

Ref: FORPOL_2019_196

Title: Distrust and fragmentation among environmental NGOs in Indonesian tropical peatland responsabilization from the expansion of palm oil plantation

Journal: Forest Policy and Economics

Dear Mr. Ramdani,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Forest Policy and Economics. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below. The editorial board recommend reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments.

When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed.

To submit your revised manuscript:

- Log into EVISE® at:
http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jsp?JRNL_ACR=FORPOL
- Locate your manuscript under the header 'My Submissions that need Revisions' on your 'My Author Tasks' view
- Click on 'Agree to Revise'
- Make the required edits
- Click on 'Complete Submission' to approve

What happens next?

After you approve your submission preview you will receive a notification that the submission is complete. To track the status of your paper throughout the editorial process, log in to Evise® at:

http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jsp?JRNL_ACR=FORPOL.

Enrich your article to present your research with maximum impact. This journal supports the following [Content Innovations](#):

Data in Brief (optional):

We invite you to convert your supplementary data (or a part of it) into an additional journal publication in Data in Brief, a multi-disciplinary open access journal. Data in Brief articles are a fantastic way to describe supplementary data and associated metadata, or full raw datasets deposited in an external repository, which are otherwise unnoticed. A Data in Brief article (which will be reviewed, formatted, indexed, and given a DOI) will make your data easier to find, reproduce, and cite.

You can submit to Data in Brief via the Forest Policy and Economics submission system when you upload your revised Forest Policy and Economics manuscript. To do so, complete the template and follow the co-submission instructions found here: www.elsevier.com/dib-

template. If your Forest Policy and Economics manuscript is accepted, your Data in Brief submission will automatically be transferred to Data in Brief for editorial review and publication.

Please note: an open access Article Publication Charge (APC) is payable by the author or research funder to cover the costs associated with publication in Data in Brief and ensure your data article is immediately and permanently free to access by all. For the current APC see: <https://www.elsevier.com/journals/data-in-brief/2352-3409/open-access-journal>

Please contact the Data in Brief editorial office at dib-me@elsevier.com or visit the Data in Brief homepage (www.journals.elsevier.com/data-in-brief/) if you have questions or need further information.

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript as soon as possible.

Kind regards,

Dr **Burns**
Editor
Forest Policy and Economics

Comments from the editors and reviewers:

-Editor

- Guest Editor:

Please, before making any changes, read the special issues introduction chapter so that you can connect your article with the frame of the special issue.

I agree with the first reviewer and you should concentrate the comments from the first review. You should position your paper in the special issue related to responsabilization and you need to spend time in introduction and theoretical sections explaining what you mean by "responzibilization" in the situation your paper in it. NOTE from the first reviewer: "It seems like you are using a buzz word and the links between what you want to say and that topic are unclear." Still, my advice is that do not leave the concept of "responzibilization" out but improve the conceptual framework.

Also, read the other Indonesia paper in this special issue. It is already published and you can reference it.

The both reviewers did a great job and you should consider his/her comments very carefully and answer all the comments point by point. You do not need to make all the requested changes but if you do not agree the comments you need to explain why you did not make the change.

If you decided to make the changes, in your answers to the reviewer, you should write down the line and page number of the changes.

Also, NOTE the last comment from the second reviewer: You could think about the chapter especially the what should be under results, discussion and conclusions.

Please, you need to think how to do make the changes which the second reviewer pointed out and what are the most important comments from the reviewers. However, I would suggest strengthening the paper by following e.g. these key issues:

1. Please, reference our special issue introduction chapter. We have been working with it, so please, read the last version of it. We aim that all the papers are well connected to the introduction chapter.
2. As the first reviewer pointed out: "You need to avoid using superlatives.... you talk about "massive" expansion, NGOs that "never" and "impressive" growth.... without substantiation, this makes your writing seem journalistic and sensationalistic... I suggest you temper the use of these superlatives and let the reader decide whether or not the change is massive."
3. Please, read our Mexico, Nepal and Tanzania paper which is part of this special issue. We could also give comments to your paper. Especially to those issues which the first reviewer pointed out.
4. Please, develop further or take out the highlight "Donors cannot always affect the sustainability of environmental work, and they might even destroy progressiveness, internal movement values, and the creativity of voluntary environmental NGOs"

Dear Dr Sarah L Burns,

First of all, I am so pleased and happy to get your email. I do hope that my paper is not only beneficial for the researchers but also for the policy makers who focus on the role of environmental NGOs in dealing with the expansion of palm oil to the tropical peatland. Therefore, the tropical peatland can be managed in a sustainable way and donors can consider two whom the responsibilities could be transferred. In addition, here is my final paper. Could you open it for me, please?

Once again, many thanks indeed for your consideration.

If you have any inquiries, please don't hesitate to contact me, please?

Best regards,

Dear Reviewer 1

I really appreciate with your fruitful and constructive comments. Based on these processes and comments, I do agree that I'd to revise my paper and I have done to do so. In terms of the contents and substantial matter, it seems that my paper is well organized and clearer now. In terms of technical and language mistakes, it is far better and more understandable. This paper has been proofread by two natives which are Dr Josephine and Quinee. Therefore, I do hope that my paper will be accepted and then published in your reputable journal.

In addition, could you look at my answers and comments on dealing with reviewer's comments. Last but not least, please don't hesitate to contact me, if you have any further suggestion.

Many thanks indeed for giving me a chance to revise and publish this paper.

Best regards,

Revised following the comments

-Reviewer 1

- Thank you for the chance to read and review your paper. You address an interesting issue and I think it is relevant for the journal and special issue. You will find specific comments embedded in the PDF. Sorry, the PDF format was odd so I couldn't always highlight the exact text to which I refer. Overall, I summarise my suggestions for improvement of the paper as follows:

1. I can appreciate the work you have done to get language in shape for this paper, but there remain a considerable number of issues related to language and flow. I

have noted some of them in the text but suggest that you first get an academic colleague to read and comment on the flow and then a professional copy editor. there are some sections that are very choppy, and it is not clear how the ideas flow from one to the next eg. Section 2 basically.... related to this... think carefully about what concepts you need to make your argument; use them; and delete the rest. Eg you break down several variables of trust, but don't use them all when you talk about distrust, and don't use them all in your analysis. This theoretical section is therefore taking up valuable word count that you could use to make your main argument more convincing.

Answer: Yes, we have asked my colleagues to deal with the technical and language mistakes and flow. We hope now it is far better and more understandable. This paper has also been proofread by two natives which are Dr Josephine and Quinee. In the section 2, we have defined what does responsabilization mean and we have redeveloped the framework of analysis which more focuses on agents, actions, institutions, and material supports. In terms of distrust concept, we follow your advice by defining trust in general meaning first followed by explaining distrust and we applied the distrust concept into ENGOs context.

2. You need to avoid using superlatives.... you talk about "massive" expansion, NGOs that "never" and "impressive" growth.... without substantiation, this makes your writing seem journalistic and sensationalistic... I suggest you temper the use of these superlatives and let the reader decide whether or not the change is massive.

Answer: We have revised and modified following the comments.

3. Similarly, your main argument is fragmentation between advocacy and service NGOs as the main reason why they have reduced impact on peatland protection. To assess the "main" reason, you would have to explore others, such as policy environment, the interests of elites, lack of funding, and other drivers, but you don't do that... therefore, you can't convincingly say that this is the main reason, just one of possible many. The many would be worth mentioning in order to suggest the relevance of your study and that you are aware of the myriad reasons that NGOs could fall short of their stated objectives.

Answer: We have redeveloped the concept and the framework of responsabilization. Therefore, my analysis more focuses on how the relation between donors and the agents imply and why different actions, institutions, and material supports can led to a constraint of the distrust in the context of natural resource responsabilization, rather than that focuses on fragmentation and the ENGO action impacts to the tropical peatland protection.

4. You focus on these two types of NGOS... but what about distrust even within these types? NGOs are competing in the same spaces for money and legitimacy, so why does the type of NGO really matter?

Answer: In the current analysis, we do not rise distrust within advocacy ENGO consortia. Although there is distrust within this type, it is only a minor issue and in general distrust

occurs between advocacy and Service ENGOS. The classification of ENGOS matters because of two reasons: Firstly, both types of NGOs have different characteristics concerning on actions, institutions, and material supports. Secondly, the variety of actions, networks, and donors affects to their well-being and leads to a constraint in the context of natural resources responsabilization.

5. The notion of "movement" is used at several points. You need to either show that there is such thing as an "NGO Movement" if that is what you mean... I don't see it here.... if you mean "Environmental movement", that would be easier to cite I would think, but even so, I am not sure that the idea of movements helps your arguments.... networks seem to do the job just fine, so I suggest removing reference to movements as it complicates your argument and acts as a strawman.

Answer: Yes, we have changed the word of "movement" with "actions" which refer to activities, programmes, and strategies that the ENGOS deploy. We have made it clearer in the whole paper now. We use also "network" which refers to institution in the responsabilization framework (Mustalahti and Agawal, forthcoming in this special issue).

6. You position your paper in the special issue related to responsabilization. That is fine, but you need to spend more time in introduction and theoretical sections explaining what you mean by this and then situation your paper in it. As it is, it seems like you are using a buzz word and the links between what you want to say and that topic are unclear. If not for the focus of the special issue, I would suggest deleting the term from your paper, but in this case, I suggest positioning your paper better within that concept and explain what it means to you.

Answer: We have revised it and detailed in introduction and conceptual framework section. Besides, we have tried to avoid the buzz words, for example by replacing the word "confront" with "challenge" etc.

7. You make this distinction between advocacy and service NGOs. I think this needs some more unpacking.... how did you make that distinction and how well does it apply in the field? E.g. if respondents talked those terms, then it would be fair to use it, or if you can cite literature that makes that distinction, fine, but I would imagine that there are many NGOs who do both service and advocacy.... the lack of clarity on the basis of this distinction puts your entire analysis on tenuous ground. It might take just a few sentences to explain how you got that distinction and why you chose it over other variables, like whether or not the NGO has international affiliations, works at a local scale only, has an open membership structure, is registered by the state, gets money from companies etc.

Answer: As we have explained above, the classification of ENGOS is critical. Both advocacy and service ENGOS have different actions, institutions, and material supports which lead to the distrust between them. Lastly, we have also cited Lisa Jordan and Michael T Heaney on defining advocacy and service ENGOS.

8. You highlight "Donors cannot always affect the sustainability of environmental work, and they might even destroy progressiveness, internal movement values, and the creativity of voluntary environmental NGOs"... I honestly don't see that in the paper.

Answer: It has been taken out.

9. I can appreciate the difficulty of combining results and discussion sections, and I know it feels odd to separate them sometimes, but in this case, the effect of combining them is to severely weaken your empirical claims. By mixing literature references and your empirical data, I as a reader was not at all clear how you came to some conclusions. I really think that separating them would make your findings stronger and you could show the reader how you come to your conclusions and how it relates to literature after that.

Answer: We have reorganized the sections and we have separated between result and discussion.

I hope these points are constructive and you can see that I appreciate the paper and what you are trying to do. With some more work and thinking, I imagine I will see significant improvement in the next revision.

P1-L54 English Sumatra

Answer: It has been revised.

P2-L68 Reading on, I think you need to start this sentence with NGOs ... delete the first bit as it is awkward working and it is not clear that the cited scholars are actually making this argument but they substantive.

Answer: It has also been revised following the comment.

P2-L81 Use past tense here.

Answer: It has been revised in the whole method section.

P2-L84 Delete "a lot" and "huge".

Answer: We have deleted them.

P2-L91 Their role according to whom? CSO often define their roles, which may or may not align with the perspectives of the subjects their activities.

Answer: We have revised the sentence. It is according to the previous research on NGOs in Indonesia, for example we can see to Hadiwinata 2003 and Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002.

P2-L102 To what is this NGOs referring?

Answer: These NGOs refer to Environmental NGOs in a global context. However, I have modified and revised the paragraph.

P2-L114 What efforts? Perhaps use "despite their efforts".

Answer: Yes, however as we more focus on actions, institutions, and material supports rather than that focuses on fragmentation and the ENGO action impacts to the tropical peatland protection, we have modified and revised the paragraph.

P3-L122 You have not talked about it as a movement so far ... be careful of your wording and explain how you see it as a movement or change the wording.

Answer: Yes, we have changed the word of "movement" with "actions" which refer to activities, programmes, and strategies the ENGOs deploy. We have also made it clearer in the whole paper now.

P3-L123 You need to substantiate the claim that it has had little impact Oil palm is expanding, yes but in the absence of these groups would it be expanding at a greater rate? If you cannot answer this, be careful about your claim. Perhaps say that the efforts of NGOs have been insufficient to stop the rapid expansion of oil palm plantation.

Answer: Yes, we have been more careful. We have switched my analysis which focuses on the relation between donors and the agents and a constraint in the context of natural resource responsabilization.

P3-L139 You need to dig a bit deeper here.... There are also suggestions of the contrary.

Answer: The paragraph has been modified as we do not raise the issue of smallholder palm oil farmers now.

P3-L171 Above you use "our" and here you use "I" ... be consistent and align with your author list.

Answer: It has been revised.

P4-L228 You need to unpack this Sen quote... it does not make sense stands alone.

P4-L231 Same you need to explain Mustalahti quote. The meaning of "valuable expectation" and link to the previous sentence is not at all clear.

P4-L231 Sorry lost here... not sure what "it" refers to.

P4-L233 the use to the pronoun "who" for an NGO is not

P5-L246 Was Sen talking about NGOs here?

P5-L254 Since you are a Sen fan, I would consider a note on adaptive preferences here Suggesting that NGOs and communities all are free agents and can make their own decisions is overly simplistic and even naïve ... they are constrained by many factors, including the priorities of donors for one. Also, the claim that NGOs may facilitate communities to govern themselves needs to be unpacked or deleted ... they equally as well as may not. If you do not want to open the debate, then you need to delete this sentence.

P5-L256 I would disagree that Ribot et al 2006 says this.

Answer P4-L228 to P5-L256: This paragraph has been revised and modified. In defining the concept of responsabilization, we have mostly referred to Lemke (2002) and Rose (2006), the critical perspective of governmentality. Lastly, I have followed the responsabilization framework in the introduction of this special issue to position my paper.

P5-L260 Again, you have not shown evidence of what an "NGO movement" is ... in fact your overall argument in the paper is not fragmentation of organisations so I think that you need to re-consider using the word movement and that it may be contra productive to your framing if you choose to elaborate on it. It would be easier to argue an environmental movement than NGO movement ... but for the framing of this apper, I suggest you remove references to movements.

Answer: It has been revised following the comments.

P6-L320 wording.

Answer: It has been revised.

P6-L322 Missing pronoun somewhere.

Answer: It has been revised.

P7-L364 Careful ... safer to use tend not to.

Answer: It has been revised.

P7-L394 Again, "never" is a strong word ... I can think plenty of instances in which corporations support advocacy NGOs e.g.

Answer: It has been revised. Yes, but in Indonesian context companies barely support advocacy NGOs.

P7-L402 This whole section needs some editing ... many of the sentences do not flow to the next or build on the previous and it is not always clear how what you say related to your argument.

Answer: The section has been revised following the comments and we have asked the proofreader to concern on the flow.

P8-L424 You list a range of concepts with brief definitions, but don't show how they relate one another ... it reads like a list, but the meaning is not clear for your argument ... I suggest you spend more time how these variables relate to one another and your argument.

Answer: We have revised and we more concern on the concept of trustors, trustees, and actions. In the discussion section. We have applied these concepts to analyze distrust between advocacy and service ENGOS in the discussion section.

P8-L430 you define distrust very narrowly here ... better to root it in what you have said about trust generally first and bring it into how it applies to environmental NGOs.

Answer: It has also been revised following the comment.

P8-L453 This is more a concluding remark ... you have not shown the NGOs distrust one another so it is premature to say this here.

Answer: It has also been revised and we took this paragraph out.

P9-L483 You switch tenses from present to past ... pick one and be consistent.

Answer: It has been revised and we use past tense in the whole method section.

P11-L630 By mixing results and discussion, your argument is weakened. It is often not clear in section on what you are basing your findings – weather from empirical data or literature. I suggest your argument will be clearer, if you separate out these sections to allow the readers to more focus to your findings first, and then what make of your findings, rooting them in the literature.

Answer: We have reorganized the paper and we have separated between result and discussion.

P11-L632 Delete first sentence ... You have said this several times already.

Answer: It has been revised.

P11-L633 All NGOs are a member of a consortium?

Answer: Yes, they are. All NGOs affiliate with one of the consortia.

P12-L686 I explore.

Answer: It has been revised.

P12-L686 Roles.

Answer: It has been revised.

P15-L863 You have this in the abstract also – I am not sure you clearly differentiated what the service NGO is and what advocacy NGO is ... I would imagine that many are both. But since I am not clear on your definition, I can't say.

Answer: We follow Lisa Jordan (2002) to classify the NGOs based upon advocacy and service delivery role. In the context of responsabilization framework, this classification has implied with the actions which the ENGOS conduct. In addition, although many ENGOS work with advocacy and service-delivery actions, in general they are closer to one of the both roles.

P15-L873 The rest of this section is confusing ... it seems to continue to rely on literature rather than your empirical findings or results ... aside from the table, I can't see your primary research here.

Answer: As we have separated between result and discussion, currently the empirical finding and the discussion part are far clearer and more understandable.

P15-L875 I actually don't see that in the table.

Answer: We have revised. Besides, the evidence that the advocacy ENGOs challenge companies can be seen in the explanation on the result section, for example JIKALAHARI, WALHI, AGRA and JMGR.

P16-L905 Look like from Austin, not your own work.

Answer: Now, it is much clearer as we have separated the result and discussion section.

P16-L907 Evidence?

Answer: The evidence can be seen in the result section and we have directly cited the interview words.

P16-L939 Among? Is the distrust only between those opposing and wanting to work with government or companies or also among organisations within these categories ... also there are several examples of actors who sometime work with government or sometime oppose e.g. WALHI ... so where do they fit?

Answer: It has been revised as we more focus on distrust between advocacy and service ENGOs consortia. Advocacy ENGOs, like WALHI sometime work with government, if the programmes meet with their interest as I have explained in the discussion section.

P16-L939 Show how you know this?

Answer: Now, it can be seen on the result section.

P17-L949 Show.

Answer: The evidence on the result section.

P17-L965 Yay evidence. Root your arguments in evidence and expand on it.

Answer: We have revised it.

P17-L976 Same problem as above.

Answer: We have revised it.

P18-L1024-1026 Back to the problem of showing ... you need to unpack how you come to this conclusion ... not clear from the data you presented.

Answer: The evidence has been shown in 4.2 on the sub-section of the result.

P20-L1147 I suggest you add a paragraph on why it matters if NGOs collaborate? I mean is it even possible and if so, what different would it make? Neo-liberal.

Answer: Yes, we do think that it contradicts with distrust. Hence, we would prefer not to rise this collaboration issue in my paper, we would just talk about it as a suggestion.

P20-L1151 I still do not feel like you have made clear how these are the variables that determine fragmentation ... maybe there are others like local or national or international

affiliation, or membership base ... this is a pivotal distinction for your paper and it remains unconvincing.

Answer: As we have modified the concept and the framework of responsabilization, we have revised and modified the whole conclusion section following the discussion.

P20-L1168 Suggest deleting ... cause and effect are not convincing-only co-occurrence.

Answer: It has been revised.

P21-L1190 Did not get this from your discussion.

Answer: Yes, it has been modified. Currently, we more focus on how this type of ENGO can finance their activities, lead their organization and become entrepreneurs themselves based on environmental analysis of costs and benefits.

P21-L1202 This link is not apparent to me.

Answer: Yes, it has been taken out and the discussion section has been changed following the discussion.

P21-L1222 This needs to be discussed more in the discussion section and you need to unpack how this does not contradict your interpretation of your findings.

Answer: Yes, we have answered this question above.

P22-L1242 Suggest not using "should" here ... the paper barely talks about smallholders so the concluding sentence "should" not focus on them ... to make this statement you would need to unpack why smallholders need NGOs in the paper and I don't think you can do that without severely losing focus.

Answer: The paragraph has been modified as we do not raise the issue of smallholder palm oil farmers now.

Revised following the comments

-Reviewer 2

-The strength of the paper is a timely topic and a rich empirical material, as well as interesting results, however, methods need some clarification and the results could be presented with a table. In addition, language revision might be useful.

Please see more detailed comments:

- Previous literature has been reviewed and it is sufficient, and the conceptual literature is nicely developed. However, concept responsabilization could be defined clearly as it is not common for all the readers.

Answer: I have redeveloped and defined the concept responsabilization in section two. It is clearer now.

- Method section, the first sentence qualitative approach, not method as there are several qualitative methods. I wonder if snowball technique is the best way to determine the NGOs? Does that mean that there was prior knowledge about them beforehand? Was it difficult to identify the informants inside the NGO or the organisations themselves?

Answer: It has been revised, and I have stated that I apply the grounded theory approach. I built the key concepts of responsabilization and its framework and distrust used as a primary lens to understand and to analyse the phenomenon at the same time I am also able to elaborate and modify the key concepts regarding data analysis and findings. Besides, the informants who mainly the coordinators of consortium and the leaders of the ENGOS have been known beforehand, but to meet with them, for example to get their phone numbers, the first interviewee informed me of others. In my case, only few NGOs have website or social media in which it challenged me to meet them.

Table 1: why on 2016 and 2017 there are interviews but on 2018 KEY informant interviews? What is the difference? There is no point to organize the table in a way that reader does not see the sums per organizational type but the year only? Add the sums of interviews per organizational type to column to the right. Does that effect to your results that you have 11 advocacy NGOs and 5 service NGOS? How national are service NGOS? Do they get funding from outside of Indonesia too? Did you interview at least few representatives of each category of NGOs you present in result section?

Answer: Yes, I have revised as there are no different among them. I have also added the sums per organization following the comment. I do not think this number has an impact to the result as the number of advocacy NGOs and its consortia is larger than that the service NGOs. Besides, as I have explained in the result section, the service NGOs consortium and its members are only situated in Riau province, local level. They are supported by central government and companies, from national level, and they do not receive funding from international donors. In addition, I do think that the number of informants is representative and many enough.

- Results – Was it a result of this work to find out the number of NGOs in Riau? This was not known beforehand. How the 6 categories correspond with your data? You have interviewed 16 of 50 NGOs? I think would be important to explain why you choose those 16 of 50 – snowball technique is not a good one to explain it. So, add justification for selection.

Answer: I have modified the result following the comments and it is far clearer now. I have chosen 11 leaders from 5 advocacy NGO consortia and 5 leaders from the service NGO consortium. All of them represent the variety of the NGO background in their consortia. For example, I did interview with 4 informants namely the coordinator, and a youth organization, a legal aid NGO, and an international NGO of JIKALAHARI consortium members. The list of all informants whom I interviewed as below:

Types of NGOs	Consortium	Informant
Advocacy ENGOS	JIKALAHARI	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinator of JIKALAHARI 2. leader of youth organization 3. Leader of legal aid NGO 4. Leader of an International NGO
	WALHI	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WALHI coordinator 2. Leader of legal aid NGO 3. Leader of Women NGO
	AGRA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The coordinator of AGRA 2. Leader of Women Organization
	JMGR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinator of JMGR 2. Leader of JMGR in a regency branch
	Green Radio	Director of Green Radio
Service ENGOS	FKKM	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Director of FKKM 2. Coordinator of GIAM SIAK working group (6 NGOs) 3. Coordinator of Kerumutan working group (4 NGOs) 4. Coordinator of Semenanjung Kampar working group (4 NGOs) 5. Coordinator of SINEPSIS working group (3 NGOs) 6. Coordinator of Bukit 30 National Park (3 NGOs)

Does the table 2 correspond the row 1 in table 1? (local environmental NGOs?)

Answer: No, it is different. In the table 1 context, local advocacy ENGOS refer to a member of Jikalahari, a member of WALHI, and two representatives of JMGR categorized as local advocacy ENGOS while 5 local service ENGOS refer to FKKM consortium members.

Page 18, row29, you wonder why they do not share resources within each other? I wonder if that is naïve to think that would be the case? Why they would do it?

Answer: In the critical perspective of responsabilization, the transfer of responsibilities should be followed by the ceding of power. It means that the agents receiving

responsibilities should be able to apply what actions they expect to conduct and should be autonomous to manage the budget.

In short, I think result section is not really organized, it could be re-written by adding a table that summarises all the results.

Answer: I have separated the result section into two sub-sections which are 4.1 about actions, network, and fundraising of ENGOs in Riau province, and 4.2 about distrust and the transfer of responsibilities. I put the table summarize (Table 2) on the 4.1., but it is quite hard to summarize the distrust and the transfer of responsibilities in a table.

- Conclusions – include now sentences that should be included in discussion section. As the paper has no discussion section obviously it combines results and discussion. However, this does not mean that conclusion section should contain discussion! Rewrite the conclusions –max length less than a page and remove reference and focus on your findings – do not discuss on them- move that your results and discussion section.

Answer: The conclusion section has been revised following the comments and the result and discussion section have been separated.

Title: Palm oil expansion in tropical peatland: Distrust between advocacy and service environmental NGOs

Journal: Forest Policy and Economics

Dear Mr. Ramdani,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Forest Policy and Economics. I have received comments from reviewers on your manuscript. Your paper should become acceptable for publication pending suitable moderate revision and modification of the article in light of the appended comments.

When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed.

To submit your revised manuscript:

- Log into EVISE® at:
http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=FORPOL
- Locate your manuscript under the header 'My Submissions that need Revisions' on your 'My Author Tasks' view
- Click on 'Agree to Revise'
- Make the required edits
- Click on 'Complete Submission' to approve

What happens next?

After you approve your submission preview you will receive a notification that the submission is complete. To track the status of your paper throughout the editorial process, log in to EVISE® at:

http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=FORPOL.

Enrich your article to present your research with maximum impact. This journal supports the following [Content Innovations](#):

Data in Brief (optional):

We invite you to convert your supplementary data (or a part of it) into an additional journal publication in Data in Brief, a multi-disciplinary open access journal. Data in Brief articles are a fantastic way to describe supplementary data and associated metadata, or full raw datasets deposited in an external repository, which are otherwise unnoticed. A Data in Brief article (which will be reviewed, formatted, indexed, and given a DOI) will make your data easier to find, reproduce, and cite.

You can submit to Data in Brief via the Forest Policy and Economics submission system when you upload your revised Forest Policy and Economics manuscript. To do so, complete the template and follow the co-submission instructions found here: www.elsevier.com/dib-template. If your Forest Policy and Economics manuscript is accepted, your Data in Brief submission will automatically be transferred to Data in Brief for editorial review and publication.

Please note: an open access Article Publication Charge (APC) is payable by the author or research funder to cover the costs associated with publication in Data in Brief and ensure your data article is immediately and permanently free to access by all. For the current APC see: <https://www.elsevier.com/journals/data-in-brief/2352-3409/open-access-journal>

Please contact the Data in Brief editorial office at dib-me@elsevier.com or visit the Data in Brief homepage (www.journals.elsevier.com/data-in-brief/) if you have questions or need further information.

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript as soon as possible.

Kind regards,

Dr. Burns

Editor

Forest Policy and Economics

Revised following the comments

- Guest Editor:

Please, before making any changes, read the special issues introduction chapter so that you can connect your article with the frame of the special issue.

I agree with the first reviewer and you should concentrate the comments from the first review. You should position your paper in the special issue related to responsabilization and you need to spend time in introduction and theoretical sections explaining what you mean by "responsibilization" in the situation your paper in it. NOTE from the first reviewer: "It seems like you are using a buzz word and the links between what you want to say and that topic are unclear." Still, my advice is that do not leave the concept of "responsibilization" out but improve the conceptual framework.

Answer: I have read the introduction of special issue several times and I have connected my paper with the responsabilization framework focusing on agents, institutions, and material supports. I position my study on how advocacy and service ENGOs received responsibilities from donors and why different institutions and material supports lead to a constraint on natural resources responsabilization. In the second section, I have also defined what does responsabilization mean. Lastly, I have tried to avoid the buzz words, for example by replacing the word "confront" with "challenge".

Also, read the other Indonesia paper in this special issue. It is already published and you can reference it.

Answer: I did, and I have cited it.

The both reviewers did a great job and you should consider his/her comments very carefully and answer all the comments point by point. You do not need to make all the requested changes but if you do not agree the comments you need to explain why you did not make the change.

Answer: I mostly do agree with all comments from the first and second reviewer.

If you decided to make the changes, in your answers to the reviewer, you should write down the line and page number of the changes.

Answer: Yes, thank you.

Also, NOTE the last comment from the second reviewer: You could think about the chapter especially the what should be under results, discussion and conclusions.

Answer: I have reorganized the paper and I have separated between result and discussion.

Please, you need to think how to do make the changes which the second reviewer pointed out and what are the most important comments from the reviewers. However, I would suggest strengthening the paper by following e.g. these key issues:

1. Please, reference our special issue introduction chapter. We have been working with it, so please, read the last version of it. We aim that all the papers are well connected to the introduction chapter.

Answer: Yes.

2. As the first reviewer pointed out: "You need to avoid using superlatives.... you talk about "massive" expansion, NGOs that "never" and "impressive" growth.... without substantiation, this makes your writing seem journalistic and sensationalistic... I suggest you temper the use of these superlatives and let the reader decide whether or not the change is massive."

Answer: I do agree, and I have made many changes to eliminate the superlatives in the whole paper now.

3. Please, read our Mexico, Nepal and Tanzania paper which is part of this special issue. We could also give comments to your paper. Especially to those issues which the first reviewer pointed out.

Answer: I did, and I have cited it

4. Please, develop further or take out the highlight "Donors cannot always affect the sustainability of environmental work, and they might even destroy progressiveness, internal movement values, and the creativity of voluntary environmental NGOs"

Answer: Yes, I have taken it out.

-Reviewer 1

- Thank you for the chance to read and review your paper. You address an interesting issue and I think it is relevant for the journal and special issue. You will find specific comments embedded in the PDF. Sorry, the PDF format was odd so I couldn't always highlight the exact text to which I refer. Overall, I summarise my suggestions for improvement of the paper as follows:

10. I can appreciate the work you have done to get language in shape for this paper, but there remain a considerable number of issues related to language and flow. I have noted some of them in the text but suggest that you first get an academic colleague to read and comment on the flow and then a professional copy editor. There are some sections that are very choppy, and it is not clear how the ideas flow from one to the next eg. Section 2 basically.... related to this... think carefully about what concepts you need to make your argument; use them; and delete the rest. Eg you break down several variables of trust, but don't use them all when you talk about distrust, and don't use them all in your analysis. This theoretical section is therefore taking up valuable word count that you could use to make your main argument more convincing.

Answer: Yes, I have asked my colleagues to deal with the technical and language mistakes and flow. I hope now it is far better and more understandable. This paper has also been proofread by two natives which are Dr Josephine and Quinee. In the section 2, I have defined what does responsabilization mean and I have redeveloped the framework of analysis which more focuses on agents, actions, institutions, and material supports. In terms of distrust concept, I follow your advice by defining trust in general meaning first followed by explaining distrust and I applied the distrust concept into ENGOs context.

11. You need to avoid using superlatives.... you talk about "massive" expansion, NGOs that "never" and "impressive" growth.... without substantiation, this makes your writing seem journalistic and sensationalistic... I suggest you temper the use of these superlatives and let the reader decide whether or not the change is massive.

Answer: I have revised and modified following the comments.

12. Similarly, your main argument is fragmentation between advocacy and service NGOs as the main reason why they have reduced impact on peatland protection. To assess the "main" reason, you would have to explore others, such as policy environment, the interests of elites, lack of funding, and other drivers, but you don't do that... therefore, you can't convincingly say that this is the main reason, just one of possible many. The many would be worth mentioning in order to suggest the relevance of your study and that you are aware of the myriad reasons that NGOs could fall short of their stated objectives.

Answer: I have redeveloped the concept and the framework of responsabilization. Therefore, my analysis more focuses on how the relation between donors and the agents imply and why different actions, institutions, and material supports can led to a constraint of the distrust in the context of natural resource responsabilization, rather than that focuses on fragmentation and the ENGO action impacts to the tropical peatland protection.

13. You focus on these two types of NGOS... but what about distrust even within these types? NGOs are competing in the same spaces for money and legitimacy, so why does the type of NGO really matter?

Answer: In the current analysis, I do not rise distrust within advocacy ENGO consortia. Although there is distrust within this type, it is only a minor issue and in general distrust occurs between advocacy and Service ENGOs. The classification of ENGOs matters because of two reasons: Firstly, both types of NGOs have different characteristics concerning on actions, institutions, and material supports. Secondly, the variety of actions, networks, and donors affects to their well-being and leads to a constraint in the context of natural resources responsabilization.

14. The notion of "movement" is used at several points. You need to either show that there is such thing as an "NGO Movement" if that is what you mean... I don't see it here.... if you mean "Environmental movement", that would be easier to cite I would think, but even so, I am not sure that the idea of movements helps your arguments.... networks seem to do the job just fine, so I suggest removing reference to movements as it complicates your argument and acts as a strawman.

Answer: Yes, I have changed the word of "movement" with "actions" which refer to activities, programmes, and strategies that the ENGOs deploy. I have made it clearer in the whole paper now. I use also "network" which refers to institution in the responsabilization framework (Mustalahti and Agawal, forthcoming in this special issue).

15. You position your paper in the special issue related to responsabilization. That is fine, but you need to spend more time in introduction and theoretical sections explaining what you mean by this and then situation your paper in it. As it is, it seems like you are using a buzz word and the links between what you want to say and that topic are unclear. If not for the focus of the special issue, I would suggest deleting the term from your paper, but in this case, I suggest positioning your paper better within that concept and explain what it means to you.

Answer: I have revised it and detailed in introduction and conceptual framework section. Besides, I have tried to avoid the buzz words, for example by replacing the word "confront" with "challenge" etc.

16. You make this distinction between advocacy and service NGOs. I think this needs some more unpacking.... how did you make that distinction and how well does it apply in the field? E.g. if respondents talked those terms, then it would be fair to use it, or if you can cite literature that makes that distinction, fine, but I would imagine that there are many NGOs who do both service and advocacy.... the lack

of clarity on the basis of this distinction puts your entire analysis on tenuous ground. It might take just a few sentences to explain how you got that distinction and why you chose it over other variables, like whether or not the NGO has international affiliations, works at a local scale only, has an open membership structure, is registered by the state, gets money from companies etc.

Answer: As I have explained above, the classification of ENGOs is critical. Both advocacy and service ENGOs have different actions, institutions, and material supports which lead to the distrust between them. Lastly, I have also cited Lisa Jordan and Michael T Heaney on defining advocacy and service ENGOs.

17. You highlight "Donors cannot always affect the sustainability of environmental work, and they might even destroy progressiveness, internal movement values, and the creativity of voluntary environmental NGOs"... I honestly don't see that in the paper.

Answer: It has been taken out.

18. I can appreciate the difficulty of combining results and discussion sections, and I know it feels odd to separate them sometimes, but in this case, the effect of combining them is to severely weaken your empirical claims. By mixing literature references and your empirical data, I as a reader was not at all clear how you came to some conclusions. I really think that separating them would make your findings stronger and you could show the reader how you come to your conclusions and how it relates to literature after that.

Answer: I have reorganized the sections and I have separated between result and discussion.

I hope these points are constructive and you can see that I appreciate the paper and what you are trying to do. With some more work and thinking, I imagine I will see significant improvement in the next revision.

P1-L54 English Sumatra

Answer: It has been revised.

P2-L68 Reading on, I think you need to start this sentence with NGOs ... delete the first bit as it is awkward working and it is not clear that the cited scholars are actually making this argument but they substantive.

Answer: It has also been revised following the comment.

P2-L81 Use past tense here.

Answer: It has been revised in the whole method section.

P2-L84 Delete "a lot" and "huge".

Answer: I have deleted them.

P2-L91 Their role according to whom? CSO often define their roles, which may or may not align with the perspectives of the subjects their activities.

Answer: I have revised the sentence. It is according to the previous research on NGOs in Indonesia, for example I can see to Hadiwinata 2003 and Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002.

P2-L102 To what is this NGOs referring?

Answer: These NGOs refer to Environmental NGOs in a global context. However, I have modified and revised the paragraph.

P2-L114 What efforts? Perhaps use "despite their efforts".

Answer: Yes, however as I more focus on actions, institutions, and material supports rather than that focuses on fragmentation and the ENGO action impacts to the tropical peatland protection, I have modified and revised the paragraph.

P3-L122 You have not talked about it as a movement so far ... be careful of your wording and explain how you see it as a movement or change the wording.

Answer: Yes, I have changed the word of "movement" with "actions" which refer to activities, programmes, and strategies the ENGOs deploy. I have also made it clearer in the whole paper now.

P3-L123 You need to substantiate the claim that it has had little impact Oil palm is expanding, yes but in the absence of these groups would it be expanding at a greater rate? If you cannot answer this, be careful about your claim. Perhaps say that the efforts of NGOs have been insufficient to stop the rapid expansion of oil palm plantation.

Answer: Yes, I have been more careful. I have switched my analysis which focuses on the relation between donors and the agents and a constraint in the context of natural resource responsabilization.

P3-L139 You need to dig a bit deeper here.... There are also suggestions of the contrary.

Answer: The paragraph has been modified as I do not raise the issue of smallholder palm oil farmers now.

P3-L171 Above you use "our" and here you use "I" ... be consistent and align with your author list.

Answer: It has been revised.

P4-L228 You need to unpack this Sen quote... it does not make sense stands alone.

P4-L231 Same you need to explain Mustalahti quote. The meaning of "valuable expectation" and link to the previous sentence is not at all clear.

P4-L231 Sorry lost here... not sure what "it" refers to.

P4-L233 the use to the pronoun "who" for an NGO is not

P5-L246 Was Sen talking about NGOs here?

P5-L254 Since you are a Sen fan, I would consider a note on adaptive preferences here ... Suggesting that NGOs and communities all are free agents and can make their own decisions is overly simplistic and even naïve ... they are constrained by many factors, including the priorities of donors for one. Also, the claim that NGOs may facilitate communities to govern themselves needs to be unpacked or deleted ... they equally as well as may not. If you do not want to open the debate, then you need to delete this sentence.

P5-L256 I would disagree that Ribot et al 2006 says this.

Answer P4-L228 to P5-L256: This paragraph has been revised and modified. In defining the concept of responsabilization, I have mostly referred to Lemke (2002) and Rose (2006), the critical perspective of governmentality. Lastly, I have followed the responsabilization framework in the introduction of this special issue to position my paper.

P5-L260 Again, you have not shown evidence of what an “NGO movement” is ... in fact your overall argument in the paper is not fragmentation of organisations so I think that you need to re-consider using the word movement and that it may be contra productive to your framing if you choose to elaborate on it. It would be easier to argue an environmental movement than NGO movement ... but for the framing of this paper, I suggest you remove references to movements.

Answer: It has been revised following the comments.

P6-L320 wording.

Answer: It has been revised.

P6-L322 Missing pronoun somewhere.

Answer: It has been revised.

P7-L364 Careful ... safer to use tend not to.

Answer: It has been revised.

P7-L394 Again, “never” is a strong word ... I can think plenty of instances in which corporations support advocacy NGOs e.g.

Answer: It has been revised. Yes, but in Indonesian context companies barely support advocacy NGOs.

P7-L402 This whole section needs some editing ... many of the sentences do not flow to the next or build on the previous and it is not always clear how what you say related to your argument.

Answer: The section has been revised following the comments and I have asked the proofreader to concern on the flow.

P8-L424 You list a range of concepts with brief definitions, but don't show how they relate one another ... it reads like a list, but the meaning is not clear for your argument ... I suggest you spend more time how these variables relate to one another and your argument.

Answer: I have revised and I more concern on the concept of trustors, trustees, and actions. In the discussion section. I have applied these concepts to analyze distrust between advocacy and service ENGOs in the discussion section.

P8-L430 you define distrust very narrowly here ... better to root it in what you have said about trust generally first and bring it into how it applies to environmental NGOs.

Answer: It has also been revised following the comment.

P8-L453 This is more a concluding remark ... you have not shown the NGOs distrust one another so it is premature to say this here.

Answer: It has also been revised and I took this paragraph out.

P9-L483 You switch tenses from present to past ... pick one and be consistent.

Answer: It has been revised and I use past tense in the whole method section.

P11-L630 By mixing results and discussion, your argument is weakened. It is often not clear in section on what you are basing your findings – whether from empirical data or literature. I suggest your argument will be clearer, if you separate out these sections to allow the readers to more focus to your findings first, and then what make of your findings, rooting them in the literature.

Answer: I have reorganized the paper and I have separated between result and discussion.

P11-L632 Delete first sentence ... You have said this several times already.

Answer: It has been revised.

P11-L633 All NGOs are a member of a consortium?

Answer: Yes, they are. All NGOs affiliate with one of the consortia.

P12-L686 I explore.

Answer: It has been revised.

P12-L686 Roles.

Answer: It has been revised.

P15-L863 You have this in the abstract also – I am not sure you clearly differentiated what the service NGO is and what advocacy NGO is ... I would imagine that many are both. But since I am not clear on your definition, I can't say.

Answer: I follow Lisa Jordan (2002) to classify the NGOs based upon advocacy and service delivery role. In the context of responsabilization framework, this classification has implied with the actions which the ENGOs conduct. In addition, although many ENGOs work with advocacy and service-delivery actions, in general they are closer to one of the both roles.

P15-L873 The rest of this section is confusing ... it seems to continue to rely on literature rather than your empirical findings or results ... aside from the table, I can't see your primary research here.

Answer: As I have separated between result and discussion, currently the empirical finding and the discussion part are far clearer and more understandable.

P15-L875 I actually don't see that in the table.

Answer: I have revised. Besides, the evidence that the advocacy ENGOs challenge companies can be seen in the explanation on the result section, for example JIKALAHARI, WALHI, AGRA and JMGR.

P16-L905 Look like from Austin, not your own work.

Answer: Now, it is much clearer as I have separated the result and discussion section.

P16-L907 Evidence?

Answer: The evidence can be seen in the result section and I have directly cited the interview words.

P16-L939 Among? Is the distrust only between those opposing and wanting to work with government or companies or also among organisations within these categories ... also there are several examples of actors who sometime work with government or sometime oppose e.g. WALHI ... so where do they fit?

Answer: It has been revised as I more focus on distrust between advocacy and service ENGOs consortia. Advocacy ENGOs, like WALHI sometime work with government, if the programmes meet with their interest as I have explained in the discussion section.

P16-L939 Show how you know this?

Answer: Now, it can be seen on the result section.

P17-L949 Show.

Answer: The evidence on the result section.

P17-L965 Yay evidence. Root your arguments in evidence and expand on it.

Answer: I have revised it.

P17-L976 Same problem as above.

Answer: I have revised it.

P18-L1024-1026 Back to the problem of showing ... you need to unpack how you come to this conclusion ... not clear from the data you presented.

Answer: The evidence has been shown in 4.2 on the sub-section of the result.

P20-L1147 I suggest you add a paragraph on why it matters if NGOs collaborate? I mean is it even possible and if so, what different would it make? Neo-liberal.

Answer: Yes, I do think that it contradicts with distrust. Hence, I would prefer not to rise this collaboration issue in my paper, I would just talk about it as a suggestion.

P20-L1151 I still do not feel like you have made clear how these are the variables that determine fragmentation ... maybe there are others like local or national or international affiliation, or membership base ... this is a pivotal distinction for your paper and it remains unconvincing.

Answer: As I have modified the concept and the framework of responsabilization, I have revised and modified the whole conclusion section following the discussion.

P20-L1168 Suggest deleting ... cause and effect are not convincing-only co-occurrence.

Answer: It has been revised.

P21-L1190 Did not get this from your discussion.

Answer: Yes, it has been modified. Currently, I more focus on how this type of ENGO can finance their activities, lead their organization and become entrepreneurs themselves based on environmental analysis of costs and benefits.

P21-L1202 This link is not apparent to me.

Answer: Yes, it has been taken out and the discussion section has been changed following the discussion.

P21-L1222 This needs to be discussed more in the discussion section and you need to unpack how this does not contradict your interpretation of your findings.

Answer: Yes, I have answered this question above.

P22-L1242 Suggest not using "should" here ... the paper barely talks about smallholders so the concluding sentence "should" not focus on them ... to make this statement you would need to unpack why smallholders need NGOs in the paper and I don't think you can do that without severely losing focus.

Answer: The paragraph has been modified as I do not raise the issue of smallholder palm oil farmers now.

-Reviewer 2

-The strength of the paper is a timely topic and a rich empirical material, as well as interesting results, however, methods need some clarification and the results could be presented with a table. In addition, language revision might be useful.

Please see more detailed comments:

- Previous literature has been reviewed and it is sufficient, and the conceptual literature is nicely developed. However, concept responsabilization could be defined clearly as it is not common for all the readers.

Answer: I have redeveloped and defined the concept responsabilization in section two. It is clearer now.

- Method section, the first sentence qualitative approach, not method as there are several qualitative methods. I wonder if snowball technique is the best way to determine the NGOS? Does that mean that there was prior knowledge about them beforehand? Was it difficult to identify the informants inside the NGO or the organisations themselves?

Answer: It has been revised, and I have stated that I apply the grounded theory approach. I built the key concepts of responsabilization and its framework and distrust used as a primary lens to understand and to analyse the phenomenon at the same time I am also able to elaborate and modify the key concepts regarding data analysis and findings. Besides, the informants who mainly the coordinators of consortium and the leaders of the ENGOS have been known beforehand, but to meet with them, for example to get their phone numbers, the first interviewee informed me of others. In my case, only few NGOs have website or social media in which it challenged me to meet them.

Table 1: why on 2016 and 2017 there are interviews but on 2018 KEY informant interviews? What is the difference? There is no point to organize the table in a way that reader does not see the sums per organizational type but the year only? Add the sums of interviews per organizational type to column to the right. Does that effect to your results that you have 11 advocacy NGOs and 5 service NGOS? How national are service NGOS? Do they get funding from outside of Indonesia too? Did you interview at least few representatives of each category of NGOs you present in result section?

Answer: Yes, I have revised as there are no different among them. I have also added the sums per organization following the comment. I do not think this number has an impact to the result as the number of advocacy NGOs and its consortia is larger than that the service NGOs. Besides, as I have explained in the result section, the service NGOs consortium and its members are only situated in Riau province, local level. They are supported by central government and companies, from national level, and they do not receive funding from international donors. In addition, I do think that the number of informants is representative and many enough.

- Results – Was it a result of this work to find out the number of NGOs in Riau? This was not known beforehand. How the 6 categories correspond with your data? You have interviewed 16 of 50 NGOs? I think would be important to explain why you choose those 16 of 50 – snowball technique is not a good one to explain it. So, add justification for selection.

Answer: I have modified the result following the comments and it is far clearer now. I have chosen 11 leaders from 5 advocacy NGO consortia and 5 leaders from the service NGO consortium. All of them represent the variety of the NGO background in their consortia. For example, the first author did interview with 4 informants namely the coordinator, and a youth organization, a legal aid NGO, and an international NGO of JIKALAHARI consortium members. The list of all informants whom I interviewed as below:

Types of NGOs	Consortium	Informant
Advocacy ENGOS	JIKALAHARI	5. Coordinator of JIKALAHARI 6. leader of youth organization 7. Leader of legal aid NGO 8. Leader of an International NGO
	WALHI	4. WALHI coordinator 5. Leader of legal aid NGO 6. Leader of Women NGO
	AGRA	3. The coordinator of AGRA 4. Leader of Women Organization
	JMGR	3. Coordinator of JMGR 4. Leader of JMGR in a regency branch
	Green Radio	Director of Green Radio
Service ENGOS	FKKM	7. Director of FKKM 8. Coordinator of GIAM SIAK working group (6 NGOs) 9. Coordinator of Kerumutan working group (4 NGOs) 10. Coordinator of Semenanjung Kampar working group (4 NGOs) 11. Coordinator of SINEPSIS working group (3 NGOs) 12. Coordinator of Bukit 30 National Park (3 NGOs)

Does the table 2 correspond the row 1 in table 1? (local environmental NGOs?)

Answer: No, it is different. In the table 1 context, local advocacy ENGOS refer to a member of Jikalahari, a member of WALHI, and two representatives of JMGR categorized as local advocacy ENGOS while 5 local service ENGOS refer to FKKM consortium members.

Page 18, row29, you wonder why they do not share resources within each other? I wonder if that is naïve to think that would be the case? Why they would do it?

Answer: In the critical perspective of responsabilization, the transfer of responsibilities should be followed by the ceding of power. It means that the agents receiving

responsibilities should be able to apply what actions they expect to conduct and should be autonomous to manage the budget.

In short, I think result section is not really organized, it could be re-written by adding a table that summarises all the results.

Answer: I have separated the result section into two sub-sections which are 4.1 about actions, network, and fundraising of ENGOs in Riau province, and 4.2 about distrust and the transfer of responsibilities. I put the table summarize (Table 2) on the 4.1., but it is quite hard to summarize the distrust and the transfer of responsibilities in a table.

- Conclusions – include now sentences that should be included in discussion section. As the paper has no discussion section obviously it combines results and discussion. However, this does not mean that conclusion section should contain discussion! Rewrite the conclusions –max length less than a page and remove reference and focus on your findings – do not discuss on them- move that your results and discussion section.

Answer: The conclusion section has been revised following the comments and the result and discussion section have been separated.