



Muhammad Alif K. Sahide <alif.mksr@gmail.com>

Received revision LUP_2017_635_R1

1 pesan

Land Use Policy <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

23 Maret 2018 23.38

Balas Ke: jlup@elsevier.com

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

This message was sent automatically. Please do not reply.

Ref: LUP_2017_635_R1

Title: Deadlock opportunism in contesting conservation areas in Indonesia

Journal: Land Use Policy

Dear Mr. Sahide,

Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript for consideration for publication in Land Use Policy . Your revision was received in good order.

To track the status of your manuscript, please log into EVISE® http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jsp?JRNL_ACR=LUP and locate the submission under the header 'My Submissions with Journal' on your 'My Author Tasks' view.

We appreciate your submitting your revision to this journal.

Kind regards,

Land Use Policy

Have questions or need assistance?

For further assistance, please visit our [Customer Support](#) site. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about EVISE® via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/5 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email.

Copyright © 2018 Elsevier B.V. | [Privacy Policy](#)

Elsevier [B.V.](#), [Radarweg 29, 1043 NX Amsterdam, The Netherlands](#), Reg. No. 33156677.

RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWERS

Title: Deadlock opportunism in contesting conservation areas in Indonesia

Reviewer#1

The manuscript is substantially improved, and now offers a far more coherent, cogent, and useful contribution. Importantly, this paper now provides a succinct and well-articulated political ecology of social forestry in Indonesia through colonial and post-colonial periods. This is in itself a valuable piece of scholarship. The theoretical positioning is much clearer and certainly more effectively applied in the analytical process. I have some further minor suggestions that could be addressed before publication.

Reviewer#2

I got the opportunity to review your manuscript after revision. Yes, your article is not easy digestible. But it is well structured, it provides a clear research focus, a method and the supporting results. The topic is very interesting as well as your results. And I encourage you to continue with your research. All in all, I agree with your comments to the previous reviewers and from my side your manuscript is ready for publication. Well done!

Response:

We take this as encouragement and motivation from both reviewers, we acknowledge and highly appreciate your suggestion on the conceptual and operational framework, which are now well improved. Thanks also for the detailed comments with which the overall quality of the paper is greatly improved Thank you very much

Reviewer #1

First, there could be a succinct explanation of the conceptual terms provided in the Introduction, and a more clearly articulated statement of the problem and rationale for the study.

Response:

We have made changes in the introduction following reviewer suggestions, we have:

- *deleted some sentences that are redundant (repeating the points that are already made).*
- *defined acronym when used the first time and use it throughout the paper (e.g. DG).*
- *changed some conservation areas terms into more local context with 'HK' – Hutan Konservasi'. We also identified that the word, "conservation areas" is used too many times. So we changed "conservation areas" to HK in some cases and deleted some when it was obvious we meant conservation areas.*
- *made some changes based in the purpose that wider readership can digest this paper or to avoid mis-understanding*

Second, there is room to make slight changes to the headings and structure, to space the manuscript's logical flow more effectively, and avoid the rabbit-hole scale of sub-headings. Third, I am not sure that the figures (particularly Fig 1) are as clear as they could be - there might be merit in asking someone with Adobe Illustrator skills to reproduce these more effectively, since this is a paper that may well be read and cited for some time, and powerful

graphics will support that outcome. Finally, there are still some minor issues with expression and grammar that could be addressed.

I have made specific notes on an attached file, and hope you will take these small suggestions as an encouragement to finalise the manuscript. A genuine improvement on the initial submission and a useful contribution.

Response:

Thank you very much for providing the detailed suggestions and comments in the track change file, we received most of the suggestions. Exception for the method section that reviewer suggest to include in the introduction, we think that we need to keep the method section so the reader can understand that this paper has clear method that can be replicate in the future research.

We agree with the heading and structure suggestion from reviewer, and we have addressed it with this revision. We also ask someone to re-shape our Figure 1 and Figure 2, and his contribution is added in our acknowledgement as well. We also provide graphical abstract anticipating wider readership digest this paper



Muhammad Alif K. Sahide <alif.mksr@gmail.com>

Requested for LUP_2017_635

2 pesan

Muhammad Alif K. Sahide <alif.mksr@gmail.com>

20 Maret 2018 15.38

Kepada: gmrsrc@gmail.com

Cc: Lukas Giessen <lukas.giessen@efi.int>

Dear Professor Guy Martin Robinson
Editor of Land Use Policy

We would like to inform that previously we submitted our manuscript LUP_2017_635 which title "Pushing the boundaries of conservation and development: geothermal projects, community forests, and contesting the future of conservation zones in Indonesia". We also had received a mayor revision.

We already revised our manuscript based on one LUP reviewer comments, and now we are ready to re-submit. We feel sorry that it takes long time to revise due to the very substantive comments from reviewer side. We reconstruct our paper based on the reviewer comments and provide new title "Deadlock opportunism in conservation areas in Indonesia".

Unfortunately, after checking our account submission in the Evise system, we could not find it anymore. Would you please to reactivate it, and we will re-submit it soon.

Thank you very much.

Best regards
Muhammad Alif K. Sahide
Corresponding author for LUP_2017_635

Muhammad Alif K. Sahide
Editor in Chief, Forest and Society
<http://journal.unhas.ac.id/index.php/fs>

Google Scholar link:
<https://scholar.google.de/citations?user=o884t9QAAAAJ&hl=id>

On Aug 15, 2017, at 7:01 AM, Guy Martin Robinson <EviseSupport@elsevier.com> wrote:

Ref: LUP_2017_635

Title: Pushing the boundaries of conservation and development: geothermal projects, community forests, and contesting the future of conservation zones in Indonesia

Journal: Land Use Policy

Dear Mr. Sahide,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Land Use Policy. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments. Please note that as I was only able to obtain one rebiewer for your manuscript I will need to add a second for the revision. You need to use a professional editor to improve the standard of English usage and grammar. I suggest you use the serive offered by the publishers.

When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed.

To submit your revised manuscript:

- Log into EVISE® at: http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=LUP
- Locate your manuscript under the header 'My Submissions that need Revisions' on your 'My Author Tasks' view
- Click on 'Agree to Revise'
- Make the required edits
- Click on 'Complete Submission' to approve

What happens next?

After you approve your submission preview you will receive a notification that the submission is complete. To track the status of your paper throughout the editorial process, log in to Evise® at: http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=LUP.

Enrich your article to present your research with maximum impact. This journal supports the following **Content Innovations**:

- Explain your research in your own words and attract interest in your work using **AudioSlides** : 5-minute webcast-style presentations that are displayed next to your published article and can be posted on other websites. You will receive an invitation email to create an AudioSlides presentation within three weeks after your paper has been accepted.
- **Interactive Map Viewer**: Interactive viewer displaying geospatial data on a Google Map. Please use the online **KML/KMZ Editor** or your own geographic information system (GIS) to create the file required for uploading. GIS users can preview how files will display [here](#).
- **Interactive Plots**: Interactive plot viewer providing easy access to the data behind plots. Please prepare a **.CSV** file with your plot data and test it online [here](#) before submitting as supplementary material.

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript as soon as possible.

Kind regards,

Guy Robinson

Professor Guy M Robinson
Editor
Land Use Policy

Comments from the editors and reviewers:

-Reviewer 1

-

The social-ecological dynamics of Indonesian forests and forest governance are extremely complex, with fragmented and overlapping regulatory structures, diverse interests and actors across local, national, and global scales, and challenging political and cultural contexts. The authors are well versed in the institutional and political issues of Indonesia's forests, and offer some interesting perspectives on this topic. This paper presents a potentially useful commentary at the political end of a political ecology analysis, but is not publishable in its current form.

The paper as it stands is not easily accessible to non-specialist readers, and even for those with expertise and experience in these areas the manuscript would benefit from substantial revisions to clarify the meaning of key terms and improve the structure and analytical insights. Major changes are needed to meet the standards of an international scientific journal of repute, such as LUP.

I offer the authors suggestions in several broad but critical areas, and then provide examples of stylistic and structural aspects that need to be improved throughout the paper.

The principal weakness of the paper is its lack of clarity – in conceptual positioning, analytical structure, and expression of information.

The text states that “The objective of this article is to describe and explain how a deadlock situation can be broken to open up opportunities by employing allowable narratives of forest conservation zoning in Indonesia to open up opportunities for both geothermal utilization and community forest politics.” The authors also state that their “main hypothesis is that community forestry policy did not have a strong claim to the conservation zone because of environmental arguments on protecting biodiversity,” and that they “apply deadlock and Bureaucratic Political theories to explain the deadlock between geothermal projects and community forestry in conservation area.

The theoretical positioning is confused. **Bureaucratic politics** theory emphasises the role of government agencies in promoting their own interests against those of other government agencies – with which they are competing for funding, resources, and authority.

Dilemmas as used by Fearnside (2003) refer to the challenges for government of legislating in the face of competing interests and priorities, across the private sector, communities, and environmental NGOs. This is fine, but does not appear much or at all after this first use. What’s the point?

The reference to “**deadlock**” in Wiranto et al. 2001 is in Bahasa Indonesia, and therefore not immediately accessible. In game theory, “deadlock” refers to a situation where the most beneficial behaviours or actions are also dominant, meaning that self-interest for all parties has the most positive outcomes generally. This begs the question, how is deadlock being used in this paper? This should be clarified and applied consistently throughout the manuscript.

The phrase “**hollow** state” is an established reference to executive political regimes in which governance is fractured and diluted through extended layers of contractual relations with sub-agencies and the private sector. Here the authors appear to refer to “hollow policy” as governance actions – either formal or informal – that are insubstantial, or tokenistic. The “hollow” concept needs to be made very clear early on.

The authors say that “**non-decision** exists as a power tools when the dominant values of the most powerful actors forcefully and effectively manipulate the situation in order to prevent certain grievances from developing into full-fledged issues which will call for decisions.” This is perhaps the most clearly applied concept throughout the discussion.

These concepts are all arguably relevant and appropriate lenses to apply to the analysis, but not coherently applied in the paper. Perhaps the main problem is a lack of explication of the meaning of the terms as used in the analysis. In revising the paper, the authors should introduce each term, clarify its meaning with suitable explanation and references to previous literature, and ensure that the use of the term in the present manuscript is clear and specific.

Thereafter, in the analysis, the various case studies should be explained in line with these conceptual lenses, so that the reader has a consistent framework for understanding the issues. Given the complexities of Indonesian forestry law, it is worth remembering that traditional structures and scientific formats will be very helpful in comprehending the arguments.

The second major issue in the paper is the analysis. The authors state that “data collection methods used in this research include content analysis, interviews, and observations from our long experiences on witnessing conservation policy.” The only inclusion of data appears in a few brief comments and footnotes. This is a major flaw in the paper – it does not seem that there is a genuine use of primary research data, and the hypotheses are not properly tested using original empirical information. If the authors wish to use the hypotheses approach, then the testing of propositions needs to be much rigorous and structured. As it stands, the paper seems to say, “We think this is the case”, and then present extended and largely unreferenced discussion (in other words, opinionated assertions without supporting evidence) before concluding with “Therefore we have proved our hypotheses.” I am unconvinced by this approach, and encourage the authors to offer more data-driven arguments, built on evidence-based analysis that is robust and logical.

The coding presented in Table 2 is poorly explained and not obviously relevant. What is the purpose and value of the table? The other graphics are similarly lacking in relevance or impact.

If the paper is to be successful as a piece of original analysis, it needs to present original data in a clear and accessible form (where are the interview and survey results, where is the coding?) that is then assembled to present evidence for particular outcomes, analysed using the themes of deadlock, hollowness, etc., with the results used to generate specific arguments. As it stands the paper reads as an overly detailed history

lesson with lots of personal insights and opinion, with some token (hollow?) gestures toward established scientific practice, in the form of theoretical framing and data presentation.

This is the other primary constraint on the manuscript – its tendency to present information and ideas in not just a discursive but unsubstantiated manner. Section 4 is not so much a presentation of results but a review of current and recent history. These arguments must be supported far more effectively, with the evidence of your original research, or through citations of other peer-reviewed literature.

There is some good material in the paper – Table 2 is insightful, for instance. However, the consideration of geothermal energy initiatives is confusing – and minimal. The paper purports to explore the dynamics of geothermal in forest conservation areas, but this could be done much more convincingly and clearly.

I would suggest that the paper be restructured in a political ecology format. The manuscript could do the following:

1. Provide an overview of Indonesia's forest conservation policies and energy development agenda (current section 1, with parts of section 4). Explain the research problem and question (what is the research question exactly?). Outline the manuscript structure.
2. Specify the methods (lit review, interviews, workshops). Lose the hypotheses – not necessary.
3. Discuss background and concepts (current sections 2 and 4.1)
4. Present results: interview responses to specific questions (table form), section 4.2.2 (and table 2).
5. Discuss stakeholders (actors) – current section 4.3; discuss local, national, global implications in terms of forests (ecology), development (energy), and sustainability (equity). All using the key concepts established in the beginning.
6. Conclude with key insights, highlight main findings, identify further research needs.

Sections 1, 3, and 5 can be condensed. Sections 2, 4, and 6 considerably expanded.

A critical improvement is clarification around the central theme of geothermal energy. This is not well presented as central to the analysis.

Below I point out some problems of expression, grammar and spelling, referencing, and other details. These few examples are not comprehensive, but indicative of issues that need to be addressed throughout the manuscript before it can be reviewed again.

Problems with expression:

Please clarify the meaning of:

P15, section 4.2.1 “they consider conservation areas the last defense of Indonesian forestry” – do you mean “Indonesian *forests*”? The following sentence does not help make this clear.

P15, section 4.2.1 “territorial quantity of state forests area”?

P15, section 4.2.1 “customary forest sites”

Section 4.2.1 “hollow regulations were created thus making it effective depends on the particular presence interests.”

Problems with spelling, grammar, or punctuation, e.g:

Abstract first sentence “...it is reasonable to expect”

Intro 2nd para “...the terms forest preservation should be differentiated with *from* forest conservation”

Intro 5th para “camouflaging”; “hyphotesis”; final sentence is incomplete, and finishes with a comma.

Section 2.1 “Ideologies related to conservation areas and its utilization are multiple.”

Lack of referencing:

Intro 3rd para "In the last few decades, forest conservation in Indonesia has become the battlefield of contesting interests; political actors evaluate 'proposals' on the conservation areas. Arguments of how utilization could be made in conservation areas are often used by political actors for pursuing their own interests. Sometimes conservation is defined and interpreted differently by political actors involved." Each of these sentences make assertions that should be supported with suitable references to peer-reviewed literature.

Section 4.1.1.4 *The role of international donor organisations section*: "It is found that community empowerment activities inside conservation forest areas are still lacking." This requires a reference.

Section 4.3.6 "The company has proven that it cares about the environment in managing 200 ha from 10.000 ha concession (since 1980) and they achieve 'golden category' certificate from the Ministry of Environment in 2011."

Details

Section 4.1.1.4 5th para "a high degree of functionality and management protection responsibilities" – What does this mean? There is a need for greater clarity around the ecological aspects of the argument.

Surely it's not that "geothermal can trigger small or micro-earthquakes," but that drilling activities associated with geothermal resource exploration and exploitation can do so, or be perceived as having this type of impact by local communities. The authors should examine this assumption critically, looking at available peer-reviewed science.

Section 4.2.1 Can you clarify the meaning of "social forestry mechanisms" as contrasted to community forestry? This sort of clarity will facilitate engagement by a diverse audience.

Figure 2 is not clear. Graphics should be used to effectively and concisely convey complex ideas. This figure does not do that well; it might be better to communicate the point in text.

P23(21) Footnote 17 Ibid 20 and 21 – what do the 20 and 21 refer to?

Section 5 para 2 "Indonesian conservation bureaucracy history (see Section 4.1.1 has clearly – needs a closing parenthesis

There is much of value in this paper but in its current form it is not coherent nor useful. The authors should consider a significant revision that addresses these structural and conceptual constraints, in order to make the data, findings, and arguments more accessible to the wider scholarly community.

Have questions or need assistance?

For further assistance, please visit our [Customer Support](#) site. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about EVISE® via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/5 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email.

Copyright © 2017 Elsevier B.V. | [Privacy Policy](#)

Elsevier B.V., Radarweg 29, 1043 NX Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Reg. No. 33156677.

Guy Robinson <gmrshr@gmail.com>

20 Maret 2018 18.04

Kepada: "Muhammad Alif K. Sahide" <alif.mksr@gmail.com>, EP Support <support@elsevier.com>

Dear Support,

I would be grateful if you could assist this author of a revised manuscript which they are trying to submit to Land Use Policy, but without any success.

Thanking you in anticipation.

yours sincerely,

Guy Robinson

Prof Guy M Robinson
Editor LUP

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



Muhammad Alif K. Sahide <alif.mksr@gmail.com>

Your manuscript LUP_2017_635_R1 has been sent for review

2 pesan

Land Use Policy <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

24 Maret 2018 07.41

Balas Ke: jlup@elsevier.com

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

This message was sent automatically. Please do not reply.

Reference: LUP_2017_635_R1

Title: Deadlock opportunism in contesting conservation areas in Indonesia

Journal: Land Use Policy

Dear Mr. Sahide,

I am currently identifying and contacting reviewers who are acknowledged experts in the field. Since peer review is a voluntary service it can take time to find reviewers who are both qualified and available. While reviewers are being contacted, the status of your manuscript will appear in EVISE® as 'Reviewer Invited'.

Once a reviewer agrees to review your manuscript, the status will change to 'Under Review'. When I have received the required number of expert reviews, the status will change to 'Ready for Decision' while I evaluate the reviews before making a decision on your manuscript.

To track the status of your manuscript, please log into EVISE® and go to 'My Submissions' via:

http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=LUP

Kind regards,

Land Use Policy

Have questions or need assistance?

For further assistance, please visit our [Customer Support](#) site. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about EVISE® via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/5 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email.

Copyright © 2018 Elsevier B.V. | [Privacy Policy](#)

Elsevier [B.V.](#), [Radarweg 29, 1043 NX Amsterdam, The Netherlands](#), Reg. No. 33156677.

alif <alif.mksr@gmail.com>

24 Maret 2018 13.27

Kepada: Micah Fisher <micahrf@hawaii.edu>

Dr. forests. Muhammad Alif K. Sahide
Laboratorium Kebijakan Kewirausahaan Kehutanan
Fakultas Kehutanan, Universitas Hasanuddin
Pemimpin Redaksi Jurnal Hutan dan Masyarakat (Journal of Forest and Society)
Jalan Perintis Kemerdekaan KM X,
Makassar, 90245
Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia

Begin forwarded message:

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

View Submission	LUP_2017_635	Deadlock opportunism in contesting conservation areas in Indonesia	Other Author	Jun 04, 2017	May 09, 2018	Completed - Accept	May 09, 2018	Accept
---------------------------------	--------------	--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------	--------