



The Challenges of Greenpeace Indonesia's Supports on One Map Policy Indonesia

Gita M. Nurhidayah

Gita M Nurhidayah

Affiliation : Statsit
City : Jakarta
Country : Indonesia
Email :
gitaalfian@gmail.com

History

Submission : 3 September 2022
Review : 22 October 2022
Completed
Accepted : 10 November 2022
Available : 10 December 2022
Online

DOI :

[10.51413/jisea.Vol3.Iss2.2022.108-129](https://doi.org/10.51413/jisea.Vol3.Iss2.2022.108-129)

Abstract

As a branch of international non-governmental organization (NGO), Greenpeace Indonesia has been supporting the policy of One Map Policy (OMP) Indonesia since 2017. This policy is essential to manage the forestry and land in Indonesia as deforestation is rising. Despite comprehensive support to OMP, Greenpeace Indonesia did not successfully push the Indonesian government to take severe attempts for the OMP legalization. This paper examines the challenges that Greenpeace Indonesia faces in this support. We elaborate on this problem by explaining it through the theory of International NGO Challenges in policy engagement. This theoretical framework is usually used to describe any possible opportunities and challenges for non-state actors to influence government policies. Our research is based on the literature review with the qualitative method. We argue that Greenpeace Indonesia has several challenges that hinder its support of OMP Legalization. Those are both internal coordination and external condition, especially regarding the advocacy system in Indonesia.

Key Words: Greenpeace Indonesia, One Map Policy Indonesia, Challenges, Policy Engagement

Cite this article :

Nurhidayah, G. M. (2022). The Challenges of Greenpeace Indonesia's Supports on One Map Policy Indonesia. *Journal of International Studies on Energy Affairs*, 3(2), 108–129.
<https://doi.org/10.51413/jisea.Vol3.Iss2.2022.108-129>

INTRODUCTION

Forest fires in Indonesia in 2019 raised questions about the progress of the One Map Policy (OMP), which is claimed to be an alternative solution to the problem of forest and land fires in Indonesia. The scepticism arose because 2019 is the year OMP should have entered the implementation phase. The Minister of Agrarian and Spatial Planning or Head of the State Land Agency, Sofyan Djalil, said that one of the benefits of having OMP is to prevent repeated forest fires in Indonesia. It was conveyed after attending a limited meeting on OMP development at the Presidential Office Jakarta on Tuesday, 13 June 2017. The OMP became a policy agenda sparked during the Presidency of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) in 2010 and then gained attention again with an acceleration order during the Joko Widodo Presidency in 2016. The president officially signed Presidential Regulation No. 9 of 2016 concerning the Acceleration of the Implementation of One Map Policy at the level of accuracy Map Scale 1:50,000. OMP aims as a policy of the Indonesian government to realize good forest and land governance to avoid conflicts over land tenure in Indonesia in geospatial information. This agenda was motivated by the incident of discrepancies in inland area data regarding vegetation and forest cover maps between the Presidential Working Unit for Development Supervision and Control (UKP-PPP or UKP4) and the Ministry of Forestry and Environment (KLHK) when President SBY requested the data (Silviana, 2019).

The Geospatial Information Agency (Badan Informasi Geospasial/BIG) was formed to regulating the implementation of geospatial information, providing accuracy, up-to-date and legal certainty from the existing data. This agency is nothing but an overhaul of the National Survey and Mapping Coordinating Board (Badan Koordinasi Survei dan Pemetaan Nasional/BAKOSURTANAL), appointed as the organizer of Basic Geospatial Information, for the foundation of the OMP (Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 4 Tahun 2011 Tentang Informasi Geospasial, 2011). BIG is mandated to form Geospatial Information (IG) through cooperation, coordination, integration, synchronization, and encouraging maximum use (BIG, 2017). In addition, BIG is also responsible for unifying all map data information produced by the relevant sectors into an integrative map form. The aim is to avoid the later problems of overlapping information and formations from previous maps. All these responsibilities are outlined in the draft of OMP. This regulation is expected to be a standard map reference to guide policy direction for all levels of society regarding forest and land management in Indonesia.

Looking at the deforestation issue in Indonesia, several Civil Society Organizations appear to show their concern. This issue has become an exclusive topic of discussion

after the forest and land fires in Indonesia in 2015. Several analyses also reveal that the Indonesian government's national policy in 1980, which opened forest concessions by changing the function of natural forests for plantations, and transmigration and irrigation development and agricultural expansion, contributed to the increase in forest fires. Increased investment to support the economy also causes the intensity of forest and land fires in Indonesia. Development in Indonesia which continues to grow, often does not pay attention to environmental problems. Environmental damage caused by human activities occurs due to a lack of ecological insight so that the use of forests by burning is natural (Putri, 2019).

Greenpeace Indonesia is one of the branches of Greenpeace International whose goal is to save the environment (Virgy et al., 2020). With the OMP draft, it is hoped that there will be no more land licensing problems between the government, business actors, and the community as the perpetrators of forest and land fires in Indonesia. Greenpeace Indonesia has taken a responsive approach to the Indonesian government to realize OMP since the 2015 land and forest fires in Indonesia, hoping that OMP can become a legally binding basis for traditional land and forest governance. Opening petitions nationally and internationally is one of the paths taken by Greenpeace Indonesia. This action was taken to strengthen the moratorium on land clearing, which is then handed over to the Indonesian government to influence the acceleration of policy formation and collect Indonesia's commitment to forest and land protection (Putri, 2019). In addition to providing an overview of the expected CSOs, Greenpeace Indonesia collaborated with Greenpeace Southeast Asia and Global Forest Watch (GFW) to launch an interactive map platform called the "Kepo Hutan" map. This map is an open map with easy access for the community to see detailed information about company concessions and how they relate to peatlands, hotspots, and warnings against deforestation.

However, Greenpeace Indonesia's response and response to the OMP plan to the government was faced with obstacles that led to the weakening of Greenpeace Indonesia's support for the OMP agenda. This event shows that the effectiveness of the OMP for the problem of forest and land fires in Indonesia has not been fully realized. We can see the repeated occurrences of forest and land fire crises in Indonesia in 2019, which is based on the agenda for accelerating the realization of OMP to be the year limit for the completion of OMP and knowing the causes and finding solutions to these problems. Based on the background described, this research focuses on gathering information regarding the obstacles that Greenpeace Indonesia then faces in supporting the Indonesian Government's OMP agenda.

One of the studies on OMP conducted by Shahab (2016) examines the root causes of creating the OMP agenda in Indonesia to analyze the future of OMP. Shahab departs from an analysis of conflicts and overlapping claims on land that often occur in Indonesia. However, Indonesia is a developing country that still needs a national development agenda to achieve prosperity. Forest and land areas are vulnerable to this agenda, so it is necessary to create strict regulation. OMP is an agenda that aims to unify all geospatial data which can then be used as a reference for national maps for all groups. Since the establishment of the OMP in 2010 with good enthusiasm, the OMP's momentum has slowly started to decline. Until it was re-echoed during the presidential campaign of President Joko Widodo (Jokowi) in 2014, but still not developed to its full potential.

The research on the implementation of OMP by Silviana (2019) examines the governance of OMP rules for the land sector to prevent normative conflicts in land administration by using a normative legal approach as a research method. The result is that to realize orderly land administration, OMP still needs to be reviewed comprehensively, this is because there are still problems related to ownership disputes and duplication of evidence of land ownership (Silviana, 2019). Overall, Silviana (2019)'s writing focuses on the implementation of OMP which is reviewed from the point of view of national law. How then can the OMP be used as a legal reference to untie the problems of the forest and land crisis in Indonesia, such as forest and land fires which increase every year.

Greenpeace Indonesia is one of the many global environmental care groups that participate in influencing the policies of an actor who contributes to environmental destruction. One of the activities carried out is through the establishment of an advocacy network to seek support at the boundary of the problem to suppress the targeted actors. One of the studies on Greenpeace Indonesia's actions to influence the policy patterns of a target actor is an article entitled "Greenpeace Indonesia's Transnational Advocacy Network Strategy Regarding the Issue of Deforestation in Indonesia by Wilmar International", written by Virgy et al., (2020) (Virgy et al., 2020). Greenpeace Indonesia emphasizes Wilmar International to fulfil its commitments by implementing No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation (NDPE) through the establishment of a transnational advocacy network. Research by Virgy et al., (2020) focuses more on the analysis of the use of the theory of the Transnational Advocacy Network (TAN) by Keck & Sikkink, how then these strategies are implemented to suppress targets and try to influence policy making.

METHOD

The research design which is then used in this study is a qualitative research method. Therefore, in this study, the author tries to present a causal relationship between problems or issues that hinder Greenpeace Indonesia's support for the acceleration of OMP by using a policy engagement approach. This method is used to prepare a report on the barriers faced by Greenpeace Indonesia in encouraging the acceleration of OMP in Indonesia to reduce the forest and land fire crisis in Indonesia. Based on selecting research methods, namely qualitative case studies, the data collection process can be done by interviewing, internet-based research, and archival or document-based research. The process to fulfil all the data needed to analyse the research questions in this study uses primary and secondary data, with primary data in the form of an official report issued by Greenpeace Indonesia. At the same time, secondary data is a source of data by referring to the analysis of primary sources or obtained indirectly, such as internet-based research and archival or document-based research (Bakry, 2017). Data were obtained through printed or online books, articles, related news, and scientific journals, which were then analysed to answer research questions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the policy engagement approach, as an effort by Greenpeace Indonesia to influence a country's policies, some things are not in favour of Greenpeace Indonesia during the process. Some obstacles come from external and internal to Greenpeace Indonesia. However, referring to the claims of the Policy Engagement article by Court et al., pg. 14. (2006), at the points of internal barriers implicitly explain that the five barriers mentioned can then appear various and according to existing conditions. Court et al. (2006) wrote that CSOs use various approaches to influence policy so that existing barriers are also affected. In the issue of the appointment of OMP by Greenpeace Indonesia in 2015-2019, there are at least three obstacles that then have the most influence during the policy engagement process. We can analyze this issue by referring to the claims written by Court et al., (2006) carried out by Greenpeace Indonesia, namely Poor communication by CSOs; Weak links to other actors; Technical and financial capacity constraints (Court et al., 2006).

External

Problematic Political Context

As a democratic country, Indonesia should make it easy for all parties to provide input and their point of view on an issue. Then this input can be used as consideration in formulating joint policies. In line with the development of democratization in Indonesia, the era of reform, and international partners' influence, there has been an increase in the number of NGOs. At first, many NGOs were judged not to be in line with the interests of the government. However, it must be acknowledged that many NGOs, including in Indonesia, have played a significant role, especially in the process for community empowerment, so that they can better understand their rights and obligations and encourage participation in the democratic system. As part of an NGO that has an important prestige in Indonesia, Greenpeace Indonesia has taken many actions targeting government policies in overcoming environmental issues. Greenpeace Indonesia's efforts on the issue of OMP to solve the problem of forest and land fires through the unification of all geospatial data and information into one national reference map, in the process encountered obstacles in political issues.

Greenpeace Indonesia, which is eager to issue an independent interactive map platform called the "Kepo Hutan" Map, is expected to trigger the Indonesian government's seriousness in formulating OMP. However, during the period of almost 9, until the Peraturan Presiden (Perpres) expires in December 2019, the OMP has not shown partiality to the hopes and needs of the people, such as the government's claim to protect and recognize people's management areas and to resolve the socio-ecological conflict crisis (WALHI, 2020). In addition, Greenpeace Indonesia's action has drawn protests. A protest was filed by the Palm Oil Agribusiness Strategic Institute (PASPI) to Greenpeace Indonesia. PASPI considered that Greenpeace Indonesia's efforts by issuing digital interactive maps through Kepo Hutan by providing information about forests and plantation concessions seemed to violate the government's authority and violated the law Geospatial areas under the control of the government. PASPI representative, Executive Director, Tungkot Sipayung, said that the Greenpeace Indonesia map, besides not having rights, this action could potentially create conflict between institutions and the community. This digital map is odd because the maps presented on the platform are information and data in the form of unofficial copies from various related sources (Septiadi, 2016).

The acceleration of the OMP to become legally enforceable form, but with the status of the OMP, which is a political policy, cannot be separated from contestation, pressure, and elite interests. This situation urged Greenpeace Indonesia involved in a policy process that tends to be slow and not transparent. Greenpeace Indonesia, together with Forest Watch Indonesia (FWI), the Aceh Forest, Nature, and Environment Foundation (HAKA), and Bahasa Indonesia, have urged the government to open access to map data shapefile format that is easy to analyze, unlike JPEG and PDF formats. Indonesia Centre for Environmental Law (ICEL) in November 2016. They demanded transparency of public information, especially forestry data, based on Law 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure (KIP). They reclaimed the seriousness of President Joko Widodo's Government during the campaign for good governance, clean and trustworthy Government (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2016).

After being announced at a hearing at the Central Information Commission targeted at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan/ KLHK), Greenpeace Indonesia won the lawsuit after being announced at a hearing at the Central Information Commission on Monday, 24 October 2016. However, on 7 November 2016, KLHK officially filed an appeal at the State Administrative Court (Pengadilan Tinggi Tata Usaha Negara/PTUN). The KLHK action should have complied with the decision: through the availability of the KLHK issuing information and data on cover maps such as oil palm concessions, news, and data for Industrial Plantation Forests (HTI), from data on borrowed forest areas for mining, and forest concession rights (HPH.) in a shapefile format that is easy to analyze, open to the public. The Ministry of Environment and Forestry argued that the Law on Geospatial Information requires validating geospatial information before it is announced. The shapefile format has the disadvantage that it cannot contain digital signatures. Getting this information at the KIP assembly is because the information has been validated when it was announced in formats such as JPEG and PDF, which are difficult to analyze (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2016).

According to Greenpeace Indonesia, publishing maps in shapefile format that needs to be done by the government is done as a way to anticipate and reduce the number of forest fires in Indonesia (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2016). In addition, the map in shapefile format for the public relates to the direct contribution of the community, especially in protecting the forest and helping indigenous peoples, especially those who live in areas that are threatened by the operations of large companies. Through the Fire Prevention Team, Greenpeace Indonesia once faced an issue where they found hotspots in a concession located in the HTI concession in Kec. Tanah Putih, Kab. Rokan Hilir, Riau. However, according to information submitted by the

community and law enforcement officials, they could not confirm who was responsible and the owner of the concession. The existence of a response such as the Ministry of Environment and Forestry by filing an appeal can reflect the weakness of the government's commitment to transparency, thus providing difficult access for outside parties such as the Greenpeace Indonesia government to be involved in formulating and providing input on an issue. In addition, the tendency of non-compliance responses by stakeholders such as the government, which Greenpeace Indonesia targets for data, has made Greenpeace Indonesia move towards a monitoring agenda.

Greenpeace Indonesia considers that the government's action in ratifying the Paris Agreement on Climate Change should not appeal to the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. This action is a lousy barrier in the future, especially for information disclosure. KLHK's action by filing an appeal could hinder the momentum of the meeting of countries at the COP22 forum, which took place in Marrakesh, Morocco, in 2016. The lack of transparency made the promises and claims of President Joko Widodo at the COP21 event in Paris the previous year, for the implementation of the OMP as a form of Indonesia's commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 29% by 2030 is difficult (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2016). The existence of this problem reflects that the government's efforts are still minimal in formulating a policy such as the OMP, the bureaucracy in Indonesia is often a barrier to solving certain issues, and the involvement of NGOs such as Greenpeace Indonesia to get involved in the policy formulation process (Jong, 2018). Through a report entitled "Karhutla Dalam Lima Tahun," Greenpeace Indonesia asserts that the main obstacle to the realization of halting deforestation and the use of fire for land clearing is Indonesian politics itself, not science or technology (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2020). Emphasizing the significance of transparency is key to ensuring that governments can do their job correctly. The commodity sectors such as palm oil carry out their responsibilities in limiting global temperature rise to 1.5C above pre-industrial levels. Governments need to align the economy to protect biodiversity and climate that goes hand in hand with social justice (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2020).

In addition to transparency barriers, Greenpeace Indonesia is faced with difficulties in indirect supervision of the OMP process. Despite the government's ambition for the realization of OMP, the policy not to open the OMP process to the public makes it difficult for environmental activists, including Greenpeace Indonesia, to monitor and evaluate inputs to the government. And the limited access granted to CSOs shows no government alignment with community interests related to forest and land issues in Indonesia. The data entered the OMP and recognized by the

government only comes from the relevant government agencies and has not included data and information from indigenous peoples. Thus, the government closed the freedom to submit the results of data mapping conducted by the community. It is necessary to involve the outside sector to evaluate and monitor the government's performance during the OMP process. Steps that need to be taken by the government are to strengthen CSOs, open access to the public, and implement court decisions previously submitted by various environmental activists to publish data and information related to forest and land governance in Indonesia.

Internal

Poor Communication

The obstacle that most CSOs face in approaching a policy in a country is the weak side of communication conveyed to policymakers. Sometimes CSOs are less precise in predicting when the discussion process of policy formulation is taking place, then demand inaccurate input from policymakers (Court et al., 2006). Approaches that are often taken indirectly, such as those provided by policymakers, periodic reports addressed to policymakers, and "insider lobbying" in practice is ineffective in influencing policymakers. This phenomenon indicates that CSOs have less influence than working directly with policymakers (Court et al., 2006). Greenpeace in carrying out actions has characteristics that make them look like nonviolent campaigns and tend to voice a particular issue. If another environmental organization is campaigning for specific problems on a large scale, then Greenpeace will tend not to follow the action because it has been raised on the agenda (Santesson, 2011).

The OMP, a national policy of the Indonesian government, has not received much attention from the international community, including Greenpeace International. Even though Greenpeace Indonesia is part of Greenpeace International, the focus on the vision and mission of each branch makes specific communication to build support for CSOs relatively minimal. So far, there has not been a direct involvement in communication between Greenpeace International and Greenpeace Indonesia on OMP. However, this lack of direct contact did not prevent Greenpeace Indonesia from supporting OMP. Another communication that Greenpeace Indonesia is trying to build is towards Greenpeace Southeast Asia. The problem of forest and land fires in Indonesia, which impacts national borders, has prompted Greenpeace Southeast Asia to collaborate more with Greenpeace Indonesia. They primarily work to protect forests and land in Indonesia, such as the collaboration for the analysis of the moratorium issued by the Indonesian government in the 2011-2012

period. And the existence of a link for the realization of the Kepo Hutan map with Greenpeace Southeast Asia contributed to the visualization and strengthening of data to be included as data and information material on the Kepo Hutan map (Siniwi, 2016).

However, the approach through forest loss by Greenpeace Indonesia has not shown satisfactory results. Greenpeace Indonesia's strategy to raise concerns about the expansion of hotspots in Indonesia's forests and lands through the Kepo Hutan map has indeed received a good response, especially from indigenous peoples and the public concerned.

Furthermore, information about the boundaries of the plantation industry concessions that still existed was reinforced by the government's absence of an official letter or map to explain the situation (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2016a). In the end, in 2016, Pak Manan and the local community used the Kepo Hutan map platform to discover the Tohor River's development. This method could help the community reduce doubts and inspire entrepreneurs to manage their forests and lands. And in the end, it all depends on the Government (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2016a). These problems can reflect the paramount need for indigenous peoples and the public for information disclosure related to forest and land areas in Indonesia. And the communication built by Greenpeace Indonesia to the community was successful and got a good response.

On the other hand, the communication that has been tried to build OMP policymakers has not been successful. Kepo Hutan has received criticism from PASPI, who claims that Greenpeace Indonesia's actions seem to harass the government and precede its will and trigger inter-agency disputes caused by data collection used in Greenpeace Indonesia's interactive map (Septiadi, 2016). Based on the policy engagement approach, Greenpeace Indonesia needs to take a different approach and communicate directly to policymakers such as CSOs. However, Greenpeace Indonesia still faced difficulties in doing this. Judging from the government's process and developments regarding the OMP, it indicates that there is a delay, and it seems only as a political commitment in the era of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono in 2011 and is extended every two years by President Joko Widodo. This momentum established the challenge for Greenpeace Indonesia to communicate well with the government. Added to this is whether, after implementing the OMP, the public can easily access the map. Greenpeace Indonesia doubts this. The government's refusal to open access to maps and business permits because it threatens national interests and claims that maps must be confidential to protect industry in Indonesia (Rahmawati, 2019a) add to Greenpeace Indonesia's concerns in moving the OMP agenda to be discussed. The slow process of

formulating the OMP sourced from the Indonesian government makes it difficult for Greenpeace Indonesia to get involved in the issue. As new environmental problems developed, Greenpeace Indonesia's emphasis on OMP is increasingly shifted to more significant environmental issues.

Communication within the Greenpeace Indonesia agency is essential to successful support for Indonesia's OMP agenda. During the OMP discussion process from 2015 to 2019, Greenpeace Indonesia's intense communication was carried out with local environmental communities such as the Indonesian Forum for the Environment (WALHI); Forest Watch Indonesia (FWI), the Aceh Forest, Nature, and Environment Foundation (HAKA) and the Indonesian Centre for Environmental Law (ICEL) as well as other organizations such as Forest Watch Indonesia (FWI), Rainforest Action Network (RAN) and others that have a common goal namely the realization of OMP. The communication between Greenpeace Indonesia and Greenpeace Southeast Asia then opens opportunities for strengthening to achieve the targets of the OMP plan and demonstrate the existence of regional cooperation carried out by NGOs such as Greenpeace Indonesia. However, during this period, there has not been implicit or explicit direct communication between Greenpeace International and Greenpeace Indonesia, especially on raising OMP in Indonesia.

Weak links to other actors

Collaboration and network building are essential to support the achievement of the plan by a CSO. Therefore, many CSOs then collaborate with other actors who have similar interests. This opportunity will undoubtedly provide benefits, especially about information sharing and learning. However, it is rare for collaboration to build a network between CSOs to address a particular issue in practice. The act of merging two or more CSOs into one unit is increasingly tricky if differences influence it in funding, encouragement, and motivation, approach, and influence between one another. Even though CSOs, policymakers, and researchers often coexist in handling an issue or problem, it is rare to find cooperation and involvement with one another across the boundaries of existing interests (Court et al., 2006). As a result, when a CSO fails to build a network, it is easy for them to be failed in supporting a particular agenda.

To push the OMP agenda by the Indonesian government, Greenpeace Indonesia encountered obstacles in network development which then did not agree with each other for the acceleration of the OMP. Greenpeace Indonesia does not avoid trying to build partnerships with various actors who have a stake in and contribute to the

land and forest fires issues that lead to accelerating OMP. This partnership is carried out in at least three main sectors: environmental institutions, related companies, and the Indonesian government itself. This partnership can undoubtedly encourage solutions in overcoming forest and land problems through the launch of the Kepo Hutan interactive map platform. Besides, the pressure on the government by filing through legal channels (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2016b) and forming a multi-stakeholder group called the High Carbon Stock Approach Steering Group is running the High Carbon Stock (HCS) program (Putri, 2019). However, Greenpeace Indonesia has not been able to fully network with Indonesian government policymakers directly and obtain firm, sustainable commitments with companies contributing to forest and land management in Indonesia.

Greenpeace Indonesia has won commitments for sustainable forest management from Cargill, New Britain Palm Oil, Daboon, and Wilmar to Asia Pulp and Paper by pledging to actively cooperate in the HCS program Greenpeace Indonesia together with The Forest Trust. And Golden Agri-Resources (GAR) as an alternative solution to deforestation that causes forest and land fires in Indonesia. HCS is a methodology to identify land that has character for plantation development activities or long-term forest protection. This approach was conceived to protect and restore suitable tropical forest areas in landscapes that are undergoing forest conversion to be used as agricultural and plantation areas. It is also used to ensure the availability of land use rights and the livelihoods of indigenous peoples to remain secure.

Greenpeace Indonesia also urges to fulfil Wilmar's promise as one of the palm oil supplier companies alleged to have a major contribution to deforestation and fires in Indonesian forests and lands (Soraya, 2018). This attempt is essential as the background for getting a commitment to implement zero deforestation on Wilmar's products. However, in Wilmar's career as the first company to adopt NDPE, Wilmar itself has not been fully implemented (Greenpeace, 2018a). After the NDPE problem, which was not appropriately implemented, Wilmar again made a pledge that ended in weakness and was not realized. In September 2018, Greenpeace Indonesia activists took direct action without violence in the refinery area owned by Wilmar International, precisely in Bitung, North Sulawesi, by spreading a message containing a call to "Stop Dirty Palm Oil Now ". As a result, Wilmar issued a significant public commitment in 2018 to lead the implementation of cross-industry collaboration to address the deforestation crisis outside of its supply chain. This commitment was continued in December with Aidenenvironment, Mondelez, and Unilever pledged to suspend problematic suppliers and groups from engaging in deforestation actions. They also called for development by production processes,

followed by a mapping platform for implementing these commitments (Rahmawati, 2019b).

Greenpeace Indonesia's approach to collecting the promises of Wilmar and other partner companies was carried out through intensive discussions to find solutions to accelerate commitments to targets in early 2019. However, the hope was achieved, in the end, Greenpeace Indonesia could not get the correct agreement and clear realization. These commitments. Of course, this indicates that the parties involved show that they are not ready and severe to fulfill their obligations in developing supply from deforestation by the end of 2019 (Rahmawati, 2019).

The dispute between Greenpeace Indonesia and Wilmar over the demand for zero-deforestation pledges illustrates those barriers to influencing a policy formulation process from the government and policymakers and from large companies whose primary ties are in driving the Indonesian economy through production and industry that run. Therefore, Greenpeace Indonesia's struggle for the CSOs was then hindered because the interests of these companies blocked their voices. Greenpeace Indonesia then decided to end its engagement with Wilmar-Unilever-Mondelez against the backdrop of the company's weak commitment to stopping deforestation from supply chains (Rahmawati & Achmad, 2019). The absence of a network, primarily through companies and clear and robust policymakers, makes it difficult for Greenpeace Indonesia to encourage the realization of OMP as an alternative to solving forest and land problems in Indonesia. In addition, Greenpeace Indonesia needs to open opportunities for actors outside the country who have an interest in forest and land issues in Indonesia.

Partnership with the government as an essential critical direct involvement with the policy formulation process needs to be carried out by Greenpeace Indonesia to achieve the OMP plan. However, a petition has been collected to strengthen the moratorium on land clearing by 253,800 votes for the complete protection of forests and land in Indonesia (Putri, 2019). This petition is not enough to influence a policy to be implemented optimally. Until the end of the acceleration period in 2019, the OMP still has not given a sign of the government's seriousness in processing data for the OMP.

Based on Greenpeace Indonesia data, law enforcement in Indonesia is still weak, especially for the imposition of sanctions on companies that contribute to the expansion of forest and land fire areas in Indonesia. Reflecting on the cases of violations that have been described, even though severe sanctions are given, such as suspension of permits or civil and criminal lawsuits, does not provide a guarantee for companies to take steps to prevent fires from happening again, especially on

their land. The government also encourages this issue, which often does not consider previous violations in imposing sanctions on companies. The government is not responsive and consistent in its efforts to provide a deterrent effect to these companies (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2020).

Other partnerships pursued by Greenpeace Indonesia apart from industrial companies are also through the banking sector. It is known that banks have a role in supporting the progress of a business through the provision of loans and business capital. In the forest and land fires in Indonesia, in 2017, HSBC, the largest bank in Europe and participating in palm oil funding, issued a publication for commitments to implement zero deforestation (Rahmawati & Zamzami, 2017). Greenpeace investigated and requested a promise to HSBC through their new zero-deforestation policy as a step forward in sustainable financing of the palm oil sector, which accounts for most of the crisis in forest and land fires in Indonesia. The publication of this new policy by HSBC is motivated by pressure and investigations by Greenpeace International linking HSBC to the destruction of rainforests in Indonesia. This campaign is supported by hundreds of thousands of people and includes thirty thousand HSBC customers (Rahmawati & Zamzami, 2017). Through a report entitled "Dirty Bankers: How HSBC is Financing Forest Destruction for Palm Oil," Greenpeace Indonesia claims that HSBC arranged loans and credit facilities worth \$16.3 billion to six companies, namely Bumitama Agri and Goodhope Asia Holdings Singapore, Malaysia's IOI Group, Noble Group, and POSCO Daewoo Korea and Salim Indonesia/Indofood Group. HSBC is well-known as a significant creditor in lending to the palm oil industry in the world (Siniwi, 2017). The six companies are accused of destroying tropical rainforests, land grabbing, operating without permits, employing children, and draining peatlands. Greenpeace Indonesia focuses on the banking sector considering the relationship between banks and businesses producing commodities through forest and land management in Indonesia.

Greenpeace Indonesia Campaigner Representative Annisa Rahmawati said that Indonesia's rainforests had been cleared with their impact, and significant banks worldwide are involved in financing the damage. The action taken by HSBC to cut ties with palm oil companies that contribute to environmental destruction is a good step. Besides, Greenpeace is willing to monitor closely to ensure the implementation of the policy runs appropriately and is expected to be a trigger for other banks to follow HSBC's steps. HSBC is credited with being self-reliant to advance Indonesia's zero-deforestation achievement. However, promises are only promising and do not live up to what HSBC has pledged through its 2017 policy for

NDPE. Evidence of non-achievement of policy implementation published by HSBC is disclosed by the Rainforest Action Network (RAN) (Rees, 2020).

Based on the problems that are present in each sector, it can be concluded that the weakness of the network that Greenpeace Indonesia is trying to build is only issued policies and promises to implement NDPE and or are actively involved in HCS. Furthermore, the action initiatives that they convey to the public are only cursory and are motivated by pressure from various environmental activists such as Greenpeace Indonesia. Greenpeace Indonesia and other environmental activists who focus on saving the environment cannot hold on to this commitment because they are not accompanied by a written agreement or solid legal protection. So, it is easy for companies or banks to ignore the obligations they have published themselves. Greenpeace Indonesia and environmental activists can only rely on the publication of reports resulting from in-depth investigations of those claimed to have contributed to environmental destruction (Siniwi, 2017). From the description, it is undeniable that the acceleration of the OMP, which Greenpeace Indonesia is championing as one of the answers to forest and land problems in Indonesia, seems to have stagnated, and its progress is not being monitored. The misalignment of interests and views between sectors on the benefits and objectives of the OMP has made it more difficult for Greenpeace Indonesia to engage in policy formulation for sustainability.

Technical and Financial capacity constraints

Greenpeace Indonesia's ability to create a model that can give the government an idea of what CSOs will look like has become a plus for Greenpeace Indonesia. The form of the model developed by Greenpeace Indonesia to promote CSOs can be seen through the launch of the Kepo Hutan platform, which contains data and information needed by communities and groups interested in forests and land in Indonesia. This interactive map can be realized in just a year of making the Kepo Hutan interactive map, so it can reflect that the funding capacity of Greenpeace Indonesia is not a problem and the ability to develop the platform better (Coca, 2016). However, the smog problem due to forest and land fires in Indonesia is highlighted again because it has not been appropriately handled. Based on economic and political interests, the failure of NGOs to seek action and access to information can be an obstacle to be swifter in formulating a policy.

On the one hand, Suman (2020) provides a two-sided view about details about the location of fires and the stakeholders responsible for it is scarce. In contrast, on the other hand, when information is available, it is rarely easily accessible to the public. Access to this information can be the key to reconcile all actions taken by

environmental NGOs and even communities that highlight the haze and forest fires. Although the government often violates the right to access environmental information, today's society may find creative ways to gather and find out the information they need in unconventional methods by utilizing mobile technology and sensors operated by non-state actors. (Suman, 2020).

Greenpeace Indonesia collaborates with Greenpeace Southeast Asia and Global Forest Watch (GFW) to realize the Kepo Hutan map. Greenpeace Southeast Asia contributed to the visualization of the Kepo Hutan interactive map produced using open-source technology provided by GFW and as a benchmark for CSOs. As a provider and liaison with various groups with information and data related to forests and land in Indonesia, Greenpeace Indonesia will be included in the interactive map. However, the existing obstacle is the government's reluctance to open access to existing information so that the data presented is still limited and only in the form of unofficial copies from various sources. This deficiency can undoubtedly lead to the weakening of the discussion on the acceleration of OMP in Indonesia (Suman, 2020). Greenpeace Indonesia is technically hampered in obtaining more conservation data to complement the Kepo Hutan platform and push for CSOs as a national reference. Greenpeace Indonesia's access to data and information is essential to hold companies and the government accountable, which is why Greenpeace Indonesia is often involved in legal battles to force the government to release more detailed forest concessions and high-quality ownership data. Greenpeace Indonesia believes that obtaining this data can fulfill the demands of the public and other actors who have concerns, especially regarding forest and land fires. Concerning this data, it will enter and be on the Kepo Hutan interactive map with the goal of OMP getting complete data with the government as an empowered who can refer to Greenpeace Indonesia's Kepo Hutan (Coca, 2016). This obstacle makes it difficult for Greenpeace Indonesia to submit inputs and suggestions to policymakers for OMP because official data is difficult to access for the completeness of the map model that Greenpeace Indonesia and its partners are currently working on.

OMP itself is a plan of the Indonesian government that is quite minimally discussed by the public except for those interested in forest and land issues such as Greenpeace Indonesia and indigenous peoples who live side-by-side with forest and land areas. Therefore, accelerating the realization of OMP has not received much attention, especially from the international community. In its efforts to target the resolution of environmental issues, Greenpeace Indonesia is more likely to collaborate with other environmental activists through investigations and

preparation of reports used as weapons to pressure targets to change the direction of their policies and behaviour.

CONCLUSION

This research focuses on the question of what obstacles Greenpeace Indonesia faces in pushing for Indonesia's One Map Policy (OMP), which attempts to answer using a policy engagement approach undertaken by Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), including Greenpeace Indonesia. This approach explains the relationship between CSOs, evidence, and policy processes and the influence of policies work and are closely interrelated to create policy engagement in responding to a particular issue. When the three of them run in sync, good policy engagement will achieve results that are on target, however, when one of them is not working, it should create obstacles which then hinder policy engagement so that the target issue does not stop. Obstacles in building policy engagement exist from two sides, namely internal and external. Internal barriers include insufficient capacity; strategy of using evidence is not effective; weak communication; weak network; and weak technical & financial capabilities. In addition, there are major external obstacles, namely political problems. Greenpeace Indonesia as part of the CSO is trying to push for the realization of OMP as an alternative solution to the prolonged problem of land and forest fires in Indonesia. Among the efforts made include the threat of strengthening the weapons moratorium through weaponry petitions which are then submitted to the government as well as major actions such as the launching of the interactive map platform 'Kepo Hutan' which is expected to be used as a model for the form of OMP needed by the community.

However, the internal process, up to the deadline promised by the government to realize the OMP, namely in 2019, in fact the OMP has not provided a point of hope for resolving the problem of land and forest fires in Indonesia. This then becomes a sign of weakness in pushing Greenpeace Indonesia to achieve the OMP agenda in Indonesia. Based on the policy engagement approach, the obstacles that Greenpeace Indonesia then faces are external obstacles. External obstacles stem from political problems that exist in Indonesia itself. Where OMP is part of a political policy process, the influence of contestation, pressure and elite interests has become an obstacle for Greenpeace Indonesia to be involved in a policy process that seems slow and not transparent. In fact, compiling data and information is important not only for Greenpeace Indonesia but also for indigenous peoples and the public who have an interest in the OMP issue.

While the internal obstacles faced by Greenpeace Indonesia include the weak communication that Greenpeace Indonesia is trying to develop. Even though Greenpeace Indonesia is able to build good communication, especially with indigenous peoples, essential communication such as with policy makers is still not optimal, this is indicated by the criticism received by PASPI regarding the launch of the Greenpeace Indonesia forest kepo map platform which is considered to be harassing the government and fulfilling the government's wishes, thing it is claimed that this can lead to misunderstandings and disputes between agencies due to data collection used in the interactive map of the forest group. The next obstacle is the weak development network, in which Greenpeace Indonesia has not maximally built a network with the government and also companies that are linked to the problem of land and forest fires in Indonesia as well as pushing the OMP agenda in Indonesia. Commitment and seriousness are considered by Greenpeace Indonesia in building a meaningful and sustainable network. And the internal obstacles faced by Greenpeace Indonesia in pushing for Indonesia's OMP agenda are technical and funding issues. With the interactive map feature of protected forests, Greenpeace Indonesia will have no difficulty in developing this platform in an effort to push the OMP agenda in Indonesia. However, technically Greenpeace Indonesia was hampered, especially in obtaining maximum conservation data as a complement to the forest kepo platform and then aimed at the OMP model as a national reference. These data and information are very important for Greenpeace Indonesia to obtain accountability from companies and the government for managing forests and land in Indonesia. Because of these things, Greenpeace Indonesia's efforts to accelerate the OMP agenda in Indonesia and as an alternative to solving the problem of forest and land fires in Indonesia have been hampered and have not provided a picture of success like Greenpeace Indonesia's previous actions. And the absence of any information on the continuation of the OMP agenda shows that the government has not put its full seriousness into efforts to resolve the problem of forest and land protection in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Annisa Rahmawati, & Achmad, R. Y. (2019, September 3). *Greenpeace menghentikan keterlibatan dengan Wilmar-Unilever-Mondelez karena lemahnya komitmen mereka dalam menghentikan deforestasi dari rantai pasok - Greenpeace Indonesia*. Greenpeace Indonesia. <https://www.greenpeace.org/indonesia/publikasi/3677/greenpeace-menghentikan-keterlibatan-dengan-wilmar-unilever-mondelez-karena-lemahnya-komitmen-mereka-dalam-menghentikan-deforestasi-dari-rantai-pasok/>
- Bakry, U. S. (2017). METODE KUALITATIF DAN KUANTITATIF DALAM PENELITIAN HUBUNGAN INTERNASIONAL. In Dimaswids (Ed.), *METODE PENELITIAN HUBUNGAN INTERNASIONAL* (II, hal. 68–69). Pustaka Pelajar.
- BIG. (2017, Januari 28). *One Map Policy Satu Peta untuk Satu Indonesia | Geospasial untuk Negeri*. Pusat Pengelolaan dan Penyebarluasan Informasi Geospasial Badan Informasi Geospasial (BIG). <https://portal.inasdi.or.id/home/node/64>
- Coca, N. (2016, Oktober 19). *Mapping an end to fires in Indonesia with Kepo Hutan - MobLab*. MobLab. <https://mobilisationlab.org/stories/mapping-end-fires-indonesia-kepo-hutan/>
- Court, J., Mendizabal, E., Osborne, D., & Young, J. (2006). Policy
- Greenpeace. (2007). *Annual Report 07*. greenpeace.org
- Greenpeace. (2009, Agustus 5). *Victory for the Boreal Forest! Kimberly-Clark announces new paper policy | Greenpeace International*. Greenpeace International. <https://wayback.archive-it.org/9650/20200403023708/http://p3-raw.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/features/victory-for-the-boreal-forest/>
- Greenpeace. (2017). *Bankir kotor*. https://wayback.archive-it.org/9650/20200418052302/http://p3-raw.greenpeace.org/international/Global/international/publications/forests/2017/GP_DirtyBankers_Report_LowRes_BAH.pdf

- Greenpeace. (2018). *Final Countdown - now or never to reform the palm oil industry*.
<https://www.greenpeace.org/international/publication/18455/the-final-countdown-forests-indonesia-palm-oil/>
- Greenpeace Indonesia. (2016a). *PUBLISH MAPS, STOP FIRES, SAVE FORESTS*.
<https://www.greenpeace.org/static/planet4-southeastasia-stateless/2019/04/b7ba3691-b7ba3691-kepo-hutan-transparency-briefer-english.pdf>
- Greenpeace Indonesia. (2016b, Oktober 9). *Transparansi Peta, Kunci Keberhasilan Pengelolaan Hutan Berkelanjutan - Greenpeace Indonesia*. Greenpeace .
<https://www.greenpeace.org/indonesia/siaran-pers/2363/transparansi-peta-kunci-keberhasilan-pengelolaan-hutan-berkelanjutan/>
- Greenpeace Indonesia. (2020). *KARHUTLA DALAM 5 TAHUN TEAKHIR*. Greenpeace Southeast Asia-Indonesia.
- Jong, H. N. (2018, Maret 8). *Public access to Indonesian plantation data still mired in bureaucracy*.
- Putri, B. (2019). Upaya Greepeace Dalam Menangani Kerusakan Lingkungan Pasca Kebakaran Hutan Dan Lahan Di Indonesia. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9), 1689–1699.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Raco, J. (2018). *Metode penelitian kualitatif: jenis, karakteristik dan keunggulannya* (A. L & J. B. Soedarmanta (ed.)). PT Grasindo.
<https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/mfzuj>
- Rahmawati, A. (2019a, April 24). *Tackling Deforestation in the Palm Oil Industry: Quo Vadis Private and Public Sectors Commitments?* Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung - Southeast Asia. <https://th.boell.org/en/2019/04/24/tackling-deforestation-palm-oil-industry-quo-vadis-private-and-public-sectors-commitments>
- Rahmawati, A., & Zamzami. (2017, Februari 21). *Kebijakan Baru “Nol Deforestasi” HSBC Langkah Maju Keberlanjutan Pendanaan Kelapa Sawit - Greenpeace Indonesia*. Greenpeace Indonesia.
<https://www.greenpeace.org/indonesia/siaran-pers/2323/kebijakan-nol-deforestasi-hsbc/>

- Rees, T. (2020, Februari 8). *HSBC has not cut its ties to deforestation despite pledge, say activists.* The Telegraph. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2020/02/08/hsbc-has-not-cut-ties-deforestation-despite-pledge-say-activists/>
- Santesson, P. (2011). *A Study of Greenpeace Campaigns*. Södertörn University.
- Septiadi, A. (2016, Maret 16). PASPI: Peta Digital Greenpeace Lecehkan Pemerintah - Majalah Sawit Indonesia. *Majalah Sawit Indonesia*. <https://sawitindonesia.com/paspi-peta-digital-greenpeace-lecehkan-pemerintah/>
- Shahab, N. (2016). Indonesia : One Map Policy. *Open Government Partnership*.
- Silviana, A. (2019). Kebijakan Satu Peta (One Map Policy) Mencegah Konflik di Bidang Administrasi Pertanahan. *Administrative Law and Governance Journal*, 2(2), 195–205. <https://doi.org/10.14710/alj.v2i2.195-205>
- Siniwi, R. M. (2016, Maret 16). *Greenpeace Launches Interactive Map to Track Deforestation, Fires in Indonesia.* JAKARTA GLOBE. <https://jakartaglobe.id/news/greenpeace-launches-interactive-map-track-deforestation-fires-indonesia/>
- Siniwi, R. M. (2017, Januari 17). *Greenpeace's "Dirty Bankers" Report Accuses HSBC of Funding Deforestation in Indonesia.* Jakarta Globe. <https://jakartaglobe.id/context/greenpeace-slams-hsbc-funding-destructive-indonesian-palm-oil-firms/>
- Soraya, A. (2018, September 19). *Greenpeace : Wilmar Internasional Biang Deforestasi di Indonesia - Tirto.ID.* Tirto.id. <https://tirto.id/greenpeace-wilmar-internasional-biang-deforestasi-di-indonesia-cZUD>
- Suman, A. B. (2020). Making visible politically masked risks : Inspecting unconventional data visualization of the Southeast Asian haze. *Data Visualization in Society*, April. <https://doi.org/10.5117/9789463722902>
- Virgy, M. A., Djuyandi, Y., & Darmawan, W. B. (2020). Strategi Jaringan Advokasi Transnasional Greenpeace Indonesia Terkait Isu Deforestasi Hutan Indonesia oleh Wilmar International. *Journal of Political Issues*, 1(2), 74–91. <https://doi.org/10.33019/jpi.v1i2.9>

- WALHI. (2020a). *KEBIJAKAN SATU PETA UNTUK RAKYAT BUKAN KORPORASI JAKARTA*. Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia (WALHI). <https://www.walhi.or.id/kebijakan-satu-peta-untuk-rakyat-bukan-korporasi>
- WALHI. (2020b, Agustus 27). *Kebijakan Satu Peta menuju Indonesia Maju“Pengakuan Wilayah Adat Dalam Kebijakan satu Peta”* | WALHI. Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia (WALHI). <https://www.walhi.or.id/kebijakan-satu-peta-menuju-indonesia-maju-pengakuan-wilayah-adat-dalam-kebijakan-satu-peta>