



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

Revision Requested - FORPOL_2019_366 for Forest Policy and Economics

2 pesan

Forest Policy and Economics <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

7 Mei 2020 12.25

Balas Ke: sarah.burns@forst.uni-goettingen.de

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

This message was sent automatically.

Ref: FORPOL_2019_366

Title: The boom of social forestry policy and the bust of social forests in Indonesia: A power heuristic for assessing implementation outcomes

Journal: Forest Policy and Economics

Dear Dr. Sahide,

On 27/Feb/2020 I sent the above-referenced request for your manuscript, and would kindly like to remind you to respond to this request by 06/Jun/2020.

To view the request, log into EVISE® at: http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=FORPOL and click on the title of your manuscript, located under 'My Author Tasks' on your homepage. Complete the required steps and submit the manuscript.

What happens next?

After you submit your manuscript you will receive an email confirmation that your submission is complete. To track the status of your manuscript throughout the editorial process, log into EVISE® at: http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=FORPOL and locate your submission under the header 'My Submissions with Journal' on your 'My Author Tasks' view.

Kind regards,

Forest Policy and Economics

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.

Forest Policy and Economics <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

7 Mei 2020 13.04

Balas Ke: sarah.burns@forst.uni-goettingen.de

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



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

Revision requested for FORPOL_2019_366

1 pesan

Lukas Giessen (Forest Policy and Economics) <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

28 Februari 2020 04.30

Balas Ke: lgiesse@uni-goettingen.de

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

Ref: FORPOL_2019_366

Title: The boom of social forestry policy and the bust of social forests in Indonesia: A power heuristic for assessing implementation outcomes

Journal: Forest Policy and Economics

Dear Dr. Sahide,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Forest Policy and Economics. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below. The editorial board recommend reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all 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=FORPOL
- 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=FORPOL.

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 Forest Policy and Economics submission system when you upload your revised Forest Policy and Economics manuscript. To do so, complete the template and follow the co-submission instructions found here: www.elsevier.com/dib-template. If your Forest Policy and Economics 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,

Dr. Giessen
Editor-in-Chief
Forest Policy and Economics

Comments from the editors and reviewers:

-Editor

- please revised manuscript based on reviewers comments, especially for definition of key words, reference, introduction, methods, analysis and discussion, etc.

-Reviewer 1

-

This manuscript examines the determines of success in social forestry policies in Indonesia though there is no definition of "success" in social forestry. Clearer definition is needed.

The authors argue that external actors and advisers are surprised by the results from implementation and unintended consequences. This needs references and explanations of what the unintended and intended consequences are.

My main concern is that I cannot understand what analysis the authors did. In other words, it is not clear how the results are obtained from the analysis. The considerations stated in table 3 might be known as conditions for successful forest management. In addition, it is difficult to understand how the results link to case studies and the authors' experience. Clear what the authors' experiences are.

Section 3. The theory of access (Ribot and Peluso, 2003) seems not related to the analysis in this manuscript. This section should be removed or needs more explanation of how it links methods of the manuscript. Otherwise, I hardly believe that section 3 is meaningful.

In section 4.2, the authors explain that they conducted field observation in some sites, however, it is not clear why these sites are selected and I am concerned that these sample sites may suffer from the problem of lack of representativeness in social forestry policy in Indonesia. In addition, the authors mentioned that this research is based on participant observation. I cannot find the results of observation or explanation of what the participant observation is.

In result section, state only the results obtained from the analysis. For example, in 5.2, the authors introduce some examples. I do not imagine that these introductions come from the authors' analysis.

Page 2, line 10. Maryudi et al. may be Maryudi et al. (2012)?

Insert tables in places right after statements.

-Reviewer 2

- Please find my comments--general and specific--attached.

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.

[FORPOL_2019_366_Comments.pdf](#)

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

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

Response to the reviewers/editor's 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 Editor's comments

1	please revised manuscript based on reviewers comments, especially for definition of key words, reference, introduction, methods, analysis and discussion, etc.	Thank you very much for this review that allowed us to significantly improve our paper.
---	--	---

Response to Reviewer 1

1	This manuscript examines the determines of success in social forestry policies in Indonesia though there is no definition of "success" in social forestry. Clearer definition is needed.	Thank you very much for this review that allowed us to significantly improve our paper.
2	The authors argue that external actors and advisers are surprised by the results from implementation and unintended consequences. This needs references and explanations of what the unintended and intended consequences are.	We have add footnote.....
3	My main concern is that I cannot understand what analysis the authors did. In other words, it is not clear how the results are obtained from the analysis. The considerations stated in table 3 might be known as conditions for successful forest management. In addition, it is difficult to understand how the results link to case studies and the authors' experience. Clear what the authors' experiences are.	We have revise the paragraph into "... Or Thanks, we removed it
4	Section 3. The theory of access (Ribot and Peluso, 2003) seems not related to the analysis in this manuscript. This section should be removed or needs more explanation of how it links methods of the manuscript. Otherwise, I hardly believe that section 3 is meaningful.	
5	In section 4.2, the authors explain that they conducted field observation in some sites, however, it is not clear why these sites are selected and I am concerned that these sample sites may suffer from the problem of lack of representativeness in social forestry policy in Indonesia. In addition, the authors mentioned that this research is based on participant observation. I cannot find the results of observation or explanation of what the participant observation is.	
6	In result section, state only the results obtained from the analysis. For example, in 5.2, the authors introduce some examples. I do not imagine that these introductions come from the authors' analysis.	Yes, the Institution mechanisms prevent the implementation
7	Page 2, line 10. Maryudi et al. may be Maryudi et al. (2012)?	
8	Insert tables in places right after statements.	

Response to Reviewer 2

1	<p>Overall notes:</p> <p>I think that this piece has several strong contributions to make, after it is significantly revised for resubmission. First, it provides empirical examples of how social forestry has been, and is being, implemented. Most of the literature on Indonesian Social Forestry lacks empirical evidence. This is the strongest contribution this manuscript can make. Second, the heuristic it uses to examine Social Forestry in Indonesia has promise, though it is not yet sufficiently explained or operationalized. Considering who implements Social Forestry and how is crucial to understanding when and where projects occur and with what outcomes. Drawing attention to access, exclusion, and influence is important for assessing the shift from policy to implementation. Clarifying the heuristic, ensuring that cases clearly indicate how they are drawing on it, and providing a succinct summary table will strengthen this manuscript.</p> <p>Please find my more specific comments, below. All the best.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for this review, that allowed us to significantly improve our paper.</p>
2	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Typo: “As a result of such policy, initiatives, governments around the work” - “We believe our resultant heuristic not only functions as a strategic framework for researchers to assess the various stages and implementation considerations of social forestry, but also provides a handy tool for external actors to approach implementation.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Better: “Our analytical method functions as a strategic framework for assessing the implementation of social forestry as well as a tool practitioners may use to implement social forestry.” 	
3	<p>Highlights: Grammatical issues</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>	
5	<p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “As policy ideal has moved to various applications in the form of social forestry permits, research has begun to make sense of its effects, examining more closely the extent to 	

	<p>which social forestry fulfill its stated goals (Maryudi et al., 2012; Fisher et al., 2017; 2019)”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This sentence is grammatically problematic, and it is too awkward. ○ Better: “Recent research examines the extent to which Indonesian social forestry policy is fulfilling its stated goals.” 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “In short, amidst the boom of policies supporting social forestry designation, we aim to provide ways a method for assessing whether policy implementation has succeeded, or whether they go bust.” ○ I like this sentence. It’s clear and catchy. 	
6	<p>2. The rise of Indonesian social forestry policy and current policy approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Social forestry policy in Indonesia has historically been promoted, supported, and implemented by external actors (Maryudi, 2011).” ○ Actors external to what? Are you suggesting that local and indigenous people are external actors? If so, this is problematic. Please rephrase for clarity. ○ This term is clarified in the “Method” section. However, it is too unclear to use without clarification from the beginning. Either rephrase this sentence or clarity or provide the definition of external actors from the beginning and repeat it in section four. 	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “As social forestry policy became entree to the many policy interests listed above, implementation mechanisms emerged involving various institutions.” ○ Better: “As social forestry policy increases in scale and scope, many different administrations, organizations, and individuals become responsible for its implementation.” 	This is refer to the administration system re
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problems with Table 1 ○ Formatting ○ Table 1. Boom Social Forestry (SF) policy: comparison before and after Jokowi era on printing SF permits² <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Printing permits is a strange choice of words ○ Footnotes contain grammatical problems 	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For “Table 2. Bureaucratic schemes of several social forestry in Indonesia” ○ Please list the individual regulations from which the information on “Before MOEF 83 of 2016” comes. 	
10	<p>3. Land and power: Access, exclusion, and influence “The paradigm shift on the role of local actors in the management of natural resources”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of the words “paradigm shift” are problematic. Substitute “Growing recognition of the important role local actors play in the management of natural 	

	<p>resources.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explanation: The existence of more rights-based development policies is not sufficient to justify the claim of a “paradigm shift” regarding the role of local actors in natural ○ resource management. Most of the world’s forests—much less land—remains controlled by the state, without any attempt to include local or indigenous people. Indeed, even in Indonesia, moving the needle from 2% to 10% of the Kawasan Hutan to be managed or co-managed by user-groups represents a major change, but it still falls short of a paradigm shift. ○ This may seem pedantic, but a significant number of studies examine policy change for evidence of paradigm shift. — “Therefore, as we build our framework in the ensuing sections, such theories provide the precursors for generating a heuristic across the stages of social forestry policy formulation and through the stages of application.” ○ Delete 	
11	<p>4. Method</p> <p>4.1. Methods of developing the heuristic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In developing a heuristic We have chosen to incorporate three considerations based on the theoretical framing of land and power to develop a heuristic to understand the implementation of Social Forestry above. - I find the notion of “external actors” playing an outsized role in Indonesian Social Forestry to be true not just of Indonesian Social Forestry, but of forest resource management in general, within and outside of Indonesia. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This might not be problematic for the heuristic, but it at least needs to be addressed, since the text seems to frames this involvement of “external actors” as novel to Social Forestry. ○ Literature that examines the technocratic and professionalized nature of forest management would be good to highlight briefly as evidence of this point. A recent starting point (as there are countless examples) is : Lund, J.F., 2015. Paradoxes of participation: The logic of professionalization in participatory forestry. For. Policy Econ. 60, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2015.07.009 ○ That said, is there anything about Indonesian Social Forestry that draws external actors in, more than other forms of forest management or even participatory/communityforest management in other 	

	contexts?	
12	- I think that deleting “external” might help. I keep getting caught-up on that word. Actors may not even be external! Think of social forestry liaisons and extension agents—they aren’t always external.	
13	4.2. Methods of selecting the case - General comment on this section: o Section 4.2 seems a bit disjointed and undeveloped. I suggest reorganizing like so: ▪ Move the second paragraph to the first, describing where case study locations are and why, based on their relevance to different stages of Social Forestry implementation ▪ Streamline the other paragraph, focusing it on how participant observation was carried out in the field. Use the citation from Evera (1997) to substantiate this. Perhaps provide more information on authorial involvement (difficult in a peer review process, I know, but keeping information anonymous should be sufficient).	
14	- “Development of the heuristic is based on in depth discussion among the various authors about the key inflection points of SF implementation. Each of the authors also carried out field observations at social forestry sites from across Indonesia, with in depth engagement on sites in Sulawesi, Java, and Kalimantan, which guided the considerations that led to the sequencing and content of our heuristic.” o Delete this. You mention authorial involvement below, which is important and valuable. However, this text reads as anecdotal.	
15	- “[Case] research is based on participant observation, policy analysis, and active involvement in SF policy and implementation across Indonesia. By participant observation, we mean that the authors were actively involved with external actor interventions, as either facilitators, or at the very least as observing facilitations of SF development and implementation in Indonesia.”	We have made a proper spelling for SRAK (page), BKSDA (page 8), CCB
16	- “for our analysis of the initial stage we selected the overall national experiences of HTR.” o I will admit to being doubtful at the asymmetry between choosing a “national experience” as a case, and two specific case studies.	
17	- “Observations based on Van Evera (1997) also helped guide us on the application of our research, drawing from critical theories but taking them to the field, making observations to generate data without imposing external stimulus on	

	<p>the situation. We thereafter questioned whether observations were compatible with our heuristic.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reincorporate this into a paragraph that defines, specifically, how this occurred. 	
18	<p>5. Results</p> <p>5.1. Proposing a “boom-bust” framework: A heuristic power assessment for delivering policy commitments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I don’t think the heuristic should be titled a “boom-bust” framework. Rather, it captures the process of moving from policy to implementation. Perhaps there is evidence of a boom-bust phenomenon, but the heuristic itself goes beyond that. It should be able to organize knowledge of social forestry implementation beyond a “boom-bust” example, no? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am again fixating on this idea of “external actors.” Is this heuristic only for those seeking to implement social forestry from outside, or can it be used by local actors (despite the fact that this is not often the case)? I tend to think this heuristic is instructive beyond external actors, and would suggest (again) deleting “external.” 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As provided, I don’t think Table 3 works for this heuristic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The different elements of the heuristic need to be explained. As a reader I wonder: why are they important? What are the citations that provide evidence for this importance? How are these elements reflected in other studies? ○ A table that summarizes the heuristic would be helpful. Perhaps consider including the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Code, Considerations, Risks and Opportunities ▪ In Considerations, keep the titles of the current “Intervention Considerations by External Actors” ▪ In “Risks and opportunities,” highlight, in general, the “implementation risks and corollary opportunities” represented by this consideration. 	
	<p>5.2 Contested power in the context of external actor interventions: Examples from each heuristic level</p> <p>5.2.1. Initial stage example: Rushing Community Forest Plantations (HTR) trials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think this would be a much more powerful case if there was one, site-specific example being analyzed. - The third paragraph is important, but it contains too much generality for a publishable “case.” Please substantiate the claims with research evidence or ground them in a specific example. 	

	<p>5.2.2. Formal hand over example: Emulating bureaucratic requirements and unintended effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “As of 2018, none of the sites never received management rights.” - You may want to read this quick but well-written source on the importance of cadastral systems for forest monitoring, in general <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Gaveau, D.L.A., Pirard, R., Salim, M.A., Tonoto, P., Yaen, H., Parks, S.A., Carmenta, R., Mcelwee, P., 2017. Overlapping Land Claims Limit the Use of Satellites to Monitor No- Deforestation Commitments and No-Burning Compliance 10, 257–264. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12256 	
	<p>5.2.3 Implementation example: Success to what ends?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a great deal of interesting, important information in this section, but it doesn’t tie back to the heuristic. Or, if it does incorporate important elements of the heuristic, it was not clear to me how they helped interpret this case. 	
	<p>6. Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Finally, we also consider that each stage has its own unique power contestations. External actors tend to think of social forestry as a distinct and singular category within various permitting options. In this paper we have shown that they emerge in very different ways across various different phases of an intervention. Rather than lumping all SF cases into the same category external actors need to beware of the power elements that emerge in distinct ways across these phases, and the corresponding capacity required to influence outcomes and avoid unintended consequences.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This is a very good point 	
	<p>The boom in Indonesian social forestry has generated a related boom in scholarship on Indonesian forestry. The revision of this article should discuss and contain the following citations, most of which are recent contributions:</p> <p>Suharjito, D., Wulandari, C., 2019. A reflection of Social Forestry in 2019: Towards inclusive and collaborative government approaches. For. Soc. 3, 137. https://doi.org/10.24259/fs.v3i1.6099</p>	

	<p>Galudra, G., 2019. Focusing on facilitation: Issues and challenges of capacity development in Indonesia's social forestry reforms. <i>For. Soc.</i> 3, 133. https://doi.org/10.24259/fs.v3i1.5995</p> <p>Peluso, N.L., Poffenberger, M., 1989. Social Forestry in Java: Reorienting Management Systems. <i>Hum. Organ.</i> 48, 333–344. https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.48.4.a4r82227p5065638</p> <p>Erbaugh, J.T., 2019. Responsibilization and Social Forestry in Indonesia Author: <i>For. Policy Econ.</i> 109, 102019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.102019</p> <p>Resosudarmo, I.A.P., Tacconi, L., Sloan, S., Hamdani, F.A.U., Subarudi, Alviya, I., Muttaqin, M.Z., 2019. Indonesia's land reform: Implications for local livelihoods and climate change. <i>For. Policy Econ.</i> 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.04.007</p> <p>Race, D., Suka, A.P., Irawanti, S., Surati, Oktalina, S.N., Bisjoe, A.R.H., Muin, N., Purwanti, R., Sumirat, B., 2019. Smallholder forestry: the role of commercial forestry in rural livelihoods in Indonesia. <i>Int. For. Rev.</i> 21, 225–237. https://doi.org/10.1505/146554819826606568</p> <p>In particular, Galudra (2019) and Erbaugh (2019) discuss issues with the implementation of Indonesian social forestry.</p>	
--	--	--

Response to the reviewers/editor's comments

Thank you very much for these excellent reviews. We are delighted that both reviewers saw the merits of the paper and encouraged us to be more ambitious in our scope. We have heartily taken on this challenge. Our responses are therefore contextualized with two broader points. The first is that we have significantly deepened our engagement on the access-exclusion framework. We feel this is a major improvement of the paper and we believe could provide a significant contribution to theories of access and exclusion. This is particularly timely as a recent revisit/review of a theory of access has pointed out the shortcomings of deeply engaging with the theories and applying it as a rigorous framework. We feel the current version of this paper meets this challenge. The second major challenge that we have taken very seriously by commentary from the reviewers was to go into more depth in applying the framework to the case studies. We have therefore improved our paper both methodologically and were much more systematic in showing how the framework relates to the case studies. The only shortcoming on significantly expanding on these two aspects is that the paper has also gotten longer. However, we believe that based on the reviewer comments the length is adequate for what it delivers in content.

1	Please revise the manuscript based on reviewers comments, especially for definition of key words, reference, introduction, methods, analysis and discussion, etc.	Thank you very much for this review that allowed us to significantly improve our paper.
---	---	---

Response to Reviewer 1

1	This manuscript examines the determination of success in social forestry policies in Indonesia though there is no definition of “success” in social forestry. Clearer definition is needed.	Thank you for this comment. We have clarified this point throughout the paper, engaging with the normative elements of success in social forestry, and going into more depth in the literature review about what consists of success in social forestry.
2	The authors argue that external actors and advisers are surprised by the results from implementation and unintended consequences. This needs references and explanations of what the unintended and intended consequences are.	We have also significantly addressed and reworked this point, clarifying in much more detail the references and the outcomes of social forestry implementation to date, foregrounding theories from Indonesia, Southeast Asia, and around the world.
3	My main concern is that I cannot understand what analysis the authors did. In other words, it is not clear how the results are obtained from the analysis. The considerations stated in table 3 might be known as conditions for successful forest management. In addition, it is difficult to understand how the results link to case studies	See header explanation above. This is a great comment by the reviewer and it has provided us the motivation to conduct a much more detailed and rigorous study, which is detailed in the current version. Table 3 has especially undergone restructuring, incorporating

	and the authors' experience. Clear what the authors' experiences are.	two distinct columns of access and exclusion.
4	Section 3. The theory of access (Ribot and Peluso, 2003) seems not related to the analysis in this manuscript. This section should be removed or needs more explanation of how it links methods of the manuscript. Otherwise, I hardly believe that section 3 is meaningful.	Theory of access is fundamental to this research as we hope we have now been able to convincingly show.
5	In section 4.2, the authors explain that they conducted field observation in some sites, however, it is not clear why these sites are selected and I am concerned that these sample sites may suffer from the problem of lack of representativeness in social forestry policy in Indonesia. In addition, the authors mentioned that this research is based on participant observation. I cannot find the results of observation or explanation of what the participant observation is.	Indeed any case study suffers from the issue of representation and generalizability. Nevertheless, we have taken on this challenge to be more specific on our selection of sites. We have also selected new sites for this paper, and highlighted we selected the sites that we did. In addition, we also show that the authors triangulated findings with cases in Papua, Kalimantan and Java, due to our research team's breadth of experience across numerous social forestry sites in Indonesia
6	In result section, state only the results obtained from the analysis. For example, in 5.2, the authors introduce some examples. I do not imagine that these introductions come from the authors' analysis.	This was an important question for the previous version. It has also helped us to redraft a significantly improved draft and we believe that this comment is now thoroughly addressed.
7	Page 2, line 10. Maryudi et al. may be Maryudi et al. (2012)?	Yes, fixed!
8	Insert tables in places right after statements.	Hopefully the spacing and re-outlining makes for an easier and smoother reading experience.

<p>1</p>	<p>Overall notes:</p> <p>I think that this piece has several strong contributions to make, after it is significantly revised for resubmission. First, it provides empirical examples of how social forestry has been, and is being, implemented. Most of the literature on Indonesian Social Forestry lacks empirical evidence. This is the strongest contribution this manuscript can make. Second, the heuristic it uses to examine Social Forestry in Indonesia has promise, though it is not yet sufficiently explained or operationalized. Considering who implements Social Forestry and how is crucial to understanding when and where projects occur and with what outcomes. Drawing attention to access, exclusion, and influence is important for assessing the shift from policy to implementation. Clarifying the heuristic, ensuring that cases clearly indicate how they are drawing on it, and providing a succinct summary table will strengthen this manuscript.</p> <p>Please find my more specific comments, below. All the best.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for this review, that allowed us to significantly improve our paper.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Typo: “As a result of such policy, initiatives, governments around the work” - “We believe our resultant heuristic not only functions as a strategic framework for researchers to assess the various stages and implementation considerations of social forestry, but also provides a handy tool for external actors to approach implementation.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Better: “Our analytical method functions as a strategic framework for assessing the implementation of social forestry as well as a tool practitioners may use to implement social forestry.” 	<p>The abstract has been rewritten to address these points. The edits were much appreciated!</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Highlights: Grammatical issues</p>	<p>Thanks, we have conducted several additional editing for the current version and hope we have addressed these grammatical issues.</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>Language has been changed. Thank you for pointing this out.</p>
5	<p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “As policy ideal has moved to various applications in the form of social forestry permits, research has begun to make sense of its effects, examining more closely the extent to which social forestry fulfill its stated goals (Maryudi et al., 2012; Fisher et al., 2017; 2019)” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This sentence is grammatically problematic, and it is too awkward. o Better: “Recent research examines the extent to which Indonesian social forestry policy is fulfilling its stated goals.” 	<p>Thanks for the recommended edits. We accepted them all and then made further changes as the content and analysis of the paper changed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “In short, amidst the boom of policies supporting social forestry designation, we aim to provide ways a method for assessing whether policy implementation has succeeded, or whether they go bust.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o I like this sentence. It’s clear and catchy. 	<p>Thanks</p>
6	<p>2. The rise of Indonesian social forestry policy and current policy approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Social forestry policy in Indonesia has historically been promoted, supported, and implemented by external actors (Maryudi, 2011).” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Actors external to what? Are you suggesting that local and indigenous people are external actors? If so, this is problematic. Please rephrase for clarity. o This term is clarified in the “Method” section. However, it is too unclear to use without clarification from the beginning. Either rephrase this sentence or clarity or provide the definition of external actors from the beginning and repeat it in section four. 	<p>The previous version included significant attention on external actors. This is not such a central focus of the paper any longer.</p> <p>The methods has also been split into two distinct new sections, one detailing how we came up with the framework, and the second showing how we applied the framework and the context of each of the case study sites.</p>

7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “As social forestry policy became entree to the many policy interests listed above, implementation mechanisms emerged involving various institutions.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Better: “As social forestry policy increases in scale and scope, many different administrations, organizations, and individuals become responsible for its implementation.” 	Thanks for the edits!
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problems with Table 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Formatting o Table 1. Boom Social Forestry (SF) policy: comparison before and after Jokowi era on printing SF permits² <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Printing permits is a strange choice of words o Footnotes contain grammatical problems 	Fixed, thanks!
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For “Table 2. Bureaucratic schemes of several social forestry in Indonesia” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Please list the individual regulations from which the information on “Before MOEF 83 of 2016” comes. 	We have followed this suggestion and also included a pre- and post- distinction
10	<p>3. Land and power: Access, exclusion, and influence “The paradigm shift on the role of local actors in the management of natural resources”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Use of the words “paradigm shift” are problematic. Substitute “Growing recognition of the important role local actors play in the management of natural resources.” o Explanation: The existence of more rights-based development policies is not sufficient to justify the claim of a “paradigm shift” regarding the role of local actors in natural o resource management. Most of the world’s forests—much less land—remains controlled by the state, without any attempt to include local or indigenous people. Indeed, even in Indonesia, moving the needle from 2% to 10% of the Kawasan Hutan to be managed or co-managed by user-groups represents a major change, but it still falls short of a paradigm shift. o This may seem pedantic, but a significant number of studies examine policy change for evidence of paradigm shift. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — “Therefore, as we build our framework in the ensuing sections, such theories provide the precursors for generating a heuristic across the stages of social forestry policy formulation and through the stages of application.” 	Thanks for all these detailed comments. It was really helpful for us in improving the manuscript.

○ Delete

<p>11</p>	<p>4. Method</p> <p>4.1. Methods of developing the heuristic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In developing a heuristic We have chosen to incorporate three considerations based on the theoretical framing of land and power to develop a heuristic to understand the implementation of Social Forestry above. - I find the notion of “external actors” playing an outsized role in Indonesian Social Forestry to be true not just of Indonesian Social Forestry, but of forest resource management in general, within and outside of Indonesia. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This might not be problematic for the heuristic, but it at least needs to be addressed, since the text seems to frames this involvement of “external actors” as novel to Social Forestry. o Literature that examines the technocratic and professionalized nature of forest management would be good to highlight briefly as evidence of this point. A recent starting point (as there are countless examples) is : Lund, J.F., 2015. Paradoxes of participation: The logic of professionalization in participatory forestry. For. Policy Econ. 60, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2015.07.009 o That said, is there anything about Indonesian Social Forestry that draws external actors in, more than other forms of forest management or even participatory/community forest management in other contexts? 	<p>This comment has been addressed above regarding the methods. We have also included Lund’s paper in the current version and engaged with this study in several ways.</p> <p>We also addressed the point on external actors above, as it is no longer a central piece of the paper.</p>
<p>12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think that deleting “external” might help. I keep getting caught-up on that word. Actors may not even be external! Think of social forestry liaisons and extension agents—they aren’t always external. 	<p>External issue addressed, thanks!</p>

13	<p>4.2. Methods of selecting the case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General comment on this section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Section 4.2 seems a bit disjointed and undeveloped. I suggest reorganizing like so: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Move the second paragraph to the first, describing where case study locations are and why, based on their relevance to different stages of Social Forestry implementation § Streamline the other paragraph, focusing it on how participant observation was carried out in the field. Use the citation from Evera (1997) to substantiate this. Perhaps provide more information on authorial involvement (difficult in a peer review process, I know, but keeping information anonymous should be sufficient). 	<p>This point addressed above. The methods section is much more detailed now and fully engages with these considerations.</p>
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Development of the heuristic is based on in depth discussion among the various authors about the key inflection points of SF implementation. Each of the authors also carried out field observations at social forestry sites from across Indonesia, with in depth engagement on sites in Sulawesi, Java, and Kalimantan, which guided the considerations that led to the sequencing and content of our heuristic.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Delete this. You mention authorial involvement below, which is important and valuable. However, this text reads as anecdotal. 	<p>Done!</p>
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “[Case] research is based on participant observation, policy analysis, and active involvement in SF policy and implementation across Indonesia. By participant observation, we mean that the authors were actively involved with external actor interventions, as either facilitators, or at the very least as observing facilitations of SF development and implementation in Indonesia.” 	<p>Agreed, fixed!</p>
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “for our analysis of the initial stage we selected the overall national experiences of HTR.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o I will admit to being doubtful at the asymmetry between choosing a “national experience” as a case, and two specific case studies. 	<p>We have selected new cases to address this issue.</p>

17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Observations based on Van Evera (1997) also helped guide us on the application of our research, drawing from critical theories but taking them to the field, making observations to generate data without imposing external stimulus on the situation. We thereafter questioned whether observations were compatible with our heuristic.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reincorporate this into a paragraph that defines, specifically, how this occurred. 	This was deleted and we reintroduced this methods section differently.
18	<p>5. Results</p> <p>5.1. Proposing a “boom-bust” framework: A heuristic power assessment for delivering policy commitments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I don’t think the heuristic should be titled a “boom-bust” framework. Rather, it captures the process of moving from policy to implementation. Perhaps there is evidence of a boom-bust phenomenon, but the heuristic itself goes beyond that. It should be able to organize knowledge of social forestry implementation beyond a “boom-bust” example, no? 	The framework is now the access-exclusion framework. Thank you for your suggestion.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am again fixating on this idea of “external actors.” Is this heuristic only for those seeking to implement social forestry from outside, or can it be used by local actors (despite the fact that this is not often the case)? I tend to think this heuristic is instructive beyond external actors, and would suggest (again) deleting “external.” 	Ok!
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As provided, I don’t think Table 3 works for this heuristic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The different elements of the heuristic need to be explained. As a reader I wonder: why are they important? What are the citations that provide evidence for this importance? How are these elements reflected in other studies? o A table that summarizes the heuristic would be helpful. Perhaps consider including the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Code, Considerations, Risks and Opportunities § In Considerations, keep the titles of the current “Intervention Considerations by External Actors” § In “Risks and opportunities,” highlight, in general, the “implementation risks and corollary opportunities” represented by this consideration. 	Fixed and completely changed to address this point.

	<p>5.2 Contested power in the context of external actor interventions: Examples from each heuristic level</p> <p>5.2.1. Initial stage example: Rushing Community Forest Plantations (HTR) trials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think this would be a much more powerful case if there was one, site-specific example being analyzed. - The third paragraph is important, but it contains too much generality for a publishable “case.” Please substantiate the claims with research evidence or ground them in a specific example. 	<p>We have selected a new case and provided a better rationale.</p>
	<p>5.2.2. Formal hand over example: Emulating bureaucratic requirements and unintended effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “As of 2018, none of the sites never received management rights.” - You may want to read this quick but well-written source on the importance of cadastral systems for forest monitoring, in general <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Gaveau, D.L.A., Pirard, R., Salim, M.A., Tonoto, P., Yaen, H., Parks, S.A., Carmenta, R., Mcelwee, P., 2017. Overlapping Land Claims Limit the Use of Satellites to Monitor No- Deforestation Commitments and No-Burning Compliance 10, 257–264. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12256 	<p>Ok thanks for the suggestion. This was helpful.</p>
	<p>5.2.3 Implementation example: Success to what ends?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a great deal of interesting, important information in this section, but it doesn’t tie back to the heuristic. Or, if it does incorporate important elements of the heuristic, it was not clear to me how they helped interpret this case. 	<p>This has been thoroughly addressed. This point has helped us to rewrite the paper.</p>

6. Conclusion

- “Finally, we also consider that each stage has its own unique power contestations. External actors tend to think of social forestry as a distinct and singular category within various permitting options. In this paper we have shown that they emerge in very different ways across various different phases of an intervention. Rather than lumping all SF cases into the same category external actors need to beware of the power elements that emerge in distinct ways across these phases, and the corresponding capacity required to influence outcomes and avoid unintended consequences.”
 - This is a very good point

Thanks, we have also
rewritten the
conclusion

The boom in Indonesian social forestry has generated a related boom in scholarship on Indonesian forestry. The revision of this article should discuss and contain the following citations, most of which are recent contributions:

Suharjito, D., Wulandari, C., 2019. A reflection of Social Forestry in 2019: Towards inclusive and collaborative government approaches. *For. Soc.* 3, 137.
<https://doi.org/10.24259/fs.v3i1.6099>

Galudra, G., 2019. Focusing on facilitation: Issues and challenges of capacity development in Indonesia's social forestry reforms. *For. Soc.* 3, 133.
<https://doi.org/10.24259/fs.v3i1.5995>

Peluso, N.L., Poffenberger, M., 1989. Social Forestry in Java: Reorienting Management Systems. *Hum. Organ.* 48, 333–344.

<https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.48.4.a4r82227p5065638>

Erbaugh, J.T., 2019. Responsibilization and Social Forestry in Indonesia Author: *For. Policy Econ.* 109, 102019.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.102019>

Resosudarmo, I.A.P., Tacconi, L., Sloan, S., Hamdani, F.A.U., Subarudi, Alviya, I., Muttaqin, M.Z., 2019. Indonesia's land reform: Implications for local livelihoods and climate change. *For. Policy Econ.* 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.04.007>

Race, D., Suka, A.P., Irawanti, S., Surati, Oktalina, S.N., Bisjoe, A.R.H., Muin, N., Purwanti, R., Sumirat, B., 2019. Smallholder forestry: the role of commercial forestry in rural livelihoods in Indonesia. *Int. For. Rev.* 21, 225–237.
<https://doi.org/10.1505/146554819826606568>

In particular, Galudra (2019) and Erbaugh (2019) discuss issues with the implementation of Indonesian social forestry.

We have added these and other additional studies and are now up to 80 citations.



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

Your manuscript FORPOL_2019_366_R1 has been accepted

4 pesan

Lukas Giessen (Forest Policy and Economics) <EvisSupport@elsevier.com>

17 Agustus 2020 13.44

Balas Ke: lgiesse@uni-goettingen.de

Kepada: alif.mksr@gmail.com

Ref: FORPOL_2019_366_R1

Title: The boom of social forestry policy and the bust of social forests in Indonesia: Developing and applying an access-exclusion framework to assess policy outcomes

Journal: Forest Policy and Economics

Dear Dr. Sahide,

I am pleased to inform you that your paper has been accepted for publication. My own comments as well as any reviewer comments are appended to the end of this letter.

Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production department. We will create a proof which you will be asked to check. You can read more about this [here](#). Meanwhile, you will be asked to complete a number of online forms required for publication. If we need additional information from you during the production process, we will contact.

Thank you for submitting your work to Forest Policy and Economics. We hope you consider us again for future submissions.

Kind regards,

Lukas Giessen
Editor-in-Chief
Forest Policy and Economics**Comments from the editors and reviewers:****- Editor**

-

- Reviewer 1

- The authors revised the manuscript, responding to my concerns about the original draft. The revision is substantially improved over the original. While the manuscript became longer, it was written well and easy to read. The manuscript can be published in the current form.

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>

3 September 2020 20.01

Kepada: lgiesse@uni-goettingen.de

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

Dear Lukas

I hope you are doing well, I just would like to ask about the production progress on the accepted paper "The boom of social forestry policy and the bust of social forests in Indonesia: Developing and applying an access-exclusion framework to assess policy outcomes" (FORPOL_2019_366_R1). Please let me know if there are any thing we need to complete.

Thank you ver much

Best regards

Alif

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

Lukas Giessen <Lukas.Giessen@efi.int>
Kepada: "Muhammad Alif K. Sahide" <alif.mksr@gmail.com>

3 September 2020 20.51

I do not know details in production, sorry

Lukas

PD Lukas Giessen, PhD

- **Principal Scientist** "Forest Governance"

European Forest Institute (EFI), Bonn Office

- **Adjunct Professor, IPB Indonesia**

- **Editor in Chief, *Forest Policy and Economics* (Elsevier):** <http://www.journals.elsevier.com/forest-policy-and-economics/>

Google Scholar: https://scholar.google.de/citations?hl=en&user=voULQt4AAAAJ&view_op=list_works&sortby=pubdate

ResearchGate: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Lukas_Giessen

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

Muhammad Alif K. Sahide <alif.mksr@gmail.com>
Kepada: Lukas Giessen <lukas.giessen@efi.int>

3 September 2020 20.53

Thank you Lukas for your quick reply :)

All the best

Alif

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]