas Hulu only had 33 personnel (mostly on contractual terms) to manage 416,000 ha area.

¹⁷ Article 12, paragraph (3) stated that elective governance as mentioned in article,11 paragraph (1) includes (a) marine and fisheries, tourism, agriculture, forestry, energy and mineral resources, commerce, industry, and transmigration.

¹⁸ Government ordinance No. 18/2016 about regional apparatus.

¹⁹ FWI. 2017. Factsheet-Penilaian Kinerja Pembangunan KPH Dengan Menggunakan Indikator FWI 1.0; Studi Kasus: KPHL Unit XXX Sungai Wain – Sungai Manggar Kalimantan Timur, KPHL Kulawi Sulawesi Tengah, dan KPHP Model Kapuas Hulu Kalimantan Barat. Bogor.

²⁰ There was a judicial review submitted by Indonesian municipal government association (*asosiasi pemerintah kabupaten seluruh Indonesia, APKASI*) on law No. 23/2014 with registration numbers 30/PUU-XIV/2016 and 31/PUU-XIV/2016.

²¹ From interview with Forestry Service in West Kalimantan and the head of KPHP of Kapuas Hulu and their long-term development agenda (*rencana pembangunan jangka panjang, RPJP*)

²² The conditions and development of model FMUs during this study in 2016-2017

References

FWI. 2014. Panduan Penilaian Kinerja Pembangunan dan Pelaksanaan Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan di Wilayah KPH: Dengan Menggunakan Kriteria dan Indikator FWI 1.0. Bogor.

FWI. 2017. Factsheet-Penilaian Kinerja Pembangunan KPH Dengan Menggunakan Indikator FWI 1.0; Studi Kasus: KPHL Unit XXX Sungai Wain-Sungai Manggar Kalimantan Timur, KPHL Kulawi Sulawesi Tengah, dan KPHP Model Kapuas Hulu Kalimantan Barat. Bogor.

Kartodihardjo H, Suwarno E. 2014. Pengarusutamaan Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan (KPH) dalam Kebijakan dan Pelaksanaan Perizinan Kehutanan. Jakarta: Direktorat Wilayah Pengelolaan dan Penyiapan Areal Pemanfaatan Kawasan Hutan Direktorat Jenderal Planologi Kehutanan.

Suwarno, E, Ratnaningsih, A.T, Insusanti, E. 2016. Implikasi Terbitnya Undang-Undang No. 23 Tahun 2014 Terhadap Pembangunan Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan di Provinsi Riau. Universitas Lancang Kuning, Riau.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 23 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pemerintah Daerah.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang Pemerintah Daerah.

Note from translator:

1. Abbreviations should be explained the first time (or page) they were mentioned, regardless the placement (foot note or main body). If they were mentioned first in the foot note, they may be explained again in the main body for the first mention. One of them: Abbreviation in foot note no. 14, RPJMD, in page 5 was explained in page 8. The ones that were not even explained at all: KKPH in page 6 and foot note number 15, BDASHL in page 9, RPJP in foot note page 9

2. Abbreviating institutions or other phrases which were only mentioned once is unnecessary.
3. Many sentences are redundant and not precise. Therefore, translator may or may not have reflected such writing style in the translation.
4. There are sentences without proper structure where the speaking-style was adopted instead.