



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

Received revision LUP_2019_2303_R1

2 pesan

Land Use Policy <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

13 April 2020 18.04

Balas Ke: jlup@elsevier.com

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

This message was sent automatically.

Ref: LUP_2019_2303_R1

Title: Anticipating a new conservation bureaucracy? Land and power in Indonesia's Essential Ecosystem Area Policy

Journal: Land Use Policy

Dear Dr. 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.

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

13 April 2020 18.19

Kepada: jlup@elsevier.com

Dear Editor of Land Use Policy

I have made mistake by uploading the manuscript with author identity, would you please give me a chance to fix it?

Thank you very much

Bets regards,
Muhammad Alif K. Sahide

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

--

Dr. forest. Muhammad Alif K. Sahide
Editor-in-Chief, Forest and Society

Forestry Faculty, Hasanuddin University

12/24/21, 11:37 AM

Gmail - Received revision LUP_2019_2303_R1

Jalan Perintis Kemerdekaan KM X,
Makassar, 90245, Indonesia



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

Please resubmit manuscript with LUP_2019_2303_R1

1 pesan

Jaap Zevenbergen (Land Use Policy) <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

15 April 2020 19.08

Balas Ke: j.a.zevenbergen@utwente.nl

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

Ref: LUP_2019_2303_R1

Title: Anticipating a new conservation bureaucracy? Land and power in Indonesia's Essential Ecosystem Area Policy

Journal: Land Use Policy

Dear Dr. Sahide,

Thank you for sending your manuscript to Land Use Policy . Before we can proceed with the review process of your manuscript we would like to ask you to address the comments listed at the end of this letter and resubmit your manuscript.

To submit your revised manuscript:

- Log in to EVISE® at: http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jsp?JRNL_ACR=LUP
- Locate your manuscript under the header 'My Incomplete Submissions' on your 'My Author Tasks' view
- Click on 'Agree to Resubmit'
- 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.jsp?JRNL_ACR=LUP.

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

Kind regards,

Land Use Policy

Comments from the editors and reviewers:

Please upload manuscript without author identity and resubmit the manuscript back to the journal

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.



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

Received resubmission LUP_2019_2303_R1

1 pesan

Land Use Policy <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

15 April 2020 19.18

Balas Ke: jlup@elsevier.com

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

This message was sent automatically.

Ref: LUP_2019_2303_R1

Title: Anticipating a new conservation bureaucracy? Land and power in Indonesia's Essential Ecosystem Area Policy

Journal: Land Use Policy

Dear Dr. Sahide,

Thank you for resubmitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in Land Use Policy . Your resubmission 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 go to 'My Submissions'.

We appreciate your resubmitting your work 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.



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

Your manuscript LUP_2019_2303_R1 has been sent for review

1 pesan

Land Use Policy <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

24 April 2020 23.12

Balas Ke: jlup@elsevier.com

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

This message was sent automatically.

Reference: LUP_2019_2303_R1

Title: Anticipating a new conservation bureaucracy? Land and power in Indonesia's Essential Ecosystem Area Policy

Journal: Land Use Policy

Dear Dr. 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.jsp?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.



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

Reviews complete and decision pending for your manuscript LUP_2019_2303_R1

1 pesan

Land Use Policy <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

13 Mei 2020 18.52

Balas Ke: jlup@elsevier.com

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

Reference: LUP_2019_2303_R1

Title: Anticipating a new conservation bureaucracy? Land and power in Indonesia's Essential Ecosystem Area Policy

Journal: Land Use Policy

Dear Dr. Sahide,

I am pleased to inform you that I have received all the required reviews, which I will now evaluate before making a decision on your manuscript referenced above.

In the event that I need to seek the opinion of an additional reviewer, you may see the status of your manuscript revert briefly from 'Ready for Decision' to 'Under Review'.

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 go to 'My Submissions'.

I will inform you once I have made a decision.

Thank you again for submitting your manuscript to Land Use Policy and for giving me the opportunity to consider your work.

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' comments

Thank you very much for this review that allowed us to significantly improve our paper. We have addressed the different points in the table below.

Response to Reviewer 1

1	Thank you for an interesting and well written manuscript. I have a number of suggestions for 'moderate' revisions.	Thank you very much for your insights, which allowed us to significantly improve our paper. We have substantially revised the manuscript accordingly and feel that the message is much clearer.
2	In the introduction, the first sentences are very general, and I'm not sure if it is referring to Indonesia in general or globally. If it is global, I'm not sure that the assertions hold. I would suggest adding in a little bit of context here.	We recognize this may have been a bit confusing. In this paper we are interested in engaging with a wider audience and so have initiated the discussion in more general, global terms. We hope that our edits throughout the introduction now provide a better context for situating the global issues prior to transitioning to the more specific case that we examine in Indonesia. We have also added context to make sure the assertions hold together better.
3	Again in the introduction, the final sentence of paragraph two "In other words..." doesn't really accurately reflect or sum up what is written in the rest of the paragraph. Consider revising or eliminating this sentence.	We have edited this sentence to be more complementary with the rest of the paragraph rather than as a summary of the paragraph.
4	In the methods section, you note that three methods were used. You describe methods two and three and provide appropriate references. Method one, which includes the statement "...by examining key elements from classical models..." has very little description and no references for the author to refer to. My main questions are: 1. Which classical models have you considered/used and why? and 2. What key elements of these classical models have you examined and why? Appropriate references should also be provided.	We see where this confusion may have arisen. That is why we have now referenced which sections the methods correspond too. To be clear, we do this in two parts of the paper. The first is at the end of the introduction, and the second is explicitly delineating the methods we applied for each section. On the specific issue you raise, we do not list the references here because they are too numerous. Rather, we reference section three which is a detailed examination of this body of research.

5	Again in the methods section, in the final paragraph, there is the phrase "...facilitate a multistakeholder dialogue on initiating multistakeholder forum..." which seems to be missing something for it to make sense.	We have edited this accordingly. Thanks for pointing this out.
6	At the end of the first paragraph in section 3.2 you have written "...the institutional mechanism were unclear on how to implement them." This may be simply a language issue, but my understanding of the paragraph is that the institutional mechanisms prevented the implementation. Please clarify.	Apologies for this confusion. We have edited the language. We were pointing out a case where a company wanted to do conservation but met with challenges because of the regulatory conditions. We hope the current language now reflects this point about the regulatory environment. We do not feel the need to explore the case in detail as it is just making a point about the regulatory situation and we have cited research that addresses the issue in detail.
7	I may not be clear on the way that MethodsX are linked to/incorporated into an article. My impression from what I could find online is that the MethodsX is a separate article that is linked to this article, and is not incorporated into this one. If that is the case (I have asked the editor for clarification), I feel that section five needs to have your discussion reference back to the MethodsX article; as it is written, section 5 is a good summary, but there should be direct links to your new framework.	This recommendation was especially helpful for us to move forward. We will still pursue the co-submission option of the framework and the empirical article. We have addressed the issue of section 4 by introducing a summary of the framework. We describe how power dynamics shapes the framework and further articulate the way that land dimensions are critical for our findings in section 5.
8	A few minor points - Check the spelling throughout - two examples - the first reference in the introduction should be Sahide, Fisher et al., and in 5.2.2 it should be PT Vale, not PT Value. Overall the language is good, however there are some instances where there is a mismatch between plural/singular or other small language nuances.	Thank you for careful observations. We have fixed the PT Vale name. We have also conducted a major effort at editing the content of the paper throughout.
9	Finally, I found that the figures, when printed in black and white were quite difficult to interpret as the lines and shadings used are all very similar.	We have fixed Figure 1 and Figure 2, following the reviewer's suggestion.

Response to Reviewer 2

1	<p>The authors present a novel analytical frame to evaluate the early/ongoing implementation of a new Indonesian policy, the Essential Ecosystem Area (EEA), which aims to expand conservation status to areas outside of typical conservation areas. This paper provides valuable insights into how a state institution that has been structured for traditional protected area management can adapt its structural practices to meet the demand of polycentric governance of lands owned and used by different actor groups, and to be able to balance the different demands and power relations amongst these groups.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for this very helpful review that allowed us to significantly improve our paper. We have addressed the comments as best we could and have included an explanation for our edits below.</p> <p>We also see some fundamental understanding from the way we initially wrote the paper. In your comment you note how the state “can adapt its structural practices.” We have been much more careful to highlight the dimensions of power, whereas the impetus for voluntary conservation mechanisms have been bought into by the state. We thus highlight how the bureaucratic power elements contest this potentially transformative policy instrument. We also show how in these early cases the major push by the rigid conservation bureaucracy to contest and reinterpret its outcomes.</p>
2	<p>Aside from focus on the state’s conservation bureaucracy, ultimately it is unclear what the implications of this policy in terms of reinforcing state-corporate power structures in these potentially diverse landscapes and what might be the effect of EEA on possibly large swaths of land area in Indonesia, particularly on non-state and non-corporate land owners. The EEA is adapted from private voluntary HCV processes to pursue conservation goals – but given that much of this will take place outside of both state and private lands, and in local farming and customary lands – it would be remiss that the authors do not consider more fully the implications of whose voices and participation are excluded from this process</p>	<p>This is an important consideration. At the moment this paper only addresses the formal bureaucratic contestations of power. Indeed EEAs are only taking place on a very land area, but the implications for bureaucratic change could potentially significant. We also agree that the importance of local stakeholders that only get limited voice with state bureaucracies are a critical justice frame that must be followed up in future research. Right now this is a bureaucratic contestation that is seeking to incorporate new mechanisms that could transform management systems. We also highlight how the EEA is tied to efforts that can incorporate mechanisms for upward/downward accountability that could incorporate local constituents and smallholders. If you also look in the heuristic framework we make a clear case for considerations with respect to smallholders and commons lands.</p>

3	<p>Given that this is research of a new policy in its implementation process, critical reflections of what these policies are missing in terms of its goals and targets would be useful. And indeed, of where/how the authors see as key opportunities for policy reflexivity.</p>	<p>We took a great deal of care in considering this comment based on our research. Unfortunately, the two cases point to maintaining the status quo and do not really present any material that suggests new terms are being set. Indeed the big finding in this early cases - which suggest a promising new approach to conservation policy - are really just a return to the old way of doing things.</p>
<p>Specific comments:</p>		
4	<p>Abstract: “We apply the framework to two emerging cases in Sulawesi Selatan to examine whether Essential Ecosystem Area policy <i>anticipates a new future of conservation management or remains tied to existing rigid bureaucratic structures</i>. Findings from the two cases, point to the latter”. Can policy anticipate – or perhaps better to rephrase as what the authors anticipate of the policy outcomes.</p>	<p>Thank you for identifying this editorial fix. We have changed the language to clarify what we are anticipating.</p>
5	<p>Introduction: “Although a global movement since the 1980s has started the acknowledgement of, and role for communities in natural resource management and conservation (Brosius et al., 1998), <i>the legacy of strictly bounded and controlled conservation areas denying access remain a central feature of policy</i> (Peluso, 1993)”. This statement is rather strong. There are many classifications of protected areas globally with varying governance structures: ranging from strict protection to protected land/seascapes where human-nature interactions are integral, to protected areas with sustainable use which emphasizes cultural knowledge and traditional governance (see the IUCN categories of protected areas). If you are only referring to the case of Indonesia, then you need to specify this explicitly and provide additional references that this is indeed the only system at play in the country.</p>	<p>At the beginning of the article, we would like to engage the EEA in the context of global discourses on conservation and the role of people in conservation areas. We have included more citations, and clarified this sentence, to incorporate the breadth of conservation models that the reviewer suggests.</p>
6	<p>Introduction: “On the one hand the policy does not challenge conservation areas on the rights of other institutions and communities to take part in the management plans because the proposed areas are located outside conservation areas.” This sentence is confusing and could be rephrased for clarity.</p>	<p>Fixed.</p>

7	<p>The term “conservation bureaucracy” is used liberally throughout the paper without a proper definition – does this refer to a specific institution or department within the Ministry, or to administrative systems and structures, or to a set of discursive practices. Similarly, the authors could also better define of what is meant by terms like “classical areas of conservation bureaucracy”, “classical models”, “classical framing of power”, etc.</p>	<p>We do not intend to use the term liberally. The conservation bureaucracy in this paper refers to a specific agency and its mandate. We have clarified this in a footnote.</p>
8	<p>Introduction: “...although we cannot yet trace direct empirical outcomes from the policy measures taking place, we believed it important to produce timely, yet robust research on emerging policy situation”. The authors should better elaborate on this claim of importance; why, and to whom, is this work important? How can it support better policy design or policy reflexivity?</p>	<p>We have been very explicit in several sections of this paper on the anticipatory dimensions of the research. We have asked the question about how we study things that are unfolding in real time and how our research can be published as these important considerations are unfolding. We also believe that the who benefits question is apparent throughout our work and we have tried to make this more explicit throughout. This work is important for international policies claiming lofty ideals about how new conservation policies can succeed in establishing more collaborative and deliberative approaches for people and forests. We also show empirical evidence about how this cooptation of power in the status quo is maintained.</p>
9	<p>Introduction: “The lead author had the opportunity to facilitate a <i>multistakeholder</i> dialogue on initiating <i>multistakeholder</i> forum on EEA at the karst ecosystem in Maros and Pangkep Districts of Sulawesi Selatan Province on October 25, 2019”. Avoid use of multistakeholder twice in one sentence. Description of the second case study in following sentence needs to provide equivalent details of sites, dates, etc.</p>	<p>Ok thank you for pointing this out. We have address the multi multi stakeholder issue throughout</p>
10	<p>Section 3.1: “Although over the years <i>several initiatives have sought to challenge the conservation law</i>, its policies remains a longstanding legal construct that is still in effect.” Unclear what are these initiatives, who leads these initiatives and what aspects of the conservation law were being opposed.</p>	<p>We have added citations and context here. There are many initiatives mostly known under the heading of social forestry. Those are the ones that particularly challenges state forest land for access for local smallholders and community land. However there are also large cases that we have referenced in the citations such as challenges to</p>

		conservation zones from geothermal power plants (Sahide et al., 2018)
11	Sections 3.1 - 3.3: In the discussions of, and comparison between “classical bureaucracy” and “EEA – voluntary initiatives”, the limitations and problems of the classical bureaucracy is prevalent but what is missing is an evaluation of the limits of the voluntary initiatives. Whose interests do the voluntary initiatives serve? Likely corporate interests first and global conservation benefits secondary. What are its limitations – who monitors and who is held accountable when the voluntary initiatives fail? Given that corporations in Indonesia were often issued large-scale concessions that were perhaps equally as contested as protected areas, it would be remiss not to highlight these within the context of what can rationally expected of EEA.	This is a valid point and forms the broader context of our research, which we have explained in a previous comment and also sought to further clarify in the text of the paper. Indeed what we see in the second case PT Vale is that the private interest used the rigid conservation regulations to be able to keep a hold on information and forego the anticipated interests of multi-stakeholder interests to take part. Overall, we are inline with this comment and indeed wanted to point out that with this research we wanted to identify whether new mechanisms for new interest groups to take part (and in what forms) was what we set out to identify.
12	Section 4: It would be useful to add a paragraph introducing the framework in addition to having the entire MethodsX paper as an appendix	This was an excellent suggestion that addressed one area that we felt was disjointed about the co-submission approach. Thank you! We have introduced several paragraphs that now make an explicit connection between our approach and our findings. We have also added the full text of the MethodsX paper as an appendix.
13	Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2: It appears that the discussion in these sections do not talk so much on power relations, but rather on administrative jurisdictions	Yes, this paper is focused on bureaucratic power - namely how the interests of key actors interpret their mandate and how that is then applied in the mechanics of the regulations. We believe that these power contestations are a precursor for understanding future research on downscaling the power relations that take a closer look at the implications that affect communities (and species).

14	Section 5.1.3: “Indeed the interests remain trained on achieving fulfilling <i>technocratic requirements</i> than responsive multi stakeholder processes geared towards fulfilling targets.” It appears to be more administrative than technocratic – if it was technocratic, I would expect the focus on details such as indicators and monitoring, technical mapping, etc., which are all rather weak. But what indeed were the targets? Were there any goals for achieving social targets? What were the expectations of, and state precedence for a truly polycentric governance mechanism?	Indeed we sought out to answer these questions. The maps are of yet unavailable and the process is proceeding as one that lacks meaningful participation. We were fortunate that two of the authors among us participated in the deliberations for the regulatory process. Indeed we show that we did not see evidence of “truly polycentric governance mechanisms.”
15	The authors need to careful with use of many acronyms without proper spelling out of what this means, eg. SRAK, BKSDA, CCB, MSA ...	We have made a proper spelling for SRAK (page), BKSDA (page 8), CCB
16	Section 5.2.1: ”...including habitats for several endemic and threatened species <i>the Maleo and Anoa</i> ...” What are these? Useful to either provide common or scientific names for the fauna/flora.	Yes, we have added the latin names. <i>Macrocephalon maleo</i> for Maleo and Anoa for <i>Bubalus quarlessi</i>
17	Footnote 6 should be inserted much earlier in the paper with first mention of HCV and Areal Konservasi Bernilai Tinggi	Yes, we have inserted this Footnote earlier in Section 3.2
18	Section 5.2.3: “...The fact that the <i>EEA process is unfolding on private lands with a high degree of autonomy to the land manager</i> in this case has reduced the incentive to engage in more collaborative stakeholder forums that involve different actors.” But isn’t this also the model with voluntary HCV initiatives? Where those results are often vetted by FSC or RSPO for certification – what is the incentive for the land manager to engage? And who vets the results here?	We believe that the point being made here reinforces the broader conclusions that we are getting in this paper. Though we cannot speak for other sites, this is clearly the conclusion based on the two sites. We have added an additional finding in the conclusion (at the very end) further suggesting at the broader trends that are being made in this comment. However, we do not want to make generalizations with other sites as those contestations are still yet inchoate.



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

Revision requested for LUP_2019_2303_R1

1 pesan

Jaap Zevenbergen <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

17 Mei 2020 21.55

Balas Ke: j.a.zevenbergen@utwente.nl

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

Ref: LUP_2019_2303_R1

Title: Anticipating a new conservation bureaucracy? Land and power in Indonesia's Essential Ecosystem Area Policy

Journal: Land Use Policy

Dear Dr. Sahide,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Land Use Policy . I have received comments from reviewers on your manuscript. Your paper should become acceptable for publication pending suitable minor revision and modification of the article in light of the appended reviewer comments.

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.jsp?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.jsp?JRNL_ACR=LUP.

Enrich your article to present your research with maximum impact. This journal supports the following [Content Innovations](#):

Data in Brief (optional):

We invite you to convert your supplementary data (or a part of it) into an additional journal publication in Data in Brief, a multi-disciplinary open access journal. Data in Brief articles are a fantastic way to describe supplementary data and associated metadata, or full raw datasets deposited in an external repository, which are otherwise unnoticed. A Data in Brief article (which will be reviewed, formatted, indexed, and given a DOI) will make your data easier to find, reproduce, and cite.

You can submit to Data in Brief via the Land Use Policy submission system when you upload your revised Land Use Policy manuscript. To do so, complete the template and follow the co-submission instructions found here:

www.elsevier.com/dib-template. If your Land Use Policy manuscript is accepted, your Data in Brief submission will automatically be transferred to Data in Brief for editorial review and publication.

Please note: an open access Article Publication Charge (APC) is payable by the author or research funder to cover the costs associated with publication in Data in Brief and ensure your data article is immediately and permanently free to access by all. For the current APC see: <https://www.elsevier.com/journals/data-in-brief/2352-3409/open-access-journal>

Please contact the Data in Brief editorial office at dib-me@elsevier.com or visit the Data in Brief homepage (www.journals.elsevier.com/data-in-brief/) if you have questions or need further information.

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

Kind regards,

Professor. Zevenbergen
Editor
Land Use Policy

Comments from the editors and reviewers:

-Reviewer 1

- Thank you for your comprehensive revisions. I have only two minor comments.

There is one reference that needs some attention.

I also think that the section referring to the MethodsX article (and where it says insert the MethodsX article) needs some work. I have suggested that you work in some of the key messages from the MethodsX article, appropriately referenced. I think that this would make the manuscript flow better. (Particularly as the MethodsX article is a standalone article). I apologise for any confusion around this section.

-Reviewer 2

-

The authors have well considered the previous comments and have made substantive revisions to address them. This is appreciated and the paper is stronger. There are a few incomplete citations and minor grammatical issues that can be easily addressed in proof-reading.

I agree that the paper has value as early analysis on a policy process that is unfolding in real time, and the authors are perhaps rightfully cautious in drawing generalized conclusions in this regard. However, this has also taken away some of the impact of this paper could have to inform the policy process. The authors indicate in their response that "this work is important for international policies claiming lofty ideals about how new conservation policies can succeed in establishing more collaborative and deliberative approaches for people and forests". As such, the authors could briefly discuss the elements that are missing from their review of the 2 cases that could enable these collaborative and deliberative approaches and contemplate what might be needed in a revised future EEA policy that would support such transformative practices in the conclusion section.

MethodsX (optional)

We invite you to submit a method article alongside your research article. This is an opportunity to get full credit for the time and money you have spent on developing research methods, and to increase the visibility and impact of your work.

If your research article is accepted, your method article will be automatically transferred over to the open access journal, MethodsX, where it will be editorially reviewed and published as a separate method article upon acceptance. Both articles will be linked on ScienceDirect.

Please use the MethodsX template available here when preparing your article: <https://www.elsevier.com/MethodsX-template>. Open access fees apply.

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.

One or more files have been made available to you as part of this decision. You can access them by clicking on the link(s) below.

[Reviewed Manuscript.pdf](#)

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

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

View Submission Author Response View Attachments Send E-mail	LUP_2019_2303	Conservation District West Papua Province Anticipating a new conservation bureaucracy? Land and power in Indonesia's Essential Ecosystem Area Policy	Corresponding Author	Dec 22, 2019	May 22, 2020	Completed - Accept	May 22, 2020	Accept
---	---------------	--	----------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------	--------