

4. Participatory Management of National Park and Protection Forest : a New Challenge in Indonesia

Haryanto R. PUTRO

“Participation without redistribution of power is an empty and frustrating process for the powerless (Stein, 1995)”

Rationale for Participatory Management

All national parks and protection forests in Indonesia were originally established with little or no regard for local people. In fact, park and protection forest management has emphasized a policing role aimed at excluding local people, sometimes characterized by “fence and fines” approach (Well, Brandon and Hannah, 1992). Many scientists argued that this conservationist approach required an essentially militaristic defense strategy and will always heighten conflicts. Following this situation, conflict over property right and loss access of local people to resources in protected areas are the most common issues in Indonesia up to date.

The need to include local communities in planning and management of protected areas has long been adopted enthusiastically by conservationist and park managers in the World Congress on National Parks in Bali 1982. However, success story on the implementation of the participatory management of national park and protection forest in Indonesia can't be found, as well as in many parts of the world. Most projects aimed to address this issue are failed to build local conservation-oriented institution, which fully support the management of the national parks and protected forests.

This paper tries to explore two different approaches on the early step of participatory

process on the management of Ujung Kulon National Park (UKNP) and Mount Salak Protection Forest (MSPF). The first approach is outcome-based participatory process for UKNP (started in September 2000) and the second is an open participatory process for MSPF (started in June 2000). This paper emphasized the lesson learned from the process findings, especially focused on the meaning of participatory process and the implementation potential of process results.19.5

The Different of National Park and Protection Forest in Indonesia

Indonesian forest is set aside into several categories based on its function including National Parks and Protection Forests. National park management is aimed to protect life-supporting system, preserve species of plant and animals and the sustainable use of biological resources and ecosystems. The management of national park is the responsibility of the central government office at province level, namely National Park Office (BTN). Zonation system of park management is implemented to ensure higher protection efficiencies. The utilization of resources in the park is mainly for research, education and ecotourism. Designation of specific-use or traditional zone possible to provide access of local people to natural resources in the park.

The protection forest is a forest area having main function as the protection of life-support system in term of hydro-ology, flood and erosion control, prevent salt water intrusion and maintain soil fertility. The management is simply protection of the forest from human activities that may cause destruction of its function. The uti-

The Department of Forest Resources Conservation, Faculty of Forestry IPB. Bogor, Indonesia.

lization of protection forest is allowed as long as the function can be maintained, especially the utilization of non-timber forest products and environmental services. The responsible institution for protection forest management is district government (Kabupaten) in coordination with Natural Resource Conservation Office (BKSDA).

Comparing the two type of protected forest above, it can be understood that management of national park is much more intensive than protection forest. Special organization unit is implemented in each Indonesian national park. In the other hand, the management of protection forest is very extensive and many type of disturbance happen in the protection forest is even unrecorded by the government.

The Participatory Process and Results

Many parties, mostly NGOs, have long initiated participative process of project development in UKNP, such as : integrated Javan rhino management and integrated primate management in the park. Some running participative projects in UKNP are annual Javan rhino census and integrated Javan-rhino monitoring program. The UKNP manager asks for more comprehensive concept in participatory management of the park. Based on UKNP manager and Bogor Agricultural University (IPB) initiative, an outcome based participatory process is set up in September 2000. The process, which involves around 20 people from university, NGO, business communities and park management identified as key stakeholders, combine two methods, namely logical framework and Meta plan, and called as logical framework approach (LFA).

The process starts with the exploration of UKNP management goal and followed by identification of problems to achieve the goal. At the basis of agreed goal and identified problems, the process continued to objective analysis and alternative analysis, followed by an output and input (activity) identification in a certain hierarchical structure. Based on the rule of LFA, each hierarchy should be accompany with indicator of success and assumption for the success with exception of input/activity that should be accompanied by level of effort required. After all work breakdown structure is obtained, planning process is

then continued by the working group of competent people to write all identified activities in a proposal form, including responsible institution(s), fund required, sources of fund and time frame of each activity.

The completion of the above process has resulted in a comprehensive draft of UKNP management plan with time frame of 20 years. Stakeholders agreed that the draft would be the main source of all further process concerning the UKNP management, including further elaboration of activities that will be implemented in field. After a year of draft formulation, there is no other process as the follow up. The reason is simply ; no funding from the government to realized all agreed activities in participatory way. Instead of that, the limitation of fund to maintain the communication and negotiation process has become the biggest barrier to mobilize stakeholders' capacity and willingness to support the UKNP management.

Different with the UKNP process, a stakeholders meeting aimed to seek synergy of MSPF management within many different interests involved parties, especially district governments, NGOs, business communities and local community institutions, was set out in June 2000 in the frame work of West Java Mountain Network. This process focus on the MSPF management goal and problems faced to achieve the goal based on the work of a small team consist of relevant expert. Through focus group discussion and working group discussion, a formulation of problem tree is carried out. This first process has also followed by agreement on the establishment of Mount Salak Conservation Network (MSCN) and the secretariat for the network in the office of small NGO based in Bogor, namely : Biodiversity Conservation Indonesia (BCI).

With stakeholders funding mechanism, bi monthly communication is maintained to reshaping stakeholders' program related to Mount Salak. Up to date, based on bi monthly stakeholders meeting, followed by 2 stakeholders workshops, some institutions has set cooperation activity in order to solve the MSPF management problems. Three typical cooperation are : (1) district government and district government, especially concern with land use planning (2) business, university and local institution or business

and local institution, especially concern with community development; (3) NGO and local institution, especially concern with capacity strengthening of local institution.

Since the involved parties set cooperation activity separately, they have own success indicator and funding agreement. Within the network mechanism all activity results are subject to discussion and other party concern, however transparent activity development and funding is hard to obtain in reality. The absent of agreed success indicator also make difficulty in performance evaluation of those activities.

It should be noted that the two processes above are still very young to evaluate in view of the success of participatory management. However, as one of the core individual involved in both processes, I would like to propose some key principles of the participative management of national park and protection forest.

Lesson Learns

Drawing on the two early process above, some lesson learns can be explored to support the implementation of participatory natural resources management in reality. The following items are concern with participation concept, process and substance.

What Does Participation Mean?

Participation is the process through which stakeholders influence and share control over priority setting, policy-making, resource allocations and access to public goods and services. There is no blueprint for participation because it plays a role in many different contexts, different projects and for different purposes. However, in whatever context or reason they are used, participatory processes allows stakeholders to begin exchanging information and learning each other and thereby increase the *transparency* of their decision-making. This in turn will improve and, as a result, increase the overall *efficiency*. Within this definition and this paper context, participation can be targeted to produce the following :

Final Impact : sustainable management of national park and protection forest

Key Outcomes :

Shared a long-term vision among all stake-

holders for national park and protection forest management

Increase equity in the national park and protection forest decision making

Accountable, transparent and efficient processes for national park and protection forest management decision.

Fair benefit sharing from the national park and protection forest management.

Key Outputs :

Multi-stakeholders institutional arrangements for participation and consensus building in national park and protection forest management decision making process, policy formulation and implementation.

Increased institutional capacity of local stakeholder institution in term of knowledge, negotiation and bargaining power.

Agreed mechanisms for negotiation and rule of engagement of stakeholders.

Agreed mechanisms for participatory monitoring system.

If maintained carefully the UKNP and MSPF processes above can achieve the similar level of impact, outcomes and output. The large gap among stakeholders in many different contexts is typical for both UKNP and MSPF early process. Intensification of process to increase communication and learning between stakeholders is an urgent step to maintain the process toward its targeted goal.

Participation Process

All parties involved in participation process need to be aware that the process is a mechanism to share and control over all aspects of national park and protection forest management. Redistribution of power among stakeholders, recognition of other right and trust level will be the most important driving force for the success of participative national park and protection forest management. The participation process therefore should be assumed as part of decision-making process in all aspect of management : planning, organizing, actuating, controlling and evaluating.

Substance

Addressing the right substance of problem will be the key of the participatory success. The

conflicting interest among stakeholders should be clearly mapped and examined carefully through out the process. In the two cases above, different substance of problem can be clearly identified. However, common management problem rooted in property right and access to natural resources can be identified, such as : conflict over benefit-cost sharing, loss of access to natural resources within the protected forest and land property right.

Precondition

The government commitments, at central, province and district level, to the participatory management of national park and protection forest need to be renegotiated. Creating enabling incentive should follow the government commitments in all process aimed to improve participative management of national park and protection forest. Instead of that, creating mechanism for developing direct incentive, both welfare-based and empowerment-based incentive, is precondition for sustainable management of national parks and protection forests.

Selected References

- Tikare, S., D. Youssef, P. Donnelly-Roark and P. Shah. 2001. Organizing Participatory Process in PRSP. Draft For Comment. Internet Publication.
- Well, M., K. Brandon and L. Hannah. People and Park : Linking Protected Area Management with Local Communities.

INDONESIA : Discussion

Question : How are the stakeholders identified? Who speak for those that cannot speak-flora, fauna, future generations etc.?

Answer : In UKNP, stakeholders are identified based on their concerns and strength effect to other institutions or local communities. Since the concerned area is national parks, more than half of involved stakeholders speak for those that cannot speak. In MSPF, all interested institutions/ individuals are invited in the first step and in the dynamic of the process “natural selection” is happen by their own concern. The difficulties rose when parties having enough strength (land own-

ers not living onsite MSPF area and some business communities) are not willing to be involved in the process. Effort to cope with this structural problem has been proposed by stakeholders.

Do you have any local people living in the area?, e.g. slash and burn agriculturalists? If so, how are their needs considered?

Answer : Yes there are. In UKNP : by long negotiation from NP manager (in collaboration with NGO), many village members have voluntarily agreed to be moved from the park. Another proposed solution is to set “specific used zone” for the area occupied by local people with some legal arrangement.

In MSPF : there are those not living in the protection forest but are involved in encroachment for agricultural land and illegal logging, these are sometimes happening in certain villages. The solution proposed by stakeholders is law enforcement.

Question : A practical question : If the decision making power is allocated to (all) the participants as in your cases, and the participants can not find a compromise solution that is acceptable for all of them; then how is the final plan/decision determined (and by whom?)

Answer : In early step of the process usually an agreement to formalize institutional arrangement on stakeholders relationship is approved : (a) in UKNP is an establishment of Ujung Kulon Trust with board member from stakeholders representatives; and (b) in MSPF is a consortium called by MSCN with core member from stakeholders representatives. If conflict aroused, the board of UK Trust or core member of MSCN will take the final decision. The board members for this conflict resolution can do negotiation and mediation or other methods.

Question : Have there been serious conflicts between/among stakeholders in your case processes?

Answer : Not yet, but potential serious conflict has been identified in MSPF, especially concerning with the structural problem, that is “landlord” who own large land around Mount Salak but not living in that lands.

Question : How do you ensure that inputs into participation process are not loss when the board decides on issues that have been discussed

openly?

Answer : As long as possible all agreements are made in open process. Conflicts brought to the board will be decided base on conflict resolution approach (negotiation, mediation, dialogues etc.) and when conflicting parties agreed with the com-

promised solution, this should be openly announced to all stakeholders. The most important thing in this case is that all stakeholders should agree on the role of the board as authorized by their institutional arrangements to cope with conflict resolution.