

特別研修

月例研究会 議事録 (7 月)

2011 年度第 4 回

報告題名 (Title) Community Participation in the Forest and Land Rehabilitation Program: A Case Study of Keduwang Sub-Watershed in Wonogiri District, Indonesia	
報告者 (name) Lies Trianadewi	日時 7 月 21 日 午後 3 時～
(所属分野)	場所 第 2 講義室
座長 八木 浩平	議事録担当者
出席者 木谷、安江、小山田、米倉、冬木、高篠、伊藤 (房)、石井、阿部 (美)、韓、Deffi, 八木、神浦、水木、宮里、池田、易思、威廉、王 (毓)、北村、金 (喆)、滝田、タンボウニ、中村、堀、山口、林、泉井、Intan, Sudirman, Lies, 金 (銀)、黄、今井、室井、ナスムンク、徐、趙、Manalo, 劉、王 (偉)、池畑、井坂、伊藤 (まき子)、金沢、丸林、門馬	
報告要旨 (Abstract) Problem statement: Critical watershed has increased every year in Indonesia. Keduwang sub watershed is one of the Sub of Bengawan Solo River upstream which causes the greatest sedimentation to the Gajah Mungkur Reservoir. The average rate of sedimentation could increase to 4.6 million m ³ /year. During 2003-2008, National Movement of Forest and Land Rehabilitation/Gerhan program has been implemented to overcome this problem through 3 phases: planning, implementation and monitoring. The community participation is an important issue to make watershed management more successful and sustainable. The effectiveness of watershed management depends on the cooperation among all trust 'stakeholders'. This study focuses on community's trust to government. This study also describes the situation of the community participation in Gerhan program that implemented in Keduwang Sub-watershed. Objectives: to examine to what extent community participation was promoted/utilized in Keduwang sub-watershed of Gerhan program and to identify significantly influence on community trust to participate in Gerhan program. Results: community participation in planning, implementation and monitoring of Gerhan program is low. More than a half of respondents observed, community perception completely distrust to government that provided imbalance information in order to improve forest and land rehabilitation through Gerhan program. Conclusion: the results of this study indicated that community's trust to government could increase community participation in Gerhan program.	

質疑・応答

Deffi: Thank you for your presentation. My question is related to your role as a government employee. In the slide 16, here Community Participation Monitoring here that said that the program area monitored only occasionally by the officers because of the officers were not received enough incentive. As a government employee what and based on your research that this project is, I am not sure to say it fail, but it's just maybe fail to get the trust from the community and what can you do about this. I mean as a government employee I don't, I cannot accept this reason I mean an officer were not received enough incentive so they say don't do the monitoring. Because the government is, this is a government program and they have to responsible for the program with or without the incentive. I think so.

Lies: Yeah, maybe it is not rational. But when I interviewed with them, it is like a psychology feel that they feel that I don't have received much money because maybe they have much impressed to their family. But they feel that I don't have enough money to receive because to go there maybe it is need more money, take money to maybe using for the fuels, for eat is not enough for them at that time.

Deffi: Do you think it's could be used as a reason? My question is morelly about your role as a government employer yourself. Because after this you will return to Indonesia and what will you do about this kind of behaviour? honestly.

Lies: Actually, in the field is a different than we work in the office because sometimes they ok I'll go but in the reality they did not go.

Manalo: So they just manipulate the data?

Lies: Yeah

Manalo: You mentioned that the Gerhan Program started in 2001?

Lies: 2003

Manalo: Is there a lifespan? Until when? Is there a lifespan or is this an institutional program that yearly will?

Lies: Until 5 years

Manalo: So it's close?

Lies: Yeah

Manalo: So in your opinion, does it achieve its objective or it failed?

Lies: It failed

Manalo: In your slide 11, these are the villages in the Upstream, and the Midstream, and the Downstream, and the total area and the danger spots. And you mentioned that, that's why there are many spots that in the downstream villages that are affected in terms of erosion, increasing the sedimentation in the rivers. Is because its aggravated by the dangers spots from the upstream and the midstream. I suggest that maybe you, if there's a data in your file to put the corresponding hectare, I mean size of land not the number of danger spots. Because in my opinion, like this for Bubakan, 11 spots, maybe if you will I mean if you put in the total area if its hectare or sq meters that this can be possible erode out of the 426. So, maybe you can show that from the 93 spots out of the 4,200 you can see how, what volume of soil will be added to the sedimentation if ever these will erode. In my suggestion, you put, I mean the approximate area not the number in terms of the danger spots. Because these is the spots that caused erosion right? and the sedimentation. So I think, for me it should be put the same indicator, hectare, hectare not hectare and number.

Lies: But do you know what the danger spots mean?

Manalo: Is an area?

Lies: It means like this file. This is what I mean by the danger spots. If the rainy season come, it could be sedimentation, erosion.

Manalo: But you can map out what portion of that. I mean the land surveyor can do that. Because maybe the whole cliff will go down.

Yonekura: I think the Program is that you know Indonesian officer didn't think its their concern. Maybe it's the concern of JICA or the team of Gerhan.

Manalo: In your slide 12, in the planning stage, is this the problem before Gerhan or the problem after the evaluation?

Lies: This is the generally Gerhan problem that happen from the beginning until...

Manalo: So this program employed a team, I mean a project team, consultants, why is it that the consultants hired, didn't I mean suggest which type of plants are suitable since they are consultants? You said that "government has less attention of choosing plant types to the..." this is the role of the consultants who made the program.

Lies: Yeah. There is the lack of their experience because sometimes they just “Ok this is good, you can plant”, for the human capability or human resources.

Manalo: In the next slide, you said that “people did not necessary appreciate/accept Gerhan program regarding plants selection” but it’s very clear that “were your ideas such as choosing plants agreed by government?” you said 59. So the government agreed to their chose of plants.

Lies: I mean this is for the Upstream and the Midstream area.

Manalo: Ok. In your bullet you should include that, that is for the upstream and midstream because your total average is contradicting.

Yonekura: Please look at the slide 14. You mentioned that in the second line, second sentence, “no conflicts of interest between participants and the parties..” I don’t know what you mean by parties involved and involvement in the implementation for example. And you know the question “did you receive seedlings in a good condition? The answer, No answer is 55%. I think that could be some conflict between the people and the program officer. Isn’t it? What do you mean by no conflict? What you can share? More than 50% said No. I cannot understand this sentence.

Lies: I mean for their interest. It is just to insist that the conflict of interest is a occur in the other programs. But in the between the participants and parties like the consultants and the...

Yonekura: Yes. But we cannot read such message from the data, you know. Impossible. So it is not natural to understand that there seems to be some conflict regarding the selection of seedlings. More than 50% said No. That is consistent without a table.

So that not only the Gerhan Program itself but also that the existing program also there were problems, mismatching and others. That would be much more natural understanding.

Takashino: I wonder how villagers aware of the risk of landslides or any other problem, If they understand the risk probably then, I guess they want to do with this program. So how they understand the risk? They suffer from landslides or floods? Am I right? Do you understand my question?

Lies: Do you mean how they know their awareness?

Takashino: Yes, very important for this program.

Lies: Actually, they realized that this condition is very deliberate because they feel by themselves at the time in December of 2007 big floods happened in there until across the other province. But in the implementation of this program many problems that occurred in there because of the government has not cool to their want like from the choosing plantation because maybe from the example in the Karang and Semagar more properly to plant the cloves but the government only give plan plantation is teak.