



Agenda Setting for Food Estate Policy in Multiple Stream Frameworks (MSF) Perspective: Case in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia

Farid Zaky Yopiannor^{1,2*}, Abdul Yuli Andi Gani³, Lely Indah Mindarti⁴, Mochamad Rozikin⁵

¹Doctoral Program of Administrative Science, Faculty of Administrative Science, Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia; faridzakyyopiannorfiaub@gmail.com (F.Z.Y.).

²Departement of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya, Indonesia.

^{3,4,5}Faculty of Administrative Science, Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia; andiganifia@ub.ac.id (A.Y.A.G.) lelyindahmindarti@gmail.com (L.I.M.) mail.rozikin01@gmail.com (M.R.).

Abstract. Agenda setting is critical to public policy due to impacts on subsequent policy processes. In 2020, The Indonesian government has issued a food estate policy in response to FAO's warning of a food crisis due to the Covid-19 pandemic. This policy has also been included in the National Strategic Project (PSN) as stipulated through Presidential Regulation No. 109/2020. This policy aims to create new paddy fields in order to maintain national food stock needs, especially rice, by prioritizing intensification and extensification of paddy fields. Now this program has received serious attention and is considered to have failed. The failure of food estates can often be attributed to the lack of community involvement in the planning and implementation of such projects. Applying the multiple streams framework, this study found two agenda setting failures, namely failure to define the problem from policy entrepreneurs and skipping the policy formulation stage. The study recommends revisiting agenda setting and adding participation streams to open up space for deliberation in decision-making through the participation of Dayak customary council institutions through their local wisdom and knowledge.

Keywords: Agenda Setting, Food Estate, Multiple Streams Framework, Policy Entrepreneurs, Policy Formulation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Several recent studies have shown that agenda setting is a crucial factor as the circulation of the main entrance in the cycle of policy stages so that it holds a key position to determine the success of a chosen policy (Bali & Halpin, 2021; Brasil & Jones, 2020; DeLeo & Duarte, 2022; Hansson-Forman et al., 2021; Herweg et al., 2022; Leppänen & Liefverink, 2022; Tembo & Lim, 2023).

In the last two decades, MSF studies have become the main concept to describe the public policy agenda setting process in various countries. There have been many recent studies that use public policy agenda setting, especially using the multiple stream frameworks initiated by Jhon Kingdon. He developed the model in his book, *Agenda, Alternatives and Public Policy* (Cairney & Jones, 2016), which was revised in 2014 after much attention from experts and has become one of the most popular theories of public policy over the past few decades. According to Kingdon, three independent currents must come together at a critical moment for a policy to be formed (Kingdon, 2014).

Since Kingdon's original work, the multiple streams framework (MSF) has been applied to various policy settings, such as health policy, transportation, energy, education, and foreign policy (Rüb, 2016). Furthermore, examining the application of the MSF in 311 articles reviewed by public policy scholars showed that the theory has been applied in 65 countries. They also divided the articles into 22 different policy domains. Nearly 80% of the articles addressed five policy domains: health, environment, governance, education, and welfare (Jones et al., 2016).

This study uses MSF to understand the agenda setting of the food estate policy in Indonesia. Food estate is a large-scale crop cultivation business activity carried out with the concept of agriculture as an industrial system based on evidence in the form of science and technology, capital, and modern organization and management. The basic concept of food estate is based on the integration of sectors and subsectors in an agribusiness system by utilizing resources optimally and sustainably, managed professionally, supported by quality human resources, environmentally sound appropriate technology and strong institutions. Food estate is directed towards an agribusiness system that is firmly rooted in rural areas based on the empowerment of indigenous or local communities which is the foundation of regional development. The priority commodities to be developed in this food estate are rice, corn, soybeans, cassava, sweet potatoes, peanuts, sorghum, fruits, vegetables, sago, oil palm, sugarcane, and cattle or chicken (Muhardiono & Hamdani, 2021).

According to the Government's explanation, the basic things related to the urgency of this program are: First, the world's food demand is increasing in proportion to population growth. Second, the world food supply is not proportional to the demand. Third, with the increasingly high rate of conversion of agricultural land (especially in Java and Bali) and the increasing national food demand, food has become a strategic commodity. Fourth, the outflow of foreign exchange to finance imports of several food commodities. Fifth, the availability of potential land as food reserve land is quite extensive (especially outside Java and Bali) but has not been optimally utilized, and requires considerable investment capital, on the other hand, government funds are limited, so it is

necessary to play the role of investors in developing food estate, with the stage of paying attention to or protecting the interests of local communities (Badan Litbang Pertanian, 2020).

The public policy process is the set of interconnected procedures that, when followed in order, yield public policy. While there are researchers who contend that the steps involved in formulating public policy are not always sequential, the consensus is that agenda framing is the first step. The conventional chronology of the policy process in the contemporary era comprises agenda setting, formulation, decision-making, implementation, and evaluation; it is adapted from Lasswell's seven-stage model. Public policy is an essential tool used by governments globally to manage political and socioeconomic matters of the state. Public policy encompasses government acts and the underlying intentions that guide these actions (Birkland, 2015).

In the wake of the COVID-19 outbreak, food insecurity has risen to the forefront of Indonesian politics. In addition to affecting people's health, this pandemic has ripple effects across Indonesia's food security system. A worldwide food crisis could be imminent due to COVID-19, according to the FAO research. In light of this danger, Indonesia developed a strategy to ensure the nation's food supply by clearing enormous areas of land to plant massive food crops, a practice known as food estates. (Cabinet Secretary, 2020).

Among the many theoretical frameworks that have been developed for the purpose of policymaking, Kingdon's multiple-streams framework is still widely used and is specifically designed for agenda framing (Kingdon, 2014). This study applies the multiple-streams framework to aid in understanding agenda setting for the food estate policy. One of the key themes of the Government Work Plan for the years 2020–2024 is economic recovery and structural change, and this food estate programme aims to achieve both of those goals by increasing national food reserves and decreasing reliance on food imports (Bappenas, 2023).

The main objective of this study is to apply the multiple-streams framework (MSF) to describe agenda setting for the food estate policy in Kalimantan, Indonesia. Past studies have focused largely on reviewing technical issues that arose during the policy implementation and evaluation phases. In view of the set objective, this study is expected to contribute to filling the knowledge gap regarding agenda setting and the influence of agenda-setting outcomes on post-agenda-setting policy phases, particularly policy implementation. This contribution will help decision and policy-makers focus on realizing a technically feasible and holistically acceptable agenda-setting outcome for the success of subsequent policy phases in future policy processes. In addition, the study uncovers the limitations of applying multiple-streams frameworks in the agriculture sector policy process.

Four years have passed since the policy initiative was adopted; however, several studies have reported the government's failure to achieve the policy objectives. Several studies have revealed the implementation challenges of this policy; these studies mostly attribute the challenges to the failure of the policy and recommend that the policy be revised (Greenpeace, 2022; Hartono, 2021; Octania, 2021).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Agenda Setting and The Multiple Stream Framework

Agenda setting is defined by Birkland (2020) as the process by which concerns and potential solutions are brought to the attention of the public and elite, or how different groups and individuals work to bring attention to or divert focus from certain issues. Putting an issue or problems on government agendas for consideration by policy-makers is the first step in the policy process, followed by identifying potential solutions to the issue. Recognising the presence of problems and the value of government intervention is an essential part of agenda setting.

The Multiple Streams Framework, introduced by Jhon Kingdon, is a widely recognized theoretical framework that seeks to explain how policy agendas are formed and policies are implemented. According to Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework, policy formation and implementation are complex processes that involve the convergence of three independent streams: the problem stream, the policy stream, and the political stream (Mukherjee, 2015).

The problem stream refers to the recognition of issues or problems that require policy attention. This stream includes events or conditions that bring certain issues to the forefront of public concern. The policy stream involves the generation of policy alternatives and proposals by various actors, such as government agencies, interest groups, and experts. These policy alternatives are often developed independent of the problem stream and reflect different solutions to address the identified problems. The political stream, on the other hand, encompasses the political context and dynamics within which policy decisions are made. This includes the political climate, public opinion, interest group pressure, and the influence of key actors and institutions. Kingdon argues that policy change occurs when these three streams come together in what he calls a "policy window," which is a favorable opportunity for policy solutions to be adopted. The Multiple Streams Framework provides valuable insights into the policy process by highlighting the interplay between problems, policies, and politics.

Furthermore, Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework identifies additional key elements that influence the policy change process (Hooper et al., 2019). These elements include the policy window, which refers to a specific time period where all three streams align, creating an opportunity for policy change to occur. During this policy window, policymakers are more likely to be receptive to new ideas and solutions, which can lead to the adoption

of new policies or the alteration of existing ones. Additionally, Kingdon emphasizes the role of policy entrepreneurs in the policy change process. Policy entrepreneurs are individuals or groups who actively promote and push for specific policy solutions. They play a crucial role in bridging the gap between the three streams and advocating for their preferred policy solutions. Overall, the Multiple Streams Framework provides a comprehensive and dynamic perspective on policy change. It takes into account the multiple factors and streams that contribute to the process, such as problem identification, policy development, and political dynamics. Through its focus on the problem, policy, and politics streams, Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework offers a valuable lens for understanding how major policy changes come about (Hooper et al., 2019).

In addition, the Multiple Streams Framework also sheds light on policy termination or abandonment. It allows policymakers to gain insights into why certain policies fail to achieve their intended goals or lose support over time. By analyzing the interactions between the problem stream, the policy stream, and the politics stream, policymakers can identify the underlying reasons for policy failure. This framework recognizes that policies may be terminated or abandoned if there is a lack of alignment between the three streams. For example, if there is a lack of public demand or awareness of a particular problem in the problem stream, policymakers may be less motivated to develop and implement policies to address it.

Furthermore, if there is a lack of feasible policy solutions in the policy stream or if there are strong political constraints in the politics stream, policymakers may be reluctant to continue supporting a policy that is deemed unattainable or politically unpopular. Moreover, Kingdon's multiple streams framework highlights the importance of timing in policy change. Timing plays a crucial role in the Multiple Streams Framework as it suggests that policy change is more likely to occur during a "window of opportunity". This window of opportunity occurs when the problem, policy, and politics streams align and create a favorable environment for change. During this window of opportunity, policy proposals are more likely to gain attention and be considered for implementation. In conclusion, the Multiple Streams Framework developed by Kingdon is a valuable tool for analyzing policy change and understanding the dynamics involved. It takes into account the complexity of the policy process, acknowledging that multiple factors and streams contribute to policy change. Furthermore, the framework recognizes the interplay between problem recognition, policy proposals, and political factors. It emphasizes the importance of alignment between these streams and timing in order to successfully enact policy change.

3. METHODS

The article utilizes a case study methodology to examine a trajectory of food estate policy agenda using MSF, which provides a versatile instrument for empirical research, particularly for case studies. Garson (2002) suggest that the case study is a conventional approach used in social science and research in public policy. It serves as a beneficial tool for fields focused on practical application and public processes. A case study can be conducted to analyze an organization, institution, or a specific unit, such as a country or agency. This type of study aims to explore and examine the chosen subject (Akgul et al., 2019; Yin, 2003).

This article use the acronym MSF within the framework of a case study that examines the processes involved in the establishment of food estate policy in Indonesia. Data were gathered from several sources that are very appropriate for analyzing a singular instance, such as a food estate. For this purpose, we utilized historical records such as statistics, newspapers, and institutional data, as well as documents like governmental, legislative, and international reports. Additionally, we relied on records of interviews conducted with key players working in the food estate policy community. A total of eleven interviews were done with individuals from various professions, including policy analyst functional position (Jabatan Fungsional Analisis Kebijakan / JFAK) in Ministry of Coordinating of economy, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livelihood and Forestry and members of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that work in environment advocacy, such as Greenpeace Indonesia, WALHI, Pantau Gambut, FIAN Indonesia, Save Our Borneo. The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured and informal manner. The researchers used purposive sampling to choose individuals who were willing to provide insights and expertise on the food estate. All participants has extensive experience in the agriculture system. Triangulation, when allowed, can offer a valuable and diverse range of evidence for analyzing an organization from multiple viewpoints.

4. RESULTS (12PT, BOLD)

4.1. Food Estate Policy Agenda in Multiple Stream Frameworks Perspective

According to John Kingdon (2014), the emergence and decline of issues on the agenda are influenced by the interaction of three key factors: problems, policies, and politics. These streams function mostly autonomously from each other, as they typically have their own regulations, prioritize various actors, and are influenced by distinct internal dynamics. However, during opportune moments (when favorable opportunities arise), knowledgeable policy entrepreneurs can assist in facilitating the convergence of the three streams, which significantly enhances the likelihood that an issue will be given substantial consideration by policymakers. In other words, when a viable solution is linked to a public issue that is considered significant by the general public and policymakers, and when the political circumstances are favorable for change, an opportunity for policy

implementation arises. Policy entrepreneurs should promptly capitalize on the opportunity and advocate for government intervention.

4.2. The Problem Stream: The Decline of Rice Production

Why would policymakers pay serious attention to food estate at some times but not at others? According to Kingdon (1995), problems come to the attention of policymakers via indicators, focusing events and feedback. Indicators can illuminate the scope and severity of a problem through the monitoring of natural or social processes, activities and events. Increases in the price of foodstuffs, including rice, are recurrent at certain times. These high prices are due to reduced supplies in the market as a result of reduced rice production. Reduced production is caused by, among others, crop failure due to pest attacks, diseases, natural disasters due to weather changes and climate change including the occurrence of the El Nino phenomenon.

According to data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), Indonesia's rice production has tended to decline in the past decade. Meanwhile, data from the Ministry of Agriculture noted that over the past six years (2017-2022) there has also been a decline in production from 59.7 million tons in 2017 to 54.3 million tons in 2022. With a population of 275.8 million in 2022 and rice consumption of 111.58 kg/capita/year, 30.77 million tons of rice are needed. In 2021, from a harvest area of 10.412 million hectares, 31.36 million tons of rice can be produced. Worryingly, the harvest area and rice production continue to decline from year to year. In 2018, a harvest area of 11.378 million hectares produced 33.94 million tons of rice. This means that in four years there was a decrease in rice harvest area of 966 thousand hectares. This is a very large number. Rice productivity did improve slightly, but it was not able to cover the magnitude of the decline in harvest area (Octania, 2021).

In addition to crop failures caused by weather such as floods and droughts as well as pests and diseases, the decline in rice production from year to year is also caused by the decreasing food agricultural land, especially rice fields. The reduction in agricultural land is due to the conversion of agricultural land into non-agricultural land.

COVID-19 Pandemic as a focusing event that drive to agenda of food estate policy. The pandemic has highlighted the vulnerability of Indonesia's food supply chain and food production processes, leading to increased food insecurity and nutrition concerns. This has led to a renewed focus on the food estate program as a means to address these issues.

Failed Previous Programs that affect feedback. The history of failed food estate programs in Indonesia, such as the PLG Food Estate Program in Central Kalimantan during President Soeharto's era, the Bulungan Food Estate Program in East Kalimantan (2011), the Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate Program in Papua (2011), and the Ketapang Food Estate Program in West Kalimantan (2013), has raised questions about the assumptions behind the decision to establish new food estate programs (Kamin & Altamaha, 2019).

4.3. The Political Stream: Food Estate as The National Strategic Project

A model of agenda-setting would be incomplete without attention to shifting political opportunities. The multiple streams model focuses on three key political factors affecting agendas: the national mood, organised political forces, and administrative or legislative turnover (Kingdon, 2014). Kingdon assumes that policymakers sense a 'national mood', perhaps via public opinion polls, and that this mood makes it more likely that the government will pay more attention to some problems and solutions than to others (Zahariadis, 2016). An 'anti-government' mood, for example, might prevent proposals for large-scale government intervention in the economy and society from achieving a prominent place on the decision agenda. Interest groups may contribute to policymakers' understanding of the

public's preferences (or at least the preferences of some segments of it) and of how various solutions will affect target groups (thus influencing policy makers perceptions of solution feasibility). The balance of interest group support and opposition to a policy may shape policy makers agendas and selection of alternatives (Kingdon, 2014).

Coordinating Minister for the Economy, Airlangga Hartarto, held a press conference on April 28, 2020 and said that President Joko Widodo had asked BUMN, regional and Ministry of Agriculture to open new land for rice fields, namely wetlands and peat. President Jokowi reminded that the risk of a food crisis conveyed by the World Food Organization (FAO) may occur as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. In an effort to quickly respond to FAO's warning, the government issued a plan to build a food estate on the land of the former Peat-land Development (PLG) Project in Central Kalimantan. The rice field printing program aims to maintain the fulfillment of national food stock needs, especially rice with priority activities of land intensification and extensification. The development of this food estate is included in the National Strategic Project (PSN) based on Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No. 109 of 2020 concerning the Third Amendment to residential Regulation Number 3 of 2016 concerning the Acceleration of the Implementation of National Strategic Projects. The government's plan to re-open the ex-PLG land to be used as a location for new rice fields has raised fears of repeated fires on peat-lands. The results of Pantau Gambut's analysis of the burned area show that the ex-PLG area is still subject to fires every year. In 2019, it was recorded that the burned area on the ex-PLG land reached 167,000 hectares (Gambut, 2021).

4.4. The Policy Stream: Agriculture Corporation VS Farmer Empowerment

In addition to a problem stream, Kingdon (2014) envisions a policy stream in which solutions are being generated by specialists and experts within policy communities and are waiting to be attached to the salient problems of the day. While there are many potential solutions, only a select few are chosen and implemented. Kingdon argues that proposals must pass a threshold test of technical feasibility and congruence with reigning values to be selected. Moreover, solutions must be perceived as staying within budgetary limits. 'Budgetary considerations prevent policy makers and those close to them from seriously considering some alternatives, initiatives, and proposals' (Kingdon, 2014). While Kingdon does not dwell on the point, it is worth noting that these criteria are subject to change and that political actors will try to shape the public and policymakers' perceptions about them. Even budgetary constraints, which appear 'objective', are subject to varying interpretations. For our purposes, the most important point that Kingdon and others make about solutions is the need to have one: problems that have no solutions attached to them are less likely to make it onto governmental and decision agendas. The public is also less likely to worry about problems when they feel there is nothing to be done about them. As detailed further below, this characteristic is one of the most critical aspects of food estate policy politics: for food estate to rise and stay high on agendas, the public and policymakers must be convinced not only that we should do something to combat food crisis, but that we can.

4.5. The Role of Policy Window: Covid-19 Momentum As An Entry Point

Kingdon argued that, in any given policy domain, there are brief periods the "policy windows" where an alignment can be perceived between political conditions, a specific problem at hand, and the existence of a policy idea that could provide an effective solution to that problem. Kingdon further claimed that policy entrepreneurs actors who can be inside or outside of government and who work closely with others are able to perceive these windows of opportunity and use them to promote their favored policy solution onto governmental decision-making agendas. "Solutions come to be coupled with problems, proposals linked with political exigencies, and alternatives introduced when the agenda changes".

Timing is critical in agenda-setting. The concept of a "policy window" or "opportunity opening" through which an issue may be placed onto a government agenda drives home the point that the agenda-setting process is sometimes governed by contingencies that force problems to the forefront (Kingdon, 2014). Four types of policy windows are common. Policy actors need to be aware of these different types of opportunities for agenda entrance, and be prepared to take advantage of them when they occur. These include:

- (1) routinized windows: in which routinized procedural events such as budget cycles dictate agenda openings;
- (2) discretionary windows: where individual political preference on the part of decision-makers dictates window openings;
- (3) random windows: where unforeseen events, such as disasters or scandals, open agenda windows;
- (4) and spill-over windows: where related issues are drawn into already opened windows in other sectors or issue areas.

Based on the above categories, the covid-19 pandemic is included in random windows because of its unpredictable nature and becomes an extraordinary event. The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic has caused enormous turmoil and tragedy. Governments around the world have sought to respond to this systemic shock through a variety of policy actions. No matter their effectiveness, these actions have made explicit the fundamental responsibility of the state to protect citizens from harm.

John Kingdon (2014) discussed how policy windows emerge through alignment among specific policy problems, political forces, and proposed policy responses. During policy windows, it becomes possible for change to occur, driven by the agenda-setting of policy entrepreneurs. Crises have long been seen as creating policy windows. The implication is that somehow a crisis can always be exploited in ways that will advance a specific agenda. But Kingdon's conception of the policy window encourages us to be considerably more judicious in how we think about any given crisis and the degree to which it might be exploited to advance an agenda. Any crisis might fall into Kingdon's "problem" stream, but for that crisis to then trigger specific policy change, there must be an alignment of political will and the availability of a viable and appealing policy response to the problem.

4.6. Policy Entrepreneur: The Role of President Jokowi and Local Government

Policy entrepreneurs are defined as advocates of policy change who utilize their knowledge, expertise, policy ideas, reputation, policy advocacy, and policy networks in the hope of future gains. Policy entrepreneurs are political actors who work to promote policy ideas or advocate for the merits of an idea. The policy entrepreneur actors in the food estate policy are the President and the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs. These two actors actively capitalize on their ideas so that this food estate policy can be formulated, and then implemented. President Joko Widodo's administration gives great priority to the food estate policy, not only technically as an effort to build a food reserve system, but also politically as a way to build a legacy of his administration in the form of national food barns or food production centers.

Table 1: President Jokowi's Direction as A Policy Entrepreneur of Food Estate.

No.	Date	Type of coordination meeting	Meeting title	Conclusion and direction
1.	July 29, 2020	Limited meeting	Limited coordination meeting on food	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Based on information from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and the Ministry of Defense, there are 1 million hectares of land in Central Kalimantan prepared for Food Estate; Leaders of Ministries and Institutions should note that the Coordinating Minister for the Economy has submitted 3 Food Estate locations: Central Kalimantan, South Sumatra and Papua; Offtakers are critical to Food Estate development
2.	September 23, 2020	Technical limited meeting	Limited coordination meeting on food estate	Presidential directive: Immediately determine who does what, how to do it, and who coordinates it. Focus on development in Central Kalimantan and North Sumatra
3.	January 11, 2021	National work meeting	National working meeting on agricultural development 2023	Presidential directives: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Development of good agricultural development schemes to support food security; Completion of Central Kalimantan and North Sumatra Food Estate in 2021 and will be used as pilot project provinces. Search for suitable land for agriculture; Re-evaluate fertilizer subsidies
4.	April 25, 2022	Internal meeting	Internal meeting on accelerating the completion of national strategic projects (PSN)	Presidential directive: The government should focus on 2 Food Estate areas first and not jump anywhere else.

Source: Kemenko Bidang Perekonomian, 2020.

The table above shows President Jokowi's efforts to provide strategic directions related to the formation of the food estate policy. In addition, the table above also shows the President's role as a policy entrepreneur so that this food estate policy can be formulated and implemented. This role can be seen from the routine timeframe where the President leads coordination meetings and provides direction to elements of the Ministries and Institutions involved in the food estate policy.

Meanwhile, Governor Sugianto Sabran is very optimistic that the food estate program will succeed. This program is considered to have a broad impact in various sectors for the community. "*Central Kalimantan has natural resources that are very suitable for this national strategic program,*" said Sugianto Sabran. The governor immediately moved quickly to follow up on the president's direction, including preparing supporting infrastructure for the food estate area. The supporting infrastructure aims to realize a reliable, integrated, and sustainable road network system in the food estate area in Central Kalimantan Province.

It is hoped that the benefits of infrastructure development and improvement will not only be felt by workers in the food estate area but also benefit the entire community to carry out activities and fulfill their daily needs. The Provincial Government's steps are also in line with national priority programs that emphasize the importance of community welfare.

The food estate program in Central Kalimantan has many positive impacts, including infrastructure development, employment and economic growth. Observing the opportunities that exist, Central Kalimantan Governor Sugianto Sabran does not hesitate to succeed this national strategic policy. "*We realize that food security has now become part of national security, apart from anticipating the threat of a food crisis due to the impact of the co-19 pandemic. Central Kalimantan is a land of blessings, ready to give birth to a prosperous future for the community,*" concluded the Governor.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Food Estate: Policy Agenda Setting That Skips the Policy Formulation Stage?

The Indonesian Government is rightly taking notice of the growing threat of food insecurity. Regrettably, one of the main solutions proposed by the organization to address this issue, namely the formulation of 'Food Estates' as a Nationally Strategic Project, has the potential to exacerbate the problem, potentially leading to more complications, including real fires in certain instances. Expanding monocrop agriculture at the expense of more forests and peatlands will have a detrimental effect on Indonesia's food security and will contribute to the escalation of peat fires and carbon emissions, rather than improving the situation. Approximately one-third of the total greenhouse gas emissions produced by worldwide agriculture can be attributed to the expansion of additional farms. The establishment of the new Food Estates would not only promote the cultivation of less-nutritious staples like rice, but it will also limit the availability of a wide range of healthy forest foods for local residents.

From the examples of food estate projects on peatlands that have been implemented, it can be seen that their

management always ends in failure and almost never provides space for the process of socio-cultural integration of local residents. In addition, there is always a large-scale change in the natural landscape that destroys the balance of the ecosystem. Food estate management by corporations also creates room for brokers or free riders who only benefit the social elite and harm the position of society as a whole by increasing social inequality, and giving rise to corrupt practices that harm the state. corruption that harms the state (Pantau Gambut, 2020).

This study reveals that agenda-setting for the food estate policy did not lead to the policy formulation stage. The end of agenda setting marks the start of the implementation of this policy initiative based on the 2020 Presidential Regulation on National Strategic Programs. As indicated in the introduction, the sequential cycle of the policy process consists of agenda setting, policy formulation, legitimization, implementation and evaluation. Here, the policy process skips the formulation stage which is a crucial stage. During this stage, the proposed policy objectives are supposed to be refined, and appropriate implementation arrangements and policy measures are established. The legal and institutional framework which is a key component of policy reform is also set up during the formulation stage.

If the concerns about the plan to expand rice fields on peatlands are proven to be a practice that is not accompanied by a complete study, adequate technological improvements, and is not accompanied by an increase in the capacity of farmers and an appropriate farming model, it is not impossible that the rice field food estate plan will not produce optimal results or will even repeat the failure of the food estate project that has been carried out on the same land over the past 23 years (Pantau Gambut, 2020).

This report argues that Indonesia's policymakers should urgently address the food insecurity and malnutrition experienced by the population, which is being driven by falling dietary diversity, land dispossession and climatic chaos, among other causes. Greenpeace believes that a blind focus of increasing production with expanding food estates is not the best policy for achieving this goal. Indeed, the renewed food estate plans threaten forests, biodiversity and the land rights of local and Indigenous peoples. Moreover, efforts to support the extensification of industrial agriculture threaten the climate, which will in turn create further food insecurity, rather than improve Indonesia's situation (Greenpeace Indonesia, 2020).

A nation's ability to feed its citizens and prevent food shortages depends on its agricultural and food policy. Individual, household, ethnic group, and national food security can only be achieved through policymaking that relies heavily on public input, expert opinion, and strong evidence, and that is subjected to frequent and thorough evaluations. However, governing elites frequently use food production system policies to further their own interests and perpetuate clientelism (loyalty to politicians in exchange for products) and unofficial state control.

The new food estate scheme announced in 2020 got underway with a renewed focus on the peatlands of Central Kalimantan, a quarter century after President Suharto first turned his attention to the area for his Mega Rice Project back in 1995. The food estate plan had an initially announced budget of IDR 1.9 trillion (USD 122 million) for the 2020 - 2021 period. The later 2022 national work plan included food estate allocations worth IDR 4.1 trillion. No fewer than twelve ministries, two statutory agencies and potentially dozens of provincial and district governments were to become involved in the new food estate push.

Past and contemporary food estate policies were introduced to the public with the goal of attaining both "food security" for all Indonesians and "food self-sufficiency" as a national security measure. Both the Mega Rice Project under Suharto and the MIFEE under Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's administrations had this as a fundamental goal. Despite not being a general himself, President Widodo has put his faith in Prabowo Subianto and Luhut Binsar Pandjaitan, two former generals who have transitioned into politics, to pursue his goals in the food estate. Both the necessity to prepare for a food crisis caused by COVID-19 and the intention to "reduce dependence on food imports" were mentioned by Widodo in his first remarks about the food estate.

Prabowo pledged to turn two million hectares of 'damaged' forest into new rice fields and another two million into biofuel production during his failed 2014 campaign for the presidency of Indonesia. In the future, it seems that the policy agenda will be realized by Prabowo Subianto as he is elected as president of the republic of Indonesia in the upcoming period, namely 2024 - 2029.

5.2. Centralized Policy: Agenda Setting in Dispersed Governance

Policies developed at the national level may have difficulties in guaranteeing a certain level of uniformity in implementation at the subnational level, particularly when the subnational level possesses a certain degree of independent political power (Norris et al., 2014). Sausman et al., (2015) utilize the notion of "local universality" to explain how generic principles, goods, or instructions are adapted and customized to suit specific local circumstances and put into action through practical applications. The challenge lies in determining how governing bodies can effectively address this situation, particularly when it remains concealed from the scrutiny of policy-makers.

Given that previous food estate plans in Indonesia ultimately proved unsuccessful, revisiting this approach suggests an absence of 'evidence-based' policymaking. Instead, it seems to support recent findings produced in a study of Indonesian Government policymaking by the Indonesian Centre for Law and Policy Studies which affirmed that policy instruments tend to be selected first without prior analysis and tend to be more political than rational in nature (Blomkamp et al., 2018).

Even in situations where governance is centralized rather than decentralized, the successful implementation of interventions will still heavily rely on the specific local circumstances. This is supported by research on complex systems, which has shown that an intervention that achieves positive outcomes in one location cannot be reliably expected to produce the same results in other places (Braithwaite et al., 2018). It highlights the importance for policy-makers to address the complex involvement of various stakeholders with different sources of knowledge, as emphasized by Davies et al., (2008).

Agenda-setting is the process of how public problems and alternative solutions attract attention or are ignored by the public, political elites, and government (Birkland, 2015). The role of interest groups to push a problem to become a public issue is important. Interest groups must fight to put an issue on the agenda to compete with other issues for a narrow policy space, or prepare to put it at the right moment. This struggle does not end with getting the issue on the agenda, but also with ensuring that it is always at the forefront of issues to be formulated. As is known, an agenda is a collection of problems, understanding of their causes, symbols, solutions, and other things related to public problems that get the attention of the public, politicians, and government officials. In the context of setting the agenda for the food estate policy, it is dominated by narratives at the central level only. So that the distribution of information and media framing is monopolized by elements at the top level. In other words, it is very top-down.

Birkland (2015) states that the levels of agenda-setting include the levels of agenda universe, systemic agenda, institutional agenda, and decision agenda. Agenda-setting is a process that is driven from the outermost circle, the agenda universe, to the innermost circle, the decision agenda. The agenda universe consists of all the issues surrounding the food crisis and solutions in the form of food estates into discourse in the frame of public conversation. Then the role of policy entrepreneurs brings the issue into a systemic agenda characterized by the emergence of a uniform narrative pattern from elements of society that are pro to the food estate policy and those who are against the policy. Public issues are then increasingly massive so that they can enter the institutional agenda to be discussed further by technocratic elements of the government bureaucracy. As a result, the government formulated a decision agenda to intervene in the food crisis with a policy of opening a large-scale food center area, namely a food estate.

There is a crucial role of policy entrepreneurs in the journey of the food estate agenda from public issue to government decision agenda. Policy entrepreneurs are individuals who actively seek to initiate dynamic policy change, utilizing their skills, position and networks to influence the policy agenda. Their effectiveness depends not only on their personal attributes, but is also significantly shaped by the institutional environment in which they operate (Mintrom et al., 2020).

In addition, interesting findings institutionally, the Dayak Customary Council (Dewan Adat Dayak/DAD) of Central Kalimantan Province can also be included as a policy entrepreneur because on several occasions it has participated in navigating the food estate while providing legitimacy through the social, economic and political resources of the institution.

They also highlight the potential benefits of food estate policies, such as increased agricultural productivity, reduced environmental impacts, and increased food self-sufficiency. By presenting these benefits and demonstrating the potential for long-term food security and sustainable development, policy entrepreneurs can build political support and influence decision-makers to prioritize food estate policies on their agenda.

Policy makers work to define food security and sustainable agriculture issues, mobilize public opinion, and formulate and promote policy solutions. Policy entrepreneurs are critical in shaping the policy agenda and building coalitions for effective food estate policy advocacy. They bring together various stakeholders and facilitate collaboration among government agencies, farmers, researchers and community organizations. Through their efforts, policy entrepreneurs help raise awareness about the importance of addressing issues related to food security and sustainable agriculture. Based on the research results, it shows that the existence of policy entrepreneurs exists at the central level to the regions. At the central level, it is played by the President, while at the regional level it is played by the Governor and the bureaucrats in it.

Additionally, individuals who operate at higher levels must have a certain understanding of the events that occur on or near the frontline in order to achieve success. This statement reflects the fundamental principle of the "bottom-up" approach to policy implementation, which aligns with Lipsky's concept of the "street-level bureaucrat." These bureaucrats possess discretionary authority that can significantly impact the outcome of a policy, either leading to its success or failure (Lipsky, 2010). A notable characteristic of many policies, particularly those involving direct interaction with the public, is that lower-ranking staff members have significant engagement with external entities and often possess discretionary authority that grants them practical independence from their supervisors. While individual decisions made by these actors may appear insignificant, when combined, they have the potential to significantly alter strategic policy intentions (Hudson et al., 2019).

6. CONCLUSION

The food estate policy agenda in Kalimantan, especially on peatlands, in order to answer the threat of a food crisis in Indonesia needs to be reviewed in depth. There are limitations to the rationality of policy makers who are indicated to have failed to define the problem and then formulate a policy proposal. Instead, what needs to be

addressed is the problem of food distribution that is hampered because some countries and regions apply social restrictions, and not due to a lack of food reserve supply. The food estate study in Indonesia also indicated that it missed a crucial process in the form of the policy formulation stage. This is because agenda setting is more elitist and centralized at the national level. At this stage, the objectives of the food estate policy must be refined, and appropriate policy measures and implementation arrangements carefully established. The legal and institutional framework, which is a key component of policy reform, is also comprehensively developed, involving lower-level elements or stakeholders in the regions. The study observations accord with the theoretical expectations embedded within the multiple-streams framework. Therefore, Kingdon's framework is relevant to the study of agenda setting and its implications on subsequent policy processes in the construction sector. Despite its relevance in describing the agenda setting of the food estate policy in Indonesia's agriculture sector, Kingdon's multiple streams framework (MSF) has its own shortcomings. Finally, The major weakness brought out by the study is the failure by Kingdon to explicitly acknowledge in his framework that problem definition or policy decisions may not always be rational or optimal undertakings. This study confirmed the results of the Zambia study that several factors that could affect agenda setting, especially in developing countries (Tembo & Lim, 2023). These included top-down policy, policy capture, political opportunism, influence of self-interested groups and political connections, as revealed by the study. In the long term, this study recommends that the formulation of the policy agenda needs to involve the policy community at the regional level in order to open up space for participation and deliberation in public policy making. in the context of the food estate in central Kalimantan province, it is necessary to involve the institution of the dayak customary council (Dewan Adat Dayak/DAD) as a morally based policy entrepreneur through their local wisdom and local knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Akgul, A., Akbas, H., & Kule, A. (2019). Probation system in Turkey: an analysis of a public policy formation using multiple streams framework. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 43(4), 325–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.2019.1578673>
- Bali, A., & Halpin, D. (2021). Agenda-setting instruments : means and strategies for the management of policy demands. *Policy and Society*, 40(3), 333–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2021.1955489>
- Bappenas. (2023). *Rencana Induk Pengembangan Food Estate / Kawasan Sentra Produksi Pangan di Provinsi Kalimantan Tengah*.
- Birkland, T. A. (2015). An introduction to the policy process: Theories, concepts, and models of public policy making: Fourth edition. In *An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making: Fourth Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717371>
- Blomkamp, E., Sholikin, M. N., Nursyamsi, F., Lewis, J. M., & Toumbourou, T. (2018). Understanding Policymaking in Indonesia : KSI Working Paper, 26, 1–45. <https://www.ksi-indonesia.org/assets/uploads/original/2020/03/ksi-1585501090.pdf>
- Braithwaite, J., Churrua, K., Long, J. C., Ellis, L. A., & Herkes, J. (2018). When complexity science meets implementation science: A theoretical and empirical analysis of systems change. *BMC Medicine*, 16(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-018-1057-z>
- Brasil, F. G., & Jones, B. D. (2020). *Agenda setting : Policy change and policy dynamics A brief introduction*. 54(6), 1486–1497.
- Cairney, P., & Jones, M. D. (2016). Kingdon's Multiple Streams Approach: What Is the Empirical Impact of this Universal Theory? *Policy Studies Journal*, 44(1), 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12111>
- Davies, H., Nutley, S., & Walter, I. (2008). Why “knowledge transfer” is misconceived for applied social research. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 13(3), 188–190. <https://doi.org/10.1258/jhsrp.2008.008055>
- DeLeo, R. A., & Duarte, A. (2022). Does Data Drive Policymaking? A Multiple Streams Perspective on the Relationship Between Indicators and Agenda Setting. *Policy Studies Journal*, 50(3), 701–724. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12419>
- Gambut, P. (2021). *FOOD ESTATE KALIMANTAN TENGAH, KEBIJAKAN INSTAN SARAT KONTROVERSI*.
- Garson, G. D. (2002). Case Study Research in Public Administration and Public Policy: Standards and Strategies. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 8(3), 209–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2002.12023551>
- Greenpeace. (2022). *Indonesia's Food Estate Program Feeding the Climate Crisis*. https://www.greenpeace.org/static/planet4-indonesia-stateless/2022/11/a388b294-food-estate-report_english_new-2.pdf
- Hansson-Forman, K., Reimerson, E., Bjärstig, T., & Sandström, C. (2021). A view through the lens of policy formulation: the struggle to formulate Swedish moose policy. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 23(4), 528–542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2021.1888700>
- Hartono, D. N. (2021). *Food Estate, Measuring Food Politics of Indonesia A Study of Central Kalimantan Food Estate Project*.
- Herweg, N., Zahariadis, N., & Zohlhöfer, R. (2022). Travelling Far and Wide? Applying the Multiple Streams Framework to Policy-Making in Autocracies. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, 63(2), 203–223. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11615-022-00393-8>
- Hudson, B., Hunter, D., & Peckham, S. (2019). Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap : can policy support programs help ? *Policy Design and Practice*, 2(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2018.1540378>
- Jones, M. D., Peterson, H. L., Pierce, J. J., Herweg, N., Bernal, A., Lamberta Raney, H., & Zahariadis, N. (2016). A River Runs Through It: A Multiple Streams Meta-Review. *Policy Studies Journal*, 44(1), 13–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12115>
- Kamin, A. B. M., & Altamaha, R. (2019). Modernisasi Tanpa Pembangunan Dalam Proyek Food Estate Di Bulungan Dan Merauke. *BHUMI: Jurnal Agraria dan Pertanahan*, 5(2), 163–179. <https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v5i2.368>
- Kingdon, J. W. (2014). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Pearson New International Edition.
- Leppänen, T., & Liefferink, D. (2022). Agenda-setting, policy formulation, and the EU institutional context: The case of the Just Transition Fund. *European Policy Analysis*, 8(1), 51–67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/epa2.1136>
- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of individual in public service*. Russel Sage Foundation.
- Mintrom, M., Maurya, D., & He, A. J. (2020). Policy entrepreneurship in Asia : the emerging research agenda Policy entrepreneurship in Asia : the emerging research. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 13(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2020.1715593>
- Muhardiono, & Hamdani. (2021). *Flood vulnerability impact for food estate potential in Central Kalimantan , Indonesia*. 648, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/648/1/012025>
- Mukherjee, I. (2015). Who is a stream? Epistemic communities, instrument constituencies and advocacy coalitions in public policy-making. *Politics and Governance*, 3(2), 65–75. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v3i2.290>
- Norris, E., Kidson, M., Bouchal, P., & Rutter, J. (2014). Doing them justice: Lessons from four cases of policy implementation. *Institute for*

- Government*, 12. [https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Policy Implementation case studies report - final.pdf](https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Policy%20Implementation%20case%20studies%20report%20-%20final.pdf)
- Octania, G. (2021). The Government's Role in the Indonesian Rice Supply Chain. *Cips-Indonesia*, 32, 8-42. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/249412>
- Rüb, F. (2016). Decision Making under Ambiguity and Time Constraints. Assessing the Multiple-Streams Framework. In *European Policy Analysis* (Vol. 2, Nomor 1). <https://doi.org/10.18278/epa.2.1.12>
- Sausman, C., Oborn, E., & Michael Barrett. (2015). *Policy translation through localisation : implementing national policy in the UK*.
- Tembo, S., & Lim, S. (2023). Agenda Setting for the 20% Mandatory Subcontracting Policy in Zambia's Construction Sector: The Multiple-Streams Framework. *Public Works Management and Policy*, 28(2), 215-238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087724X221092425>
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Zahariadis, N. (2016). Handbook of public policy agenda setting. In *Handbook of Public Policy Agenda Setting*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784715922>