

Jurisdictional Approaches to Sustainable Land Use in Indonesia

What is it, why pursue it and how to build one

November 2017





Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	2
Why pursue a Jurisdictional Approach	2
What is a 'JA'?	3
How to build a JA	5
Conclusions.....	8

Jurisdictional Approaches to Sustainable Land Use in Indonesia

What is it, why pursue it and how to build one

Blair Palmer & Gary Paoli | November 2017

Executive Summary

1. Based on recent experiences in the field and discussion/debate with colleagues, this brief paper aims to provide clear answers to the questions: What is a jurisdictional approach (JA) to sustainable land use, Why is it worth pursuing, and How should it be pursued. We advise the use of Indonesian terms for the JA, such as Kabupaten Lestari or Kabupaten Berkelanjutan. We write the paper in the spirit of guiding our collective, evolving thinking on how to conceptualize and communicate around the JA.
2. A JA is needed because (i) the drivers of unsustainable practices are inter-related and involve many actors; a multi-stakeholder, multi-issue and multi-layer approach is thus needed; (ii) the underlying governance issues must be addressed for a long-lasting solution and to prevent leakage; and (iii) the scale of support in a focused area must be greatly increased in order to counteract the incentives towards BAU land use practices.
3. Although undertaking JA is difficult and expensive, and local leaders currently have a weak value proposition to support reform oriented JAs, some leaders are newly willing to engage in discussions of sustainability, and there is surging interest from private sector actors and donors/financing sources to support 'jurisdictional efforts', variously (and often vaguely) defined.
4. It is proposed that a JA to sustainable land use be defined as a multi-stakeholder effort which is based on a credible approach to address the main causes of unsustainable land use across a defined political jurisdiction; where a vision, programs, indicators and a monitoring framework are developed; where local government reforms policies and governance but a framework is used to develop outside support for the initiative; and where the stakeholders jointly take responsibility for specific 'outcomes' rather than 'outputs' for tracking and reporting progress, establishing a framework for mutual accountability.
5. To build an effective JA, support should be delivered in a series of phases, which are pegged to achievements on established indicators. The phased investment should be administered via an appropriate governance structure, with a multi-stakeholder body making transparent decisions based on public evidence regarding achievements on agreed-upon indicators, and where funds are not directly controlled by one of the key stakeholders in the JA.
6. One key route toward developing a JA is to support locally suitable 'entry point' programs, and then to broaden out from the entry point towards a more comprehensive JA once initial successes are achieved, trust has been built, and working relationships are in place. Some entry points that show promise include: the recognition of indigenous territories; smallholder oil palm support programs; programs to support best practices for peatland management; programs for the prevention and management of fires; and community-based forest management programs.
7. Alongside these entry points, additional packages of support could (and should) be offered to local governments willing to engage, as a means of deliberately 'layering up' the engagement programs comprising the JA, while also maintaining incentives for performance.

Introduction

The Jurisdictional Approach (JA) to promoting sustainable land use is surging in popularity. Yet, ideas about what constitutes a JA are many and varied. Discussions often take place with participants holding a vague understanding of the JA as any sort of program focused on supporting a sub-national political jurisdiction to improve land use. Other times participants hold very different, narrow ideas of the JA and whether it's even worth devoting energy to support. This lack of consensus on basic features of the JA illustrates the need for more discussion, debate and clarification on What is a JA, Why pursue it, and How to build one.

In this brief paper we offer responses to these questions, aimed at building a common understanding and encouraging further debate around these concepts. We hope this will strengthen the basis for more effective exchange on approaches and lessons from the field. We also hope it will support the recently launched Lingkar Temu Kabupaten Lestari initiative (LTKL), by helping ensure discussions between local governments and implementation partners are rooted in a better understanding of the JA concept and how to pursue it.

This paper is based on Daemeter's long term sustainability work with donors, NGOs, local governments, and private sector actors implementing sustainability commitments, as well as a two-year research project on the potential for JAs in Indonesia which involved extensive district-level fieldwork.

We begin first with discussion of Why pursue a JA rather than defining what it is. This is because the definition we propose for the JA in fact grew out of debates over whether it is worth pursuing in the first place.

Why pursue a Jurisdictional Approach?

The need for a jurisdictional approach to sustainable land use stems from these realizations:

1. That achieving sustainable land use in Indonesia requires significant improvements to land use governance in sub-national political jurisdictions. This requires sustained engagement with local governments, which have authority over many aspects of land use. Other levels of government also have authority,¹ of course, but it has so far proven difficult to achieve significant on-the-ground impacts by focusing on national-level governance improvements only. When governance issues are addressed sub-nationally, there is the possibility of achieving change at the scale of a political jurisdiction, i.e. preventing leakage (where unsustainable practices are displaced to alternative locations rather than ceased) and, critically, enshrining governance improvements in a jurisdiction's policies, programs and practices that are carried forward in time. The emphasis on governance within a sub-national administrative jurisdiction is a fundamental distinction between the JA and typical landscape approaches.²
2. That multi-stakeholder action across a number of inter-related issues is required to achieve sustainable land use. Many stakeholders are involved in land use decisions, from investors, farmers, palm oil and timber companies, to downstream buyers, NGOs, communities, and district/provincial/national government. Many existing problems have proved difficult to address partially due to a lack of constructive, coherent engagement amongst these different stakeholders, since change by one or two actors is typically not enough to solve the underlying problem without support from other actors.
3. That a larger scale of intervention is required to make progress on land use issues. Relatively small donor programs or local NGO action has not been enough to counteract prevailing incentives fueling unsustainable land use. A scale-up of activity focused on particular places is required, so that larger incentives and a larger scale of collaborative action can be brought to bear on these difficult challenges. An increased investment in a particular place could occur if there were sustained efforts to align the authority of jurisdictional governments with the goals of various other national and international actors (including the private sector) interested in reducing fire, carbon emissions, and deforestation.

A JA is worth pursuing not just because it's needed, but also because it is possible. We say this mindful that, at present, it's unrealistic to assume that many district leaders will embrace a rapid move towards sustainability. This will not happen until incentives from the national government change (e.g. fiscal incentives, or increased threat of punishment) or rewards from international markets are increased (such as carbon or other PES funds channeled to district governments that improve land use or reduce emissions).³ For this reason, it is often said the 'value proposition' for

¹ For example, district governments control the issuance of permits for oil palm development, land title certification, and much regulatory enforcement; provincial authorities control the Forest Management Units (KPH) and hold much authority over mining; and national authorities control issuance of forestry permits, legal recognition of customary forest (hutan adat), wider land reform programs and national budgets.

² Effective JAs will engage at multiple levels – at the national level to change incentives applicable nationwide, and at provincial and district levels to make and institutionalize changes to be implemented throughout the jurisdiction. In practice, this means most JA efforts will show more intensive engagement at the district level, with links to authorities at provincial and national levels where synergies can be leveraged to deliver jurisdiction wide improvements.

³ Note that one form of financial incentive could come via the RPP-EA, the Indonesian government regulation on finance for environmental action.



district leaders is currently weak. This means that beginning a JA is resource-intensive and challenging, and must not be viewed as a ‘silver bullet’ leading to radically improved land use overnight. Even so, we argue that the JA is possible for two reasons:

First, knowledge of the longer term impacts of unsustainable land use is spreading, and increasing numbers of district leaders are at least willing to discuss sustainable land use, including in multi-stakeholder groups. Substance of these discussions reflects their own particular conceptions of sustainability, political programs and interests, but it still represents an important start.

Second, there is growing interest in measures of jurisdictional sustainability from companies with sustainability commitments (e.g. oil palm producers, processors and traders), from commodity certification schemes (e.g. RSPO), from conservation finance markets (beyond just carbon markets and donors) and multi-lateral trade initiatives. This means there will be increasing sources of potential finance and interested parties to consider participation in a collaborative effort.

Viewed from this perspective, we believe this means there is an opportunity to develop JAs, and a need to do so. Taken together, this is our answer to the question: *Why pursue a JA?*

What is a ‘JA’?

The term ‘Jurisdictional Approach’ is often used loosely to refer to any program oriented towards sustainable land use in a particular jurisdiction. This might be acceptable from a semantic perspective, but it’s too liberal a use of the term, and holds back productive discussion on how donors and other stakeholders can work most effectively at jurisdictional scales to affect change.

Instead, we suggest that the term JA be reserved for something much more specific, namely: programs that are based on a credible approach to address the main causes of unsustainable land use across a defined political jurisdiction; where a vision, programs, indicators and a monitoring framework are developed; where the framework is used to develop outside support for the initiative; and where stakeholders jointly take responsibility for specific ‘outcomes’ rather than ‘outputs’ for tracking and reporting progress.

This more specific definition differentiates JAs from smaller, single-stakeholder, or single-issue programs – for example, an NGO program on land use mapping, or a local government training and capacity building program on spatial planning – and by doing so, will better catalyze exchange within a community of practice to deepen understanding of how to make the JA work.



We suggest that comprehensive, fully developed jurisdictional programs show these four characteristics:

(1) The JA is a multi-stakeholder effort to achieve sustainable land use in a political jurisdiction, based on a credible approach to address the main causes of unsustainable land use (most notably deforestation and fires), while also reducing negative social impacts of unsustainable resource management, and contributing improved social and economic benefits to communities.

A ‘credible approach’ means there must be analysis of the prevailing unsustainable land use practices in the jurisdiction (e.g. timber plantations draining peatlands, commodity producers burning or clearcutting forests) and their causes

(e.g. poor spatial planning, weak land use permitting systems, lack of transparency in land use governance, weak law enforcement). Based on this analysis, solutions can be developed that are rooted in a sound 'theory of change' - even if it's implicit. In this way, a 'credible approach' means that a package of district-wide programs for tree planting or childhood environmental education (for example) should not be called a JA, when the major cause of unsustainable land use in the jurisdiction is deforestation by palm oil companies, infrastructure expansion and illegal mining.

A 'multi-stakeholder effort' is needed because of the inter-relatedness of the issues and roles of different actors, as well as the need for accountability and 'outcome' oriented programming. Efforts by just one actor typically fail to achieve transformation, for instance private sector reform without government support, or vice versa, is not enough. Single-issue efforts also typically fail; for instance, improved land use permit governance without strengthened law enforcement, or improved spatial planning without strengthened land tenure will not deliver desired outcomes.

In addition, sustainable land use should be about more than preventing carbon emissions and deforestation. It should also reduce wider negative impacts of land use practices, such as land conflicts, alienation of indigenous land rights, or labour abuses; and improve the social and economic benefits to communities of sanctioned land uses, in order to meet community rights to secure livelihoods.

Almost none of the incipient JAs in Indonesia capture all these dimensions, but all programs aspiring to function as a comprehensive JA must be mindful of these attributes from the outset, and develop a strategy for building upon entry points to achieve a larger, more comprehensive program that captures these elements.

(2) The JA also involves articulation of an overall vision of sustainable land use for the district, a set of priority programs (which describe what will be done, by whom, when), along with a set of key indicators, and a transparent monitoring framework to gauge progress.

The vision would ideally be articulated by the district government, in collaboration with other key stakeholders. The programs could be undertaken by local government, private sector, NGOs/donors, communities, consultancies, academics or others. But in all cases the key indicators for tracking outcomes must be measurable, and should be informed by the analysis of unsustainable land use practices (e.g. deforestation rates, numbers of fires) as well as other social/economic indicators related to land use (e.g. number of smallholder farmers mapped with certificated farms, or hectares of forest under management by indigenous groups or local communities). The monitoring framework must be transparent so that progress can be viewed by all stakeholders.

(3) The JA should ideally be driven by local government, and oriented towards improving policy and governance as a key part of the strategy, but should also access outside support in the pursuit and achievement of the vision, from parties such as national government, provincial government, donors, conservation finance, impact investors, green investment funds, sustainable agribusiness, etc.

A JA should be oriented towards embedding a 'green development' paradigm into jurisdictional policies and governance practices, in order that it persists over the long term. This will involve a 'greening' of regional development plans, including the Regional Mid Term Development Plan (RPJMD), RKPD (overall work plans for local government), Renstra SKPD (strategic plans per agencies) and RKT (annual work plans per agency), all of which will also ensure that local budget allocations are aligned with green development programs. Even if local government does not start out leading the JA, it must assume that role eventually in order that reforms are embedded into local policies and practices. An initiative driven by non-government stakeholders and/or non-local stakeholders, i.e. one that does not embed itself in local development planning and budgeting processes, is not likely to succeed in addressing the drivers of unsustainable practices in a lasting way.

On the other hand, local government budgets driven by policy reform are unlikely to be up to the task, even when a reformist new leader makes a significant shift towards sustainability. Outside support from a variety of actors is needed, addressing different facets of sustainability and sustainable economic development; this is a primary feature that will over time make a JA more enticing to district leaders, thereby helping address their currently weak 'value proposition', and will also make JA progress accountable to multiple parties.

(4) The JA involves stakeholders jointly taking responsibility for 'outcomes' rather than 'outputs' of a collaboration.

This is key. Rather than each stakeholder implementing and reporting on various activities which may or may not deliver impact, or together achieve the change required, we suggest that JAs must instead be designed as an intervention where stakeholders (a) continually monitor agreed key indicators of desired outcomes (e.g. reduced deforestation and fires), (b) are responsive to signs of failure to achieve progress on these indicators, and (c) try alternative approaches or

make additional investments where needed to achieve progress toward agreed outcomes.

In the long term, it is extremely important that stakeholders take responsibility at the level of outcomes not outputs. This is because the JA will retain its current popularity, and parties will continue to collaborate and provide financial support, only if demonstrable progress is being made. Many development programs take responsibility for producing key outputs, with outcomes seen as something beyond control of the program, something the program should contribute to but not be held responsible to deliver. In contrast, the JA for sustainable land use must over time become fundamentally outcome driven, with specified programs tailored to achieving reductions in deforestation, in fires, in peatland conversation, in levels of conflict, poverty, and difficulty accessing rural finance (among others). This starts with a robust diagnosis of problems and drivers, leading to a credible (if simple) theory of change and programs to pursue it. This is followed by progress monitoring on key indicators of outcomes, with learning and adaptation to failures.

We recognize that outcomes take time to generate, and that early stage progress might be more focused on outputs than outcomes (e.g. completing the analysis of problems and drivers, putting in place a multi-stakeholder working group, developing a district level vision and programs and budgets to advance it). But over time, saying focused on key indicators of outcomes, and adapting programs where needed, will invite, retain and scale up outside support for the initiative. This can also be thought of as a 'framework for mutual accountability' that will reinforce growth in support for the program.

This level of transparency and responsiveness to outcomes requires multi-stakeholder governance mechanisms for the JA, despite the limited record of success for such structures. This is because, in most cases, local government alone cannot simply coordinate efforts by other stakeholders, without assistance and guidance of a forum that encourages a different kind of collaboration than what normal local government practices will deliver.



Two final points concerning What is the JA. First, in discussions about the JA, it's useful to clarify: is the JA purpose to promote sustainable palm oil, or to achieve improved, more equitable land use across all sectors, or something else? It is entirely justifiable to undertake JA efforts oriented towards one or more of these goals, given the particular threats and opportunities in a jurisdiction. What's important is to be clear about intended scope from the outset.

Second, there is emerging agreement that the term 'jurisdictional approach' is usually not an effective term for communicating with stakeholders in Indonesia. An Indonesian term is therefore needed, one that acknowledges the need for economic development. While district actors should select a term that best captures their aspirations, Kabupaten Lestari and Kabupaten Berkelanjutan are two good options that seem to capture the spirit of the JA concept, and are more easily understood.

How to build a JA

In 2016 Daemeter published a report that outlined several ideas for how to build a JA.⁴ This included advice to formulate the inception and build-out plan based on analysis of entry points and options for growing the effort over time. Here, we build upon these earlier points, making three recommendations for how to build out the JA over time, elaborating on financial support strategies, financial governance, and entry points. We anticipate diverse opinions on these points.

Phased Support

First, we suggest promoting the idea of "phased support tied to achievements". It is unlikely that a JA will be built smoothly from an initial plan, especially where land use practices are driven by complex political economy dynamics that take time to understand. Those investing in supporting a JA may be most interested in peatland protection or emissions reduction, while local stakeholders may be more interested in improved productivity and farmer empowerment. This means early JA programming will need to be adaptive, reflecting compromise and learning.

Given challenges translating plans into outcomes on the ground, the complex political economies affecting governance, and the varied interests of stakeholders, it's not surprising that few parties will initially offer largescale support for the full costs of a comprehensive JA. This means the JA should first 'prove its potential' by achieving some progress against early indicators, before 'earning' further support to continue. Of course, it's best if there are signs from the outset that ongoing support is potentially available, so as not to impede early progress due to a perceived lack of funds, but it's also true that guaranteed funding without insistence on progress can undermine success, or encourage use of funding

⁴The Summary is available at: http://daemeter.org/new/uploads/20161105234503.DAEMETER_extended_summary_Final.pdf and the full report is at: http://daemeter.org/new/uploads/20161105215230.Daemeter_JA_2016_Full_Report_ENG.compressed.pdf

towards easier or more economically beneficial activities, rather than laying foundations to address the politically difficult, underlying drivers of unsustainable land use.

Where participants in an early JA effort could agree to an initial set of indicators to measure progress, and a work plan to guide activities toward these goals, then achievements on these indicators can be used to trigger additional investments to drive the JA forward. In addition, this would help donors avoid sinking huge sums into JAs where the problems or politics might prevent substantial impact.

Adopting Phased Support to the build out of JA programs would also have implications for how we identify suitable jurisdictions to commence with pilots. Instead of prolonged, in-depth assessments aimed at identifying the ‘most suitable’ district, Phased Support would recommend identifying a set of ‘good enough’ districts to proceed with JA pilots. This would launch a process to see how far and fast progress can be achieved in each, with future funding made contingent on progress. Phased Support also acknowledges that even in-depth suitability assessments are unlikely to fully uncover the political economy of land use in a jurisdiction and the governance challenges it presents. This means that from a donor’s perspective, it would be wiser to cast the net widely for pilots, then link ongoing investment to demonstrated progress. Some jurisdictions will show progress, others will not. Pegging investment to progress and a deepening from government commitment will motivate progress and enable the upscaling or downscaling of investment as justified.

Financial Governance

How can a phased investment approach be managed, when it’s linked to progress against a set of indicators developed by a mixed group of stakeholders? One approach attempted in the past has been to set up a governance body to administer the funds, which releases subsequent tranches when key stakeholders decide (and provide evidence) that target indicators have been met. This could take the form of one body authorized to hold and disburse funds (which is not the donor or the government), and a second body which tracks progress, revises strategies where necessary, and agrees together when targets have been met to trigger the next disbursement. If this second body is composed of the right mix of stakeholders with different interests in the JA, then this could provide a more robust structure to balance competing objectives and achieve more effective implementation across indicators. Such a body would be cumbersome and unnecessary in the early stages of a JA pilot, but could form an important part of the build out plan for JAs that show promise and merit support to pursue multi-year, multi-issue, multi-stakeholder programs.⁵

Entry Points

Given that an ‘instant JA’ is not possible, there should be more discussion on prospective entry points (batu loncatan) and on specific strategies to broaden the approach from these entry points. A Daemeter discussion piece in February 2017 described three different types of JA development: (1) ‘Start from scratch’, (2) ‘Add-on’, (3) ‘Scale-up’.

The *Start from Scratch* model describes a JA beginning from a blank slate in a jurisdiction that shows promise. The *Add-on* model describes a pathway for building towards a JA from existing, narrower programs that have shown some success in a jurisdiction, for example issuance of a district regulation on customary forest recognition, progress by a multi-stakeholder landscape initiative, or sustainability outreach programs for smallholder oil palm. The *Scale-up* model refers to situations where a comprehensive vision/framework for a jurisdiction is already being developed, but lacks adequate financial support, multi-stakeholder collaboration mechanisms, or an accountability system to track and report progress. Under the Add-on model, there are numerous programs that could serve as meaningful entry points. We suggest, however, that a good entry point is one that is oriented around a single issue (or set of linked issues), is aligned with new national policies a district must begin implementing, has an identifiable set of stakeholders willing to address the issue, has the interest of elements of the local government, and requires outside support to accelerate progress. Based on analysis of current trends in Indonesia, we highlight entry points that may hold promise:

1. **Recognition of indigenous land rights (*wilayah masyarakat adat and hutan adat*).** This is most effectively pursued where there is already a local regulation for recognition, and where there is opportunity to follow this up with mapping and recognition of territories, organizational strengthening, natural resource management support, sustainable forestry livelihood planning etc. There is a number of districts interested to have support on these issues.
2. **Sustainable smallholder oil palm.** Effectively pursued via innovative supply chain models; mapping, legalization (STDB/ ISPO), land certification; sustainability certification (e.g. RSPO); improving productivity and slowing extensification which threatens forests/peat; adoption of more sustainable methods; institutional strengthening (developing farmer groups or cooperatives); improved marketing arrangements (e.g. shortening supply chains to improve FFB prices).

⁵ For more on financial governance structures of complex, multi-stakeholder, conservation oriented projects see Linden et al. (2012) A big deal for conservation. Stanford Social Innovation Review (Summer, pages 42-49).



3. **Best practices for peatland management.** Although many districts lack an understanding of peat issues, this is a potential entry point because of national-level demands (and support) for improved peat management, most notably via the Peatland Restoration Agency (Badan Restorasi Gambut) to implement new policies on peatland management, including the revised peatland regulation (PP 57/2016). In parallel, we also see the emergence of community networks focused on peatland management issues (e.g. Peatland Communities Network - Jaringan Masyarakat Gambut). This offers numerous potential entry points in jurisdictions where peat is widespread (e.g. in Riau or South Sumatra, West or Central Kalimantan, and coastal Papua).
4. **Community-based forest management (CBFM).** For instance, Hutan Desa which builds on President Jokowi's announced goal of reallocating 12.5M ha of forested areas for communities. This program requires intensive village-level facilitation, to support communities both to obtain a Hutan Desa permit, and especially to build sustainable forest livelihoods.

We emphasize that even achieving progress on these entry points is a challenging undertaking: e.g. it would take significant time and effort to achieve indigenous land recognition in a particular district, even where local governments are supportive. Nevertheless, engagement on an entry point issue creates a pathway for building trust among stakeholders, which can lead to broadening the scope of collaboration towards wider programs, even before the entry point program itself is completed. It can also help uncover early warning signs that despite positive appearances of the potential for engagement around the entry point, local government is, in fact, not supportive of larger JA ambitions and does not merit investment for scale up.

A key issue in building out from the entry point is the role and nature of the proponent, i.e. the organization or coalition working with government to build the framework. Local legitimacy is very important for the proponent, in order to avoid being seen as a donor project and the challenges this brings. At the same time, high level expertise and international networks are also needed to facilitate effective technical approaches and to access additional funding sources. This means that a proponent must combine these two aspects, either within a single organization or more likely as a partnership between two organizations.

A different way of building momentum for JAs is now being trialed under the Lingkar Temu Kabupaten Lestari (LTKL) initiative.⁶ LTKL has brought together representatives of eight districts interested to declare themselves as a Kabupaten Lestari, along with a number of support organizations that are (or might become) able to offer support to the districts. Some districts in LTKL are more advanced in developing their sustainability framework (e.g. Musi Banyuasin and Siak, where partners have working with local government for some time to build commitment to a sustainable development paradigm), while others are at very early stages of development. The LTKL strategy is to engage with district leaders based on their expression of interest, without over-determining the content of their framework, and then build relationships over time to expand the vision, and lay the foundations for building the JA over time. In other words, rather than beginning with a local proponent pursuing JA entry points, or rather than developing a strong JA framework with multiple stakeholders then working for government buy-in of this, the LTKL approach starts with local government in charge, and develops the JA framework according to political opportunity.

This approach has a lot of merit, for its politically aware, locally driven character, as well as the building of a network which can facilitate collaborations, cross-learning, and mutual inspiration. It also provides a platform for negotiating needed support from national government. Member districts vary significantly, notably in terms of the extent of forests, peatlands and oil palm plantations in each district, meaning that challenges and opportunities to obtain external

⁶<http://www.lampost.co/berita-deklarasi-lingkar-temu-kabupaten-lestari>
<http://www.tribunnews.com/nasional/2017/07/21/transformasi-petani-sebagai-penggerak-pembangunan-berkelanjutan>



support will also vary significantly. A key challenge may be in harnessing additional support, and the related need to build a framework of indicators to track progress which are endorsed by local governments and which enable access to new sources of additional funding.

A next step in strategizing how to support the scale-up of JA programming is to conceptualize pathways or packages of support to be offered as add-ons to the entry points described above. The possibilities are myriad, and would need to be tailored to local conditions, but some examples include:

Data collection and analysis: including forest cover, deforestation, peat, and fires analysis; spatial planning review; corporate vs smallholder oil palm, with impact risk analysis. This supports identification of problems and potential drivers.

Stakeholder facilitation process: to build a JA vision/roadmap, according to the definition above (vision, pillars, programs, outcomes, indicators, monitoring mechanisms, role of various parties).

Palm oil sector analysis: including supply chain analysis, smallholder problems and solutions, industry engagement, sustainability support options

Smallholder oil palm support: including risk analysis, farm boundary mapping and mechanisms for scaling up; legal registration of smallholdings; supply chain reconfiguration for improved benefit sharing; and plans for stakeholder engagement on thorny issues such as legalization of smallholders in Forest Zone or seed origin certificates.

Adat recognition: prioritized for districts already having the umbrella regulation in place, involving initial stakeholder discussions and selection of areas for participative mapping, pilot mapping and community awareness raising, working with district government on establishment of recognition process, and outlining needs for further support on strengthening of adat institutions and business support.

Social forestry: advancing social forestry agenda by supporting licensing processes, village capacity, and analysis of appropriate forest products for economic/social/environmental success.

Forest and peatland rehabilitation: Development of plans for rehabilitation projects combined with village economic development, and strategy for seeking funding.

Peat analysis: Support local governments in efforts towards peatland protection and rehabilitation, and sustainable paludiculture for village economies, aligned with the revised peatland regulation PP 57/2016.

Sustainable villages: beginning with establishing village boundaries, participative mapping, village spatial planning, village development planning, village enterprise development, linking to Dana Desa, with a view to protecting forests and supporting sustainable community forestry enterprises and/or sustainable oil palm (intensification). Pilot role out in several villages.

Sustainability monitoring system: involving public-facing land cover and land use governance system, combined with multi-stakeholder forest/peat/fire monitoring system.

Support to strengthen existing government planning & processes: Providing data, advice and support to improve rigor and levels of participation in existing government led processes, e.g. strategic environmental assessment or medium-term development planning (RPJM).

Specific add-on 'packets' could be offered to local governments once initial engagement is underway and shows potential for expansion, pegged to achievements on particular indicators under the 'phased approach' described

above. This would function to maintain a pattern of increasing donor/investor support in line with increasing local government commitment, or conversely enabling a withdrawal from districts where progress has stalled.

Conclusions

We close by highlighting key elements of our discussion on the what, why and how of jurisdictional approaches to promote sustainable land use in Indonesia.

JAs should be supported, and built according to the following principles:

- It should be a multi-stakeholder effort to achieve sustainable land use in a political jurisdiction, based on a credible approach to address the main causes of unsustainable land use, while also reducing negative social impacts of unsustainable resource management, and contributing real social and economic benefits to communities.
- It should involve articulation of an overall vision of sustainable land use for the district, a set of priority programs (which describe what will be done, by whom, when), along with a set of key indicators, and a transparent monitoring framework to gauge progress.
- It should work towards placing local government in a leadership role for the initiative, and to ensure that sustainability reforms are embedded into local policies and budgets. However this should not be a pre-condition of building a JA.
- It should aim to access outside support in the pursuit and achievement of the vision, from parties such as national government, provincial government, donors, conservation finance, impact investors, green investment funds, sustainable agribusiness, etc.
- It should involve stakeholders jointly taking responsibility for ‘outcomes’ rather than ‘outputs’ of a collaboration, with this being carried out via adaptive management and implementation practices based on tracking desired outcomes.
- Support by external actors / donors should be phased and linked to achievements on established indicators.
- The phased investment should be administered via an appropriate governance structure, with e.g. a multi-stakeholder body making transparent decisions based on evidence regarding achievements on agreed-upon indicators, and where funds are not controlled by one of the key stakeholders in the JA.
- JAs can be built in the above manner by building out from an initial ‘entry point’ program, oriented towards something germane to sustainable land use. A good entry point is one which is aligned with new national policies that districts must implement, has an easily identifiable set of stakeholders wanting to engage on the issue, has the interest of elements of local government, and requires outside support to accelerate progress. There is also the risk that entry points become ends in themselves, especially those focused on (for example) smallholder productivity gains rather than more politically difficult issues such as regulatory enforcement or land rights recognition. This is one reason support should be phased.

Other important points to highlight about building JAs include:

- The commitment of the political leader is vital, and thus careful selection is required before supporting a JA in a particular jurisdiction. However, the phased approach we promote will allow for commitment to grow over time as progress is demonstrated, enabling JAs to progress in areas where leaders may be less than fully committed at the start. A minimal political commitment is necessary in order to justify initial investment, perhaps including endorsement of entry point activities, interest in the broader goals of a JA, and sufficient engagement to enable development of relationships and additional plans.
- Building a strong JA is partly about where you choose to try, but also largely about how you choose to try it. This is a key point to bear in mind for planning JA pilots.
- The great challenge in building a JA is in aligning incentives, establishing the space for multi-stakeholder dialogue and negotiation where power issues are considered, and in effectively channeling these discussions into policy reform and implementation on the ground. This means that the design of a JA should be built upon an effective incentive structure, including a strategy for how incentives may be shifted over time.
- Given how difficult JAs are to build, discussions within a community of practice are very desirable.⁷ These discussions will benefit from being as explicit as possible about managing incentives and coordinating effective multi-stakeholder dialogue and action.

⁷ One recent example is Fishman et al. (2017) Tackling Deforestation Through a Jurisdictional Approach: Lessons from the Field. WWF publication.



Daemeter Indonesia Office

Jl. Tangkuban Perahu no. 1
Bogor 16128
Indonesia

Phone: +62 251 8315 625

U.S. Office

417 Second Street, Ste 203
Eureka, CA 95501
USA

Phone: +1 707 267 5201

www.daemeter.org
info@daemeter.org