

RSPO, ISPO and Global Environmental Governance: An English School Perspective

Yanyan Mochamad Yani; Verdinand Robertua

International Relations Department Padjajaran University, Jl. Raya Bandung-Sumedang, Sumedang, West Java 45363

Email: yan2m@hotmail.com

Date Submitted: 20 January 2018; Accepted: 24 March 2018

Abstrak

Tulisan ini berisi tinjauan teoritis dan konseptual yang memfokuskan peran dan pengaruh organisasi non-pemerintah (LSM) dalam tata kelola lingkungan global. Artikel ini menggunakan kasus hubungan antara Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO) dan Roundtable Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO). RSPO didirikan pada tahun 2004 sebagai regulasi sektor privat dalam pengaturan standar perdagangan minyak sawit yang disesuaikan dengan nilai-nilai pelestarian lingkungan global. Pada tahun 2011, Pemerintah Indonesia membentuk ISPO untuk bersaing dengan RSPO. Tujuan dari tulisan ini adalah memberikan kontribusi pada pengembangan teori studi lingkungan Mahzab Inggris melalui reformulasi pluralisme dan solidarisme serta untuk memahami hubungan antar keduanya. Tulisan ini memiliki tiga kesimpulan. Pertama, meskipun RSPO dan ISPO memiliki karakter dan prosedur yang berbeda tetapi keduanya memiliki kesamaan dalam mencapai perbaikan perlindungan lingkungan. Kedua, berdasarkan perbedaan antara RSPO dan ISPO, tulisan ini merumuskan kembali kontribusi pluralisme dan solidarisme terhadap studi lingkungan Mahzab Inggris. Ketiga, tata kelola lingkungan global dimungkinkan menjadi konsep jalan tengah yang mampu melihat koeksistensi antara pluralisme dan solidarisme.

Kata Kunci: RSPO, ISPO, Mahzab Inggris, pluralisme, solidarisme, tata kelola lingkungan global.

Abstract

This is a theoretical and conceptual review focusing the role and influence of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in global environmental governance (GEG). This article will use the case of the relationship between Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO) and Roundtable Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO). RSPO is established in 2004 acted as private self-regulation in standard setting of palm oil trade in accordance with global environmental conservation values. In 2011, Government of Indonesia established ISPO to compete with RSPO. This article aimed to contribute to the development of theory of environmental studies of English School through the reformulation of pluralism and solidarism and to understand the relationship between pluralism and solidarism. This research has three conclusions. Firstly, despite RSPO and ISPO have different characters and procedures but they have similarities in achieving betterment in environmental protection. Secondly, based on the difference between RSPO and ISPO, this research reformulate pluralism and solidarism's contribution toward environmental studies of English School. Thirdly, global environmental governance is possible to be the middle way concept capturing the coexistence between pluralism and solidarism.

Keywords: RSPO, ISPO, English School, pluralism, solidarism, global environmental governance.

INTRODUCTION

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) has been widely neglected in the theory of Environmental Studies of English School (ESES). The inability of ESES scholars to address the increasing role of NGOs in global environmental politics is a starting point of the marginalization of ESES among International Relations theorists. Robert Falkner (2012, p. 507) argued that ESES is popular among International Relations theorists only for its state-centric-

ity perspective in dealing with global environmental problems. Matthew Paterson (2005, p. 175) challenged the exclusion of environmental ethics from ESES and urged to revisit the state-centric ESES by looking the new global environmental governance (GEG) in response to global environmental crisis. This article would like to amplify Paterson's and Falkner's challenge by taking ESES to review its conception regarding the role of NGOs in GEG.

Najam, Papa, and Taiyab (2006) argued that there are some factors of GEG's failure such as fragmentation of GEG, lack of cooperation and coordination among international organizations, lack of implementation, compliance, enforcement and effectiveness, inefficient use of resources. Firstly, there are many multilateral environmental agreements that were separated and uncoordinated. There are many overlapping authority and mandate between those multilateral environmental agreements that cause ineffective implementation in pursuing the grand strategy of environmental protection.

Secondly, there is lack of coordination among international organization (Najam, et al., 2006). World Trade Organization and United Nation Environmental Programme belong to United Nations family organization but both of them have different standards and criteria regarding environmental protection. Thirdly, the failure of GEG is due to lack of implementation, compliance, enforcement and effectiveness (Najam, et al., 2006). This is the problem with state-centric GEG that emphasized the primacy of sovereignty. Many multilateral environmental agreements are voluntary and non-binding that tolerate the incompliance of member states. It gives the possibility of being free-rider.

The failure of states in GEG created opportunities for non-governmental organizations to establish private authority beyond states. We have many labels to refer to this new private authority such as multi-stakeholder initiative, public-private partnership or hybrid governance. There are many examples of this new private authority such as Forest Stewardship Council, Roundtable Sustainable Palm Oil, and Rainforest Alliance. RSPO (Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil) is a private standard setting body focusing on environmentally friendly and sustainable palm oil production.

This research used RSPO as a case study to answer the possibility of NGO as primary actor in GEG. RSPO is selected due to its entrepreneurship in introducing the norm of sustainable agriculture in the palm oil industry. This organization was formed in 2004 with stakeholders from seven sectors in the palm oil industry. These seven sectors are palm oil producers, palm oil processors or traders, consumer goods manufacturers, retailers, banks and

investors, environmental or nature conservation non-governmental organizations (NGO). RSPO was initiated by WWF (World Wildlife Fund for Nature) which is a non-governmental environmental organization that has initiated many environmental movements various countries around the world (Nikoloyuk, et al., 2010, p. 60).

RSPO (2007) developed standards and criteria with the aim of preventing the company to perform actions that damage the environment and social neighborhood. All RSPO member companies should implement the criteria and the compliance is monitored independently. In January 2014, the RSPO has 1,439 members, including 911 as a regular member, 427 supply chain, 101 affiliate member (Angelika, 2015, p. 3). In addition to large companies in food industry such as Unilever, Ferrero, P & G and Nestle, there are also NGOs members such as WWF, Solidaridad and Oxfam (Nikoloyuk, et al., 2010).

This article would like to examine the RSPO as the viable alternative of state-led GEG for the theoretical development of Environmental Studies of English School. ESES is a new theory of English School that still need thoughts and minds regarding the application of English School concepts into world issues such as environmental degradation and climate change. There are still lack articles formulating pluralism and solidarism for enriching environmental studies of English School. This article would like to reformulate pluralism and solidarism based on the ability of RSPO to address environmental problems in palm oil sector. It is also expected that we can define the relationship between pluralism and solidarism based on the relationship of the legitimacy of RSPO in Indonesian palm oil industry.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

THE LIMITS OF STATE-CENTRIC GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE

The classical pluralist perspective of ESES emphasized the primacy of state-led environmental policies. Hedley Bull, a prominent thinker of English School, supported the primacy of state because states have legal and political accountability with direct support from the people. Meanwhile non-governmental organizations don't have such mechanism of political and legal accountability. The clas-

sical perspective of ESES denied the failure of states in protecting the peoples from environmental disasters and denied the possibility of NGOs as the viable alternative for state's failure (Bull, 1977, p. 283).

The main weaknesses of state-led global environmental governance is the ability to be inclusive engaging with non-human nature, the weak and the poor. The pursuit of material gain based on power capability resulted to the wide gap between the powerful and the non-human nature, the weak and the poor. The current of form of modernization has given legitimate role to exploitative-mode economy excluding the interest of the non-human nature, the weak and the poor.

Indigenous communities have been the victim of the man-made disasters and they were invisible in the grand design of GEG. In many cases, states blamed local communities as the perpetrators of the disasters. In the case of forest fires in Southeast Asia, there is a notion that land clearing by fires has been a common practice for nomadic tribes constituting their social identity (Barber, 2000). Government blamed native indigenous people Dayak of Central Kalimantan due to the shifting cultivation or swidden agriculture that employed slash-and-burn method (Miranda, 2016).

Forest fires has taken the natural home of the indigenous communities and harmed their existence (United Nations, 2014). Guardian (2016) reported that Indonesia's forest fire has threatened the existence of *Orang Rimba* the aboriginal people of Sumatra. *Orang Rimba*'s population was around 2.000 aborigines staying sporadically in 60.000 hectares of land in Jambi Province. *Orang Rimba*'s population has decreased 30% in a decade and now they faced the threat of extinction. Their problem was hardly publicized by media and remains unseen in the national politics. It also has some parallels in the global forum that the interest of indigenous communities has been invisible in the formulation and implementation of global development programme (Survival International, 2016).

Mongabay (2016) also reported that forest fires has threatened indigenous tribe Awá in Amazon area in Brazil. Awa is called as the "Earth's most threatened tribe" (Survival International, 2016). 2015's forest fires in Brazil has affected 12.000 peoples from the Guajajara ethnic

group and 80 peoples from Awa group. Without serious intervention from international communities, Awa tribe will face extinction.

The failure of states in protecting environment and the indigenous communities created bigger space for NGOs in global environmental governance. Clarke (pp. 1998, 2-3) defines NGOs as an organization focusing on social welfare and not-for-profit oriented. Mostly activism NGOs are using radical approach to confront government and corporation's policies. For example, Greenpeace International are actively protesting government and corporation's policies through street protest or direct movement.

Why NGOs become an increasingly important actor in GEG? First, a variety of projects handled by NGOs run by highly efficient and involving minimal human resources. In contrast, the state has a bureaucratic structure and international humanitarian assistance were very prone to be lost or corrupted. In 1993, United Nations Development Program conducted a research mentioned that international official aid failed to reach the poor amounting to 20% while the NGO failure about 5% (Raffer & Singer, 1996, p. 138). Catholic Relief Services only spent 4.78% of the total aid for staff salaries and administration. 95% of Catholic Relief Services assistance directly channeled to beneficiaries (Kim, 2011, p. 8).

The second character of NGOs is the community-based approach. This means that NGOs prioritize micro approach that directly involved grassroots. Raffer and Singer (1996, 138) gives the term human-face intervention. NGOs have a better ability to work at the grassroots with the participation of local communities. Decentralized structure and local contacts allow NGO to directly connect with grassroots. NGOs also have a preventive action and early warning. When natural disasters destroyed so many public facilities and killing many people, NGOs directly get priority in the management of humanitarian aid.

The third character is NGO's international network. Branches and networks of NGOs can reach all countries in the world. Without constrained by the membership of nation states, NGOs can continue to receive and provide information to other NGO in other parts of the world. NGOs will seek support from NGOs of other countries by spreading information and NGOs hope foreign coun-

tries will press the attitude and position of that country to directly suppress the destination country. Another scenario is the NGOs will seek the support of international organizations in the hope that the organization will press the destination country.

There are so many NGOs that were able to fund a variety of projects related to environmental protection. WWF-US contributed 12.9 million US dollars for the implementation of 407 environmental projects in 33 countries. From the 1980s until the 1990s WWF funded more than 2,000 environmental projects worldwide with a total funding of 62.5 million US Dollars (Princen, 1994, p. 29). There are still many other NGO that have enormous strength financial like Greenpeace and Great Lakes United (GLU). NGO were able to attract the attention of the mass media. As NGO in other fields, the mass media become the “backbone” for the activities of NGO. Greenpeace with local television stations, WWF with its international membership will be able to become effective media publicity for their activities.

Countries and international organizations do not necessarily do the research and data collection on a regular basis regarding environmental issues. NGOs have research capabilities that are able to reach all levels. NGOs were able to force the corporation and states to provide transparency of data and information. NGOs are able to break the information barrier by supplying accurate and comprehensive information gap. People who are often unable to access information now can receive information symmetrically.

PLURALISM AND SOLIDARISM DEBATE

The debate of pluralism and solidarism is the key character of the theory of environmental studies of English School (Bull, 1966). Despite of the growing role and influence of non-governmental organizations in global environmental governance, the ESES classical thinkers still believed that the sovereignty of the states should be the primary institutions of global environmental governance. Hedley Bull (1977, 82) argued that “but the views of these private individuals, whatever merit they may have, are not the outcome of any political process of the assertion and reconciliation of interests.”

The challenge for contemporary ESES thinkers is to reformulate pluralism and solidarism debate. Nicholas Wheeler (2000) developed the pluralism and solidarism debate in the case of humanitarian intervention. For Wheeler, pluralism is the notion for noncompliance of humanitarian responsibility and focused to the narrow national interests achieving profits, power and influence to ensure stability and welfare of nations. Meanwhile, solidarism is the notion for ambitious plan embracing new ideas and norms such as promotion of universal human rights and democracy and dare to sacrifice the principle of sovereignty in exchange of the pursuit of these norms.

Matthew Wienert argued that solidarism stands for “normative commitments to the individual do outweigh national (state-based) interests; and ideas and practices of political community need to be reformulated” (Wienert, 2011, p. 29). Meanwhile pluralism disagrees with the expansion of units and actors and stressed the “maintenance of order among states” (Wienert, 2011, p. 30). The embrace of new units and actors will potentially harm the international order (Bull, 1977).

In the discussion among ESES thinkers, pluralist wanted to show that the current states system is not the obstacle of the global environmental solution (Bull, 1977, p. 283). Instead, Bull believed that the increasing intervention of non-governmental organizations will worsen the problem. However, Nicholas Wheeler (2000) urged to include NGOs as the representation of the weak and discriminated part of society. The limits of state-centric global environmental governance will be significantly improved by the inclusion of NGOs into the core decision-making process.

The new generation of ESES scholars attempted to reformulate the pluralism and solidarism debate. Robert Falkner (2017) used the case of climate change to develop pluralism and solidarism contribution toward ESES. Despite of pluralist’s consistency in maintaining sovereignty and nonintervention in global environmental governance, Falkner showed that there is possibility of an effective global strategy in mitigation of the impact of climate change. He wrote that “Bull’s pluralist stance would be entirely consistent with a modicum of international environmental cooperation to tackle dangerous climate change”

(Falkner, 2017, p. 205).

Hurrell also developed the debate between pluralism and solidarism in the environmental studies. He devoted a chapter in his book to highlight the ongoing tension between pluralism and solidarism regarding the presence of complex governance beyond state. He wrote:

“The ecological challenge is so important and so profound because of the way in which it calls into question both the practical viability and the moral adequacy of this pluralist conception of a state-based global order; and because of the way in which responding to the ecological challenge has pushed states towards new forms of international law and global governance” (Hurrell, 2007, p. 218).

Hurrell and Falkner are very interested in exploring the possibilities of pluralism and solidarism changed the international society including in the global environmental politics. It is very important then to enrich the contribution from pluralism and solidarism debate toward ESES. Falkner has elaborated Bull’s article to develop the pluralism and solidarism conception toward climate change meanwhile Hurrell urged the reader to formulate a new conception of global governance to tackle effectively the ecological challenge.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

CASE STUDY: PALM OIL CERTIFICATION WAR

Indonesia is the biggest palm oil exporter in the world (Workman, 2017). According to Workman’s research, more than 51% global palm oil exports come from Indonesia. Indeed Indonesia wanted to continue its speed palm oil production from 35 million in 2016 to 42 million in 2020 (The Jakarta Post, 2017). Palm oil is now one of the most important engine for Indonesian economy exceeding the oil and gas export. Moreover, it provided jobs to 6 million workers in rural areas and 40 percent of the country’s 11 million hectares of oil palm plantations are owned by smallholders (The Jakarta Post, 2018).

The expansion of palm oil industry is a dilemma. Government need to maintain its economic growth through agricultural industrialization meanwhile government has to protect the forest and prevent deforestation and biodiversity loss (Alisjahbana & Busch, 2017). Indonesian

government has signed and ratified many multilateral environmental agreements and hence government has to implement the agreements. For example, Indonesia has ratified ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution in 2014. The ratification of this agreement is a symbol of Indonesian commitment to change their anthropocentric policies (Yani, 2017).

However, the massive destruction of forest has happened since Suharto’s authoritarian regime. Suharto’s government initiated many national policies that led to global ecological disaster in 1997-1998. Suharto regime has exploited forest resources without any environmental consideration (Barber & Schweithelm, 2000). According to Barber and Schweithelm (2000), there were three Suharto’s policies that contributed to the catastrophic degradation of forest, namely palm oil boom, transmigration project and million-hectare peat swamp project. Despite Suharto has been toppled down, the corrupt system are still intact in Indonesian forest management.

Environmental activist not only blamed government for deforestation and ecological disaster but also corporation. Glastra, Wakker dan Richert (2002, p. 15) mentioned that many palm oil companies choose to burn the trees and the land to clear the land for plantation. Until 1994, it was legal in Indonesia to do “controlled burning” (Glastra, et al., 2002, p. 12). Using cost-benefit analysis, it takes shorter time and less money to burn the land and forest than log and plant method (Bram, 2012).

The problem was that there is a synergy between corporation and government to exploit the forest without any ecological consideration. In the Suharto era, there were many “untouchable corporation” due to their political affiliation with Suharto families (Barber & Schweithelm, 2000). Despite protected forest was prohibited to be cleared, law enforcer was unable to stop the forest destruction. Law enforcement was also under political influence of Suharto families. For example, Bob Hasan received large forest concession due to his political affiliation with Suharto families. After the forest fires crisis in 1997, his company received bigger concession despite of the allegation of his corporation involvement in the disaster (Dauvergne, 1998, p. 17).

After Suharto’s era, forest concession and palm oil li-

cense was controlled by local leaders. In order to win the election, the leaders will give license and concession to corporation that supported their campaign funding. Berenschot (2015) said: "Democratization has failed to generate effective accountability mechanisms to halt such practices. On the contrary, as politicians need to find sources of campaign funding, direct elections in Central Kalimantan have contributed to the expansion of palm oil plantations". The failure of corporation and states in preventing deforestation has led to great forest and land fires in 1997 - 1998 and 2015.

In response to government failure to halt deforestation, NGOs take more active role in persuading and punishing corporation and official leaders (Toumbourou & Putra, 2016). Greenpeace launched campaign against palm oil and pulp corporation that endanger forest and the habitat of orangutan. Their campaign action has successfully provoked protest from consumers to the food companies regarding the destruction of orangutan habitat. Through investigative report entitled "Cooking the Climate", Greenpeace claimed that Nestle and Unilever buying palm oil from forest arsonists such as Sinar Mas. As a result of the report, Nestle and Unilever decided to stop buying palm oil from Indonesian palm oil companies (Greenpeace, 2009, p. 3).

Greenpeace also revealed that household names including Colgate Palmolive, Mondelez International (formerly Kraft), Neste Oil, Procter & Gamble, Reckitt Benckiser and a host of other companies are linked to Singapore-based Wilmar International Ltd and its international trade in dirty palm oil (Greenpeace International, 2013, p. 3). Second report "Cooking the Climate" revealed that Duta Palma group operations in the district of Indragiri Hulu in Riau between June and September 2007 reveal the serious threat to the climate posed by the expansion of the oil palm industry (Greenpeace, 2007, p. 2).

To persuade corporation and states to embrace sustainable palm oil production, conservation group WWF teamed up with the palm oil industry to launch the Roundtable Sustainable Palm Oil in 2004. One of the body's top mandates has been to set the standard of "sustainable" palm oil production and put the "sustainable" palm oil in a higher value. The standard was released in 2005. To meet

the new standard, growers and processors must apply eight principles, containing 39 specific criteria, to their operations. The principles include a commitment to transparency on environmental, social and legal issues; environmental responsibility with regard to waste, resource use, and climate; and responsible consideration for workers, individuals, and communities affected by palm oil production. Producers are beginning to implement the RSPO criteria: as of 2015, members included 72 firms worldwide, more than half of them from Indonesia. About 1.5 million tons of palm oil was certified in 2015 (Nikoloyuk, et al., 2010, p. 65).

Although relatively few companies have been certified, villagers and non-governmental organizations in Indonesia are already using the RSPO's criteria to demand better treatment for communities displaced by plantations. By using the criteria, indigenous people in local communities can stop the companies' aggression on the ground.

Therefore, the RSPO is a form of social pressure on the part of consumers against corporation that don't respect sustainability of the forests and endangered species. The products will gain sustainable palm oil price if RSPO has tested the production process and the product does not damage the environment.

CRITICS TOWARDS RSPO

Despite of RSPO's proposition toward environmental protection, there are still many companies that didn't join RSPO due to some reasons. Firstly, RSPO certification cost is not equal to the margin value of the certified palm oil. RSPO member has to pay 10 USD for every tonne of palm oil and will receive 2 USD for certified palm oil in the market (McCarthy, 2012, p. 1873). Certified palm oil price is still low due to weak demand from European customer.

Moreover, most of palm oil companies belong to small and medium enterprises. Certification cost will increase the burden of the small farmers and decrease their opportunity to gain profit and saving. Secondly, RSPO mediation body is not effective in dealing communities complaint on the violation of RSPO principles and criteria. RSPO doesn't have representative office in provinces that allow local communities files report on palm oil compa-

nies. Local communities need to engage with powerful civil society organization such as Greenpeace and WWF to make them able to file the report.

Greenpeace's report "Certifying Destruction" revealed that RSPO members concessions accounted for a disproportionate 21% of deforestation in oil palm concessions – 63,000 hectares, including nearly 20,000 hectares of carbon-rich forested peatland (Greenpeace, 2013, p. 2). Genting, Surya Dumai and Wilmar were the three privately-owned RSPO members with the largest areas of identified deforestation.

RSPO present two contradicting phenomenon. RSPO encourage its member to implement sustainability principles but RSPO failed to ensure the implementation of the principles (Ruyschaert & Salles, 2014). This contradiction is revealed by Michiel Kohne. In Kohne's article titled "Multi-stakeholder initiative governance as assemblage: Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil as a political resource in land conflicts related to oil palm plantations", he mentioned that RSPO is not a fair forum where small farmers is discriminated due to its relatively weak power vis-à-vis big corporation.

To support his argument, Kohne brings two cases, namely Batu Kayu and Sungai Putih (Kohne, 2014, pp. 470-475). In Batu Kayu, the development of an oil palm plantation led to a conflict between the company and villagers who felt cheated out of their land. Since 2000, when the conflict erupted shortly after the company started to clear the land, villagers have pursued a number of strategies to regain access to village land. Their greatest success so far is that since 2008 they have been managing part of the planted land that they consider to be theirs. Calling this activity "reclaiming", the villagers announced their intentions to the company and all relevant authorities, before peacefully occupying and subsequently managing and harvesting this part of the plantation. Since the reclaiming, police have been patrolling the border between the plantation still used by the plantation company and the land now managed by the villagers. In 2011, a discussion between palm oil workers escalated into a shooting, in which several villagers were wounded.

Critics of the RSPO by Kohne study can be summarized in two points. First, the concept of non-governmen-

tal organization has a broad application and often contradictory. RSPO as a form of global pressure on companies to adopt environmental and social policy became an entity which does not support social justice. On the other hand, there are representatives of the local population that campaign for social justice and dealing with the company.

Second, the conflict of Sungai Putih and Batu Kayu shows injustice in RSPO. Local residents are generally low-income communities and farmers who do not pursue higher education. Community access to information and communications technology was so minimal that it does not allow the process of regular reporting to the relevant RSPO stakeholders. Transnational corporations, on the other hand, have all the access to the RSPO and international certification agencies and consultancies. The power of communication is not addressed by the RSPO and backfired RSPO's legitimacy as seen in the conflict of the Sungai Putih.

In response to this imbalance, Indonesia objected to RSPO in the General Assembly of RSPO Sixth in Kuala Lumpur in 2009. Decision-making mechanism in the RSPO is determined by the number of votes obtained and the Ministry of Agriculture as a representative of Indonesian government can't defeat the number of consumer representatives dominated by European countries. This is confirmed by the statement of the Ministry of Agriculture Plantation Director General Achmad Manggabarani: "Surely, if our interests as producers did not get the attention and did not obtain benefits, the exit decision from RSPO membership is the right step. Moreover, RSPO members are not obligatory, but only voluntary" (National Geographic Indonesia, 2011)

The Indonesian government understood that they have to implement sustainable development in the palm oil business. Government has the mandate of environmental responsibility. However, the Indonesian considered RSPO as a less fair regime and reflects the interests of environmental activists in European countries (Imansari, 2015). According to Alfani (2017), Indonesian palm oil was perceived as a threat to European vegetable oil. RSPO gave much more weight to the interests of European corporation and European environmental activists and they were trying to suppress the Indonesian palm oil industry on

behalf of environmental issues. RSPO is supposed to be a push factor of Indonesian palm oil industry. In accordance with the concept of economic nationalism, Indonesia supports the RSPO if participation in RSPO increased Indonesian power, but in fact RSPO has no effect on state revenue.

It is suspected that French government wanted to replace Indonesian palm oil with French vegetable oil such as rapeseed, sun flower and soy oil (Alfani, 2017, p. 46). Indonesian palm oil has more competitive advantage than the European vegetable oil such as cheaper price, practical use, and healthier. It is also argued that palm oil plantation can be the key component to save the forest. Butler (2011) argued that "oil palm stores six to seven times the amount of carbon as cattle pasture". Cattle pasture is a main driver of deforestation in Brazil.

Legitimacy of RSPO is questioned and criticized at various levels. Interestingly, the state began to take over control of the initiative to form a rival of RSPO named as ISPO (Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil). Indonesian Government issued the decision to establish ISPO on March 29, 2011. ISPO is mandatory and a reference to the development of sustainable palm oil in Indonesia. ISPO is the sum of all regulations related to palm oil industry and the provisions of ISPO must be obeyed by all businesses plantations in Indonesia. In this case, ISPO is not only a symbol of the debate on the integration of environmental values into the company's business scheme but also the state's role in environmental standards.

Interestingly, in 2015, United Nations Development Programme facilitated a research development on the similarities and differences between RSPO and ISPO. Despite of the difference between RSPO and ISPO, it concluded that RSPO and ISPO have similar aim to prevent deforestation and unsustainable palm oil plantation practices. The report also mentioned many similarities that served as the milestone for joint audit (UNDP, 2015). The report acknowledged time and cost inefficiencies occurred due to double audit both by RSPO and ISPO. Combined audit will bring more benefits both to palm oil corporations, customers and government.

The report mentioned the recommendation for further research both by RSPO and ISPO to harmonize the

difference of palm oil standard. RSPO has eight elements that are not outlined in ISPO and there are five elements outlined exclusively in ISPO. It is very important to synchronize the difference and socialize it to the auditors. In a combined audit, RSPO and ISPO's distinctive requirement can be work together without giving more cost and time to palm oil companies.

PLURALISM AND SOLIDARISM: RIVALRY OR COEXISTENCE?

Questions about the role of the NGOs in global environmental governance are also a point of contention between the pluralism and the solidarism of English School. For the thinkers of pluralism, NGOs fall under the authority of the state and coalition of NGO are not representative of any country. Pluralists believed that the presence of NGOs in GEG brings more problem than the benefit. For example, when RSPO applies a very high environmental standards to Indonesian palm oil companies, there are significant backlash to company's profitability and threaten Indonesian government income.

Pluralist supported Eckersley's idea of inclusive sovereignty. The establishment of ISPO is an attempt to include environmental protection into the notion of Indonesian's sovereignty. Eckersley (2005) argued that states still played an important role in mitigating and preventing global ecological crisis. Despite of the past history of environmental destruction policies, states are able to change their role becoming the environmental protector. The establishment of ISPO as national standard setting for palm oil industry confirmed that state's authority can't be substituted by NGOs (Conca, 2005; Schaper, 2009). Conca (2005, 190) noted that NGOs has the role to give influences on authority but not as potential or actual authoritative agents.

Classical pluralist thinker supported the primacy of state in GEG due to three factors. Firstly, the concept of state is not inhospitable to the idea of environmental protection. Hedley Bull said that the environmental crisis would be solved if all individuals in the world agree to devote their resources to prevent global environmental crisis. The problem, according to Bull (1977, p.293), is that there are different perception regarding the impact and the mitigation of environmental problems. This argument need to be reformed because developing and developed states have now

a common perception that environmental protection should be a very important agenda. Inclusive sovereignty of Eckersley proved that there is big possibility in homogenizing states in terms of environmental protection.

However, this article would to reformulate the classical ESES thinkers' pluralism perspective. Bull (1977, p. 294) said that it is only the state that have the information, experiences and resources to cope with the environmental problems. Based on the case of ISPO and RSPO, it is the NGOs that have initiated the palm oil certification scheme. The contemporary ESES perspective emphasized the inclusiveness of state-led GEG which opened the possibility of states copying the ideas and systems from NGOs. ISPO is a reflection that government can embrace the NGO's idea in the issue of environmental protection.

Secondly, the state-led GEG is able to shape and reshape the definition of identity. RSPO is way to bring the identity politics into the environmental standard-setting arena. The biggest critic toward state-led GEG is the presence of the narrow definition of nationalism. Government used nationalism to empower their self-interest of military and economic power. International politics becomes the arena for states to compete others for being the strongest. Environmental issues becomes neglected and marginalized into the sidelines. Falkner (2012, p. 517) said:

“Political boundaries do not reflect the boundaries of the earth’s ecosystems, and protecting natural migratory species, preventing tropical deforestation and combating global climate change require a degree of international cooperation that the fragmented international system is unable to deliver. The nation-state’s claim to sovereign control over a defined territory is often viewed by environmentalists as the main hindrance to an effective collective response to global environmental problems”

ISPO has negated these critics. ISPO is a symbol on how Indonesian government wanted to synergize the environmentalism with the nationalism. Nationalism is not an obstacle for an effective implementation of state-led GEG. Nationalism can be developed in line with NGO's ambition to protect the environment. The possibility of nationalism to include environmentalism was greatly influenced by the growth of environmental campaign world-

wide. A democratic sovereign state has to consider the demand of their voters. Environmental NGOs' massive campaign has significant impact in voters' behaviour that lead to the reformulation of nationalism.

Hence, Indonesian government are now actively engaging with ASEAN neighbors in preventing deforestation and forest fires through the establishment of ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution (AATHP). ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution is binding regional law banning fires and deforestation. ISPO is a way to maintain Indonesian sovereignty and adhere to environmental issues. The replacement of Indonesian palm oil with French vegetable oil is an indication of threat toward Indonesian sovereignty (Alfani, 2017). Environmental issue was used to harm national sovereignty. ISPO is also a way to set the balance between environmental protection and economic welfare. NGO's excessive claims of environmental protection can lead to more harm toward environment as suggested by Butler's research.

NGOS AS ESSENTIALLY CONTESTED CONCEPT

The establishment of RSPO confirmed the presence of the solidarism in GEG. RSPO as private corporate governance seeks to reduce environmental destruction behavior. When states are ineffective in preventing the destruction of forests, NGOs worked together with corporation to formed RSPO as a coalition to develop surveillance against environmentally-destructive businesses. Corruption and weak awareness on the importance of biodiversity exacerbates the phenomenon of forest fires and air pollution.

It has been mentioned before that NGOs have three competitive advantages that NGOs have efficiency, international network and bottom-up approach. However, RSPO also showed weaknesses such as the cost of membership and the inequality in accessing RSPO's facilities. The weaknesses of RSPO in preventing deforestation become the solidarism's contribution toward GEG. The problem with RSPO proved that the concept of NGOs is essentially contested concept.

It is taken-for-granted that NGOs will prioritize environmental protection over business interest. However, the case of RSPO shows that definition of NGOs can't be

taken-for-granted. W.B. Gallie (1955-1956) established the idea of essentially contested concept. It is the concept that has “general definition in abstract but it generated endless and irresolvable disagreement what it means in practice” (Bueger, 2015, p. 160). NGOs become the concept that can also be defined as an actor promoting business interest in the realm of environmental protection. NGOs is used by the corporation to mask their interest in GEG. Despite of its aim in promoting non-human nature and forests conservation, many small NGOs were marginalized in the decision-making process in GEG (Moog, et al., 2015).

In pluralism, state is taken-for-granted as primary actor in GEG. Pluralists argued that states have capacity and capability as well as legitimacy in setting and implementing the rules related to natural resources and environmental livelihood (Bull, 1977). Bull (1977) warned that transfer of sovereignty to NGOs is a backlash toward international order because it will potentially harm diversity and tolerance among states in managing their internal affairs.

Meanwhile, NGOs are seen as the actors that criticized the performance of states in addressing environmental problems. The critics towards RSPO proved that there should be a new dichotomy of NGOs. Hard NGOs are radical NGOs that worked using confrontation in empowering the marginalized and the victim of the globalization and industrialization. Meanwhile, soft NGOs are lobby NGOs that promoted cooperation between NGOs and corporation.

The relationship between RSPO and ISPO showed the contribution of pluralism and solidarism. ISPO is the representation of pluralism meanwhile RSPO is the representation of solidarism. State wanted to be involved in the standard-setting of palm oil. Indonesian government instructed to make ISPO certification as mandatory for all palm oil companies. There is no sanction for the absence of ISPO certification but it increased the legitimacy of state in the GEG. ISPO showed the idea of inclusive sovereignty. State used its power and legitimacy to protect its sovereignty including in the environmental politics.

In other hand, the weaknesses of RSPO showed that there is no single definition of NGO. Solidarists have to admit that NGOs are sometimes used by corporation to mask their business interest. Therefore, it is important to

redefine NGOs based on the method they use. RSPO can be categorized as weak NGOs that RSPO put cooperation with corporation as their primary purposes. Meanwhile Greenpeace can be categorized as strong NGOs due to their confrontational approach.

The relationship between pluralism and solidarism is a point of debate between ESES scholars. Classical ESES scholar argued a rivalry relationship between pluralism and solidarism meanwhile contemporary ESES scholars argued a coexistence relationship between pluralism and solidarism. Hedley Bull claimed that NGOs are illegitimate as the primary actor in GEG. Rivalry between pluralism and solidarism is based on the Bull’s idea on international order.

According to Bull (1977), international order will exist if there are four elements. Firstly, there is the goal of preservation of the system and society of states. Secondly, there is the goal of maintaining the independence or external sovereignty of individual states and thirdly there is the goal of peace. Lastly, there is goal of property rights. Classical ESES thinkers believe that states are the only actors and it is mutually exclusive with international order. NGOs are potentially destroying the international order.

However, based on the relationship between RSPO and ISPO, Bull’s international order need to be reformed. The presence of RSPO is not illegal and destructive toward Indonesian political system. Both RSPO and ISPO can work and potentially complement each other. It confirmed with Buzan’s thesis that:

“As suggested by the ‘neo-neo’ synthesis, the fashion is swinging back to more tolerance of, or even enthusiasm for, theoretical pluralism, though debate will doubtless remain active as to whether a pluralist approach requires giving all the stories equal weight, or making some more equal than others” (Buzan, 2004, p. 25).

Buzan negated the idea of rivalry between pluralism and solidarism by bringing five spectrum namely asocial, power political, coexistence, cooperative, convergence and confederative. The aim to broaden the pluralism and solidarism debate is to bring a new complexity in English School scholarship. The rivalry relationship between pluralism and solidarism can be changed into another kind

of relationship.

In the relationship between RSPO and ISPO, coexistence relationship will be more relevant to explain the possibility of joint audit between RSPO and ISPO. Despite of different procedures in standard setting of palm oil, there are harmonious relationship between RSPO and ISPO. In the coexistence relationship, NGOs and states have the opportunities to shape the GEG and both of them have their weaknesses and advantages. Based on the case study of relationship between RSPO and ISPO, we have defined pluralism and solidarism in the context of GEG and we also set the relationship between pluralism and solidarism.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE REVISITED

The relationship between RSPO and ISPO also bring important consequences toward the concept of global environmental governance. The classical ESES scholars have formulated GEG based on solely pluralism perspective (Paterson, 2005). In pluralist perspective, there are only five primary international institutions namely diplomacy, international law, great power management, war and balance of power. All primary institutions emphasized the sovereignty as the crucial element of international order. This research argues that global environmental governance is now a primary international institution.

In English School discussion, primary institution and secondary institutions hold important role in achieving a comprehensive Environmental Studies of English School. According to Buzan, primary institution is a concept that: "they are relatively fundamental and durable practices, that are evolved more than designed; and that they are constitutive of actors and their patterns of legitimate activity in relation to each other" (Buzan, 2004, p.167).

Buzan has reformed the classical list of primary international institution by adding environmental stewardship, market, and equality of people. However, it is not enough. This research argued that there should be more primary international institution in the ESES. One of the candidate is global environmental governance. Classical primary institution will be very difficult to explain the presence of Greenpeace, RSPO and the European Union. These new actors have distinctive character and behaviour and have influence in GEG. Therefore, ESES should be an arena

for new primary institutions.

Matthew Paterson is the first contemporary ESES scholars that formulated GEG as a new primary institution. Paterson argues that there are five forms of GEG namely GEG as programmatic reforms, multi-level governance, international regimes, deterritorialization, and corporate governance. However, this research argues that GEG should consist of three derivative institutions namely inclusive sovereignty, strong NGOs and weak NGOs.

The purpose of the inclusion of inclusive sovereignty, strong NGOs and weak NGOs is that GEG will be able to be the middle way between pluralism and solidarism. As mentioned before, the finding of this research is that pluralism and solidarism is not mutually exclusive. It can be transformed into other kinds of relationship including coexistence. In order to be able to capture this phenomenon, GEG has to adopt the Eckersley's notion of inclusive sovereignty and a new dichotomy of NGOs.

The ability of setting secondary institution is crucial in developing contemporary ESES. Buzan was inspired to establish secondary institution from Holsti's distinction of foundational institution and procedural institutions. According to Holsti, procedural institutions were "repetitive practices, ideas and norms that underlie and regulate interactions and transactions between the separate actors". Using Holsti distinction, Buzan then created secondary institution. For example, Buzan crafted species survival and climate stability as the derivative of the primary institution of environmental stewardship.

However, Buzan didn't provide the method to set the derivative and primary institution of GEG. Based on the relationship between RSPO and ISPO, this research set the primary and derivate institution of GEG. Three important finding of this research become the derivate of GEG namely inclusive sovereignty, hard NGOs and soft NGOs. They are the result of deconstructing GEG using pluralism and solidarism.

CONCLUSION

This research started with a problem of recurring and worsening environmental degradation in Indonesia. Deforestation, forest fires, transboundary haze and biodiversity loss are the result of state-centric global environmental

governance. The dissatisfaction toward state-centric GEG was reflected in the debate between solidarism and pluralism. In the theory of environmental studies of English School, solidarists focus to empower the marginalized, weak, and those who are non-human being, which refers to flora and fauna of the planet Earth. The solidarism perspective acknowledge the importance of non-human being and emphasizes on the protection of the respective entities. Pluralism, on the other hand, believes that the synergy between the states and the civil society is needed in order to respond to environmental issues.

The debate was applied in the relationship of RSPO and ISPO. RSPO was the transformation of NGOs to be the self-private organization that aimed to set standard on sustainable palm oil. RSPO was the response toward the inability of government to stop deforestation and the discrimination toward local and indigenous communities. RSPO has the ambition to transform palm oil industry into a more sustainable and fair one.

However, Indonesian government also established national standard setting mechanism called ISPO. The dual standard mechanism has created confusion among the industry players due to the overlapping standard and the inefficiencies of time and financial cost. The report from UNDP has been published. It encouraged a combined audit of RSPO and ISPO due to many similarities between them. The similarities between RSPO and ISPO are an important milestone in creating a synergy between states and NGOs.

The case study of RSPO and ISPO has bring important contribution of ESES theoretical development. This research reformulated pluralism and solidarism in GEG which resulted to a critical perspective of state and NGOs. The classical pluralist argued that NGOs-led global environmental governance will destroy the international order. This research found that ISPO is a way for states to work together with NGOs in preventing deforestation and forest fires. It is also argued that ISPO is a way to protect Indonesian sovereignty in palm oil production from the threat of replacing Indonesian palm oil with European vegetable oil. This research established the new pluralism with the emphasis of inclusiveness of state-led GEG. Meanwhile, NGOs' role as the environmental protector can't

be taken-for-granted. This research argued that the reformulation of solidarism should be based on the new dichotomy of NGOs. NGOs should be now differentiated based on their method into two big categories namely hard NGOs and soft NGOs.

Lastly, global environmental governance is established as a new primary institution in ESES. In order to be able to capture the synergy between states and NGOs in the form of RSPO and ISPO, GEG will be consisted of inclusive sovereignty, hard NGOs and soft NGOs. The key to set these new configuration of GEG is the ESES' position of IR research methodology that the structure of international politics is not fixed. There can be change of the list of primary institution and the list of derivative and secondary institution based on the case study.

REFERENCES

- Alfani, A. H., 2017. *Indonesia on Palm Diplomacy in Europe: Approaches towards Boycotts (2006 - 2016)*. Cikarang: President University.
- Alisjahbana, A. S. & Busch, J. M., 2017. Forestry, Forest Fires, and Climate Change in Indonesia. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, pp. 111-136.
- Angelika, Y., 2015. Kebijakan Pemerintah Indonesia Pasca Keluar dari Roundtable Sustainable Palm Oil. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa*, pp. 1-11.
- Barber, C. V., 2000. *Forest, Fires and Confrontation in Indonesia*. Ontario: IISD.
- Barber, C. V. & Schweithelm, J., 2000. *Trial by Fire: Forest Fires and Forestry Policy in Indonesia's Era of Crisis and Reform*. Washington DC: World Resource Institute.
- Berenschot, W., 2015. *Haze of Democracy*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.insideindonesia.org/haze-of-democracy> [Accessed 14 February 2016].
- Bram, D., 2012. Kejahatan Korporasi dalam Pencemaran Lintas Batas Negara: Studi Pencemaran Kabut Asap Kebakaran Hutan di Indonesia. *Law Review*, 11(3), pp. 377-393.
- Bueger, C., 2015. What is maritime security?. *Marine Policy*, pp. 159-164.
- Bull, H., 1966. Grotian Conception on International Society. In: *Diplomatic Investigation: Essays in the Theory of International Politics*. Michigan: Allen & Unwin, pp. 51-73.
- Bull, H., 1977. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Butler, R., 2011. *In Brazil, Palm Oil Plantations Could Help Preserve the Amazon*. [Online] Available at: http://e360.yale.edu/features/in_brazil_palm_oil_plantations_could_help_preserve_amazon
- Buzan, B., 2004. *From International to World Society: English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Clarke, G., 1998. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Politics in Developing World. *Political Studies*, pp. 36-53.
- Conca, K., 2005. Old States in New Bottles? The Hybridization of Authority in Global Environmental Governance. In: *The State and the Global Ecological Crisis*. London: MIT Press, pp. 181-207.
- Dauvergne, P., 1998. The Political Economy of Indonesia's 1997 Forest Fires. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 52(1), pp. 13-17.
- Eckersley, R., 2005. Greening the Nation-State: From Exclusive to Inclusive Sovereignty. In: *The State and Global Ecological Crisis*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, pp. 159-181.
- Falkner, R., 2012. Global environmentalism and the greening of international society. *International Affairs*, pp. 503-522.
- Falkner, R., 2017. The Anarchical Society and Climate Change. In: *The Anarchical Society at 40: Contemporary Challenges and Prospects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 198-216.
- Gallie, W., 1955-1956. Essentially Contested Concept. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, pp. 167-198.
- Glastra, R., Wakker, E. & Richert, W., 2002. *Oil Palm Plantations and Deforestation in Indonesia: What Role do Europe and Germany Play?*. Dreierich: WWF Schweiz.
- Greenpeace International, 2013. *Licensed to Kill*. Amsterdam: Greenpeace International.
- Greenpeace, 2007. *Cooking the Climate*. Amsterdam: Greenpeace International.
- Greenpeace, 2009. *Unilever Hentikan Kontrak dengan Sinar Mas Akibat Kegiatan Illegal Greenpeace Mendesak Menhut Melakukan Langkah Nyata*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.greenpeace.org/seasia/id/news/unilever-hentikan-kontrak-deng/>
[Accessed 10 August 2016].
- Greenpeace, 2013. *RSPO: Certifying Destruction*. Amsterdam: Greenpeace International.
- Hurrell, A., 2007. *On Global Order: Power, Values and the Constitution of International Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Imansari, S. Y., 2015. *Penetapan Kebijakan Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil Pada Tahun 2011*. Jember: Universitas Jember.
- Kim, Y., 2011. *The Unveiled power of NGOs: how NGOs influence states' foreign policy behaviors*. Iowa: University of Iowa.
- Kohne, M., 2014. Multi-stakeholder Initiative governance as assemblage: Roundtable Sustainable Palm Oil as a Political Resource in Land Conflicts related to Oil Palm Plantation. *Agriculture Humanity*, pp. 469-480.
- McCarthy, J., 2012. Certifying in Contested Spaces: Private Regulation in Indonesian Forestry and Palm Oil. *Third World Quarterly*, pp. 1871-1888.
- Miranda, R. J., 2016. *The Indigenous Dayaks and forest-dependent communities are not to blame for the raging forest fires in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia!*. [Online]
Available at: <https://medium.com/@randijulian/the-indigenous-dayaks-and-forest-dependent-communities-are-not-to-blame-for-the-raging-forest-fires-e96d505aeac4>
[Accessed 6 August 2017].
- Mongabay, 2016. *Raging Amazon forest fires threaten uncontacted indigenous tribe*. [Online]
Available at: <https://news.mongabay.com/2016/08/raging-amazon-forest-fires-threaten-uncontacted-indigenous-tribe/>
[Accessed 7 August 2017].
- Moog, S., Spicer, A. & Bohm, S., 2015. The Politics of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives: The Crisis of the Forest Stewardship Council. *Journal of Business Ethics*, pp. 469-493.
- Najam, A., Papa, M. & Taiyab, N., 2006. *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*. Manitoba: International Institute for Sustainable Development.
- National Geographic Indonesia, 2011. *GAPKI Keluar dari RSPO*. [Online]
Available at: <http://nationalgeographic.co.id/berita/2011/10/gapki-keluar-dari-rspo>
[Accessed 13 August 2016].
- Nikoloyuk, J., Burns, T. & Man, R. d., 2010. The promise and limitations of partnered governance: the case of sustainable palm oil. *Corporate Governance*, pp. 59-72.
- Paterson, M., 2005. Global Environmental Governance. In: *International Society and Its Critics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 163-178.
- Princen, T., 1994. Creating a Niche in Environmental Diplomacy. In: *Environmental NGOs in World Politics: Linking the Local and the Global*. London: Routledge, pp. 29-47.
- Raffer, K. & Singer, H., 1996. *The Foreign Aid Business: Economic Assistance and Cooperation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- RSPO, 2007. *RSPO Principles and Criteria*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.rspo.org/file/RSPO%20Principles%20&%20Criteria%20Document.pdf>
[Accessed 22 September 2017].
- Ruyschaert, D. & Salles, D., 2014. Towards global voluntary standards: Questioning the effectiveness in attaining conservation goals The Case of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil. *Ecological Economics*, pp. 438-446.
- Schaper, M., 2009. Non-state environmental standards as a substitute for state regulation?. In: *Non-state actors as standard setters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 304 - 324.
- Survival International, 2016. *Brazil: Amazon fires threaten to wipe out uncontacted Indians*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.survivalinternational.org/news/11391>
[Accessed 7 August 2017].
- Survival International, 2016. *Top Tribal Conservation Skills*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.survivalinternational.org/articles/3380-tribal-conservation>
[Accessed 7 August 2017].
- The Guardian, 2016. *Indonesia's forest fires threaten Sumatra's few remaining Orang Rimba*. [Online]
Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/jun/07/indonesia-forest-fires-threaten-sumatras-few-remaining-orang-rimba>
[Accessed 7 August 2017].
- The Jakarta Post, 2017. *Indonesia to increase palm oil production to 42 million tons by 2020*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2017/09/08/>

- indonesia-to-increase-palm-oil-production-to-42-million-tons-by-2020.html
- The Jakarta Post, 2018. *EDITORIAL: Facing the EU palm oil policy*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/academia/2018/01/24/editorial-facing-the-eu-palm-oil-policy.html>
- Toumbourou, T. & Putra, X. R. A. S., 2016. *Civil Society Takes on the Haze Crisis in Indonesia*. [Online]
Available at: <https://asiafoundation.org/2016/04/20/civil-society-takes-haze-crisis-indonesia/>
- UNDP, 2015. *Joint Study on the Similarities and Differences of the ISPO and the RSPO Certification Systems*. Jakarta: UNDP.
- United Nations, 2014. *'Largely Invisible' in Millennium Goals Era, Indigenous Peoples' Knowledge, Traditions Key to Sustainable Future, Third Committee Told*. [Online]
Available at: <https://www.un.org/press/en/2014/gashc4106.doc.htm>
[Accessed 7 August 2017].
- Wienert, M. S., 2011. Reframing the Pluralist - Solidarist Debate. *Millenium - Journal of International Studies*, pp. 21-41.
- Workman, D., 2017. *Palm Oil Exports by Country*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.worldstopexports.com/palm-oil-exports-by-country/>
- Yani, Y. M., 2017. The Victory of Solidarism in Global Governance: Case Study of Forest Fires and Transboundary Haze in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Studies*, pp. 95-108.