Abstract—This article attempts to explain the actor's belief system in forest fires legislation at the province government. It chooses formulation of The Provincial Regulation of South Sumatera No. 8 of 2016 on the Forest Fires Mitigation (the Perda 8/2016) as the study case. The data is collected using depth interview with several informants which related to forest fires regulation such as the Governor of South Sumatera Province (the Pemprov Sumsel), the local bureaucrat, the South Sumatera Province of Regional House of Representative (the DPRD Sumsel), plantation corporation, environmental non-government organization (NGO), scientist, and a local journalist. This research also gathers digital data on YouTube, Twitter, and digital newspapers. Data are analyzing start with open coding and selective coding using a top-down approach and Atlas.ti 8 for Windows (qualitative data analysis software). The finding shows that the actor's belief system has three layers: deep core belief (developmentalism versus environmentalism), policy core belief (disaster management versus local wisdom protection, peatland restoration, and peatland use policy), and secondary belief (contra conditional burning versus pro conditional burning for small farmers). This belief system becomes a foundation for policy actor cooperation during policy formulation. However, non-government actors (plantation corporation, environmental NGO's, scientist, and journalist) have still a limited role in influencing legislation process because government institution does not open the participation windows. The author discusses the theoretical and practical implications of these findings.
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1 INTRODUCTION
In 2015, the United Nations has enactment the resolution on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It consists of 17 goals and 169 targets and should be achieved in 2030 [1, pp. 1–35]. This policy replacing the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) that consist of 8 goals and 18 target and was expired in 2015. As a form of seriousness in realizing SDGs, the central government issued Presidential Regulation No. 59 of 2017 concerning the Implementation of Achieving Sustainable Development Goals. This provision becomes a legal umbrella for three planning documents that will guide the central and regional governments to achieve SDGs, namely: SDGs road map at national level, SDGs national action plan, and SDGs action plan at regional level. Until now, the central government is still in the process of compiling a SDGs road map and national action plan [2].

One of the global problems that contributed negatively to the achievement of SDGs is the occurrence of forest fires that often occur in various parts of the world (see Figure 1). According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)[3, p. 3], forest fires are one of the causes of the global deforestation process, which reached one percent in the period 1990 - 2015. Although Indonesia's economic growth is low, it occupies third in the world - after the United States and China - as contributors to the greenhouse effect. This situation was created due to the high frequency of forest fires in the dry season, which releases more carbon dioxide gas into the air. Forest fires are not only related to Goal 15 (protecting, restoring, and increasing the sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, managing forests sustainably, stopping desertification, restoring land degradation, and stopping biodiversity loss), but also intersecting with many SDGs. The smoke produced by forest fires prevents community members from being able to activity outside the home, for example, going to school, thereby disrupting the achievement of Goal 4 (guaranteeing the quality of inclusive and equitable education and increasing lifelong learning opportunities for all).

The smoke from forest fires also has the potential to cause citizens to lose income which in turn contributes negatively to Goal 1 (ending poverty in all forms anywhere) and Goal 8 (promoting inclusive and sustainable economic growth, productive opportunities, and overall, and employment that's worth it for all). Due to the loss of people's income, smoke interferes with achieving Goal 2 (eliminating hunger, achieving good food and nutrition security, and promoting sustainable agriculture). Smoke generated from forest fires also contributes negatively to the achievement of Goal 3 (ensuring healthy living and improving the welfare of all residents of all ages) and Goal 11 (making cities and settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable). The connection between forest fire with many SDGs goals and targets confirms the attribute of forest fires as a public problem that has a systematic multiplier effect on people's lives, both at the local,
national, and international levels. Consequently, forest fires will always trigger the attention and presence of various policy actors. The relationship between forest fires and SDGs confirms the nature of the objectives and targets of SDGs that are not independent but interact with each other. In ASEAN region, forest fires often occur in Indonesia, Thailand [4], and Malaysia [5], [6]. For ASEAN countries, especially Singapore and Malaysia, the haze caused by forest fires has a negative chain impact. In Singapore and Malaysia, the haze greatly disrupts the activities of residents outside the home. The city parks, restaurants, bike paths, and jogging that were usually crowded became quiet. Trade, tourism, and aviation activities were also disrupted. For Indonesia, Singapore, and Malaysia, this haze disaster has caused economic losses of $ 4 billion [7]. For local governments, for example, the case of Riau, the smoke disaster that occurred in 2014 caused them to lose the economic benefits of Rp10 trillion [8]. Normatively, Indonesia has a strong political commitment and vision to realize sustainable development. The 1945 Constitution of Republic of Indonesia state that “the national economy is carried out based on economic democracy with the principles of togetherness, efficiency, fairness, sustainability, environmental insight, independence, and by maintaining a balance of progress and national economic unity (the 1945 Constitution, Article 33 Paragraph 4).” Indonesia also has the bill of environment management and protection and actively ratified several international agreements on environmental issues. Culturally, the Indonesian people are part of Eastern culture that emphasizes the harmonious relationship between humans and the environment around them [9]. This principle is an ethical basis that can almost be found in customary law owned by several regions in Indonesia, for example, the concept of a prohibited forest on the island of Sumatra [10], customary law on sasi in Maluku Island [11], and taboo attitudes in Banten [12]. The principle of living in harmony with nature is also practiced by Dayaks in Kalimantan, who maintain rattan, which is considered an ancestral heritage that must be cared for in forest areas without leaving traces of ecological damage [13], [14]. Alternatively, how do the people around Lore Lindu National Park, Sulawesi, consider how they are connected biologically, ecologically, and culturally with Macaca tonkeana (a type of orangutan) in Lore Lindu National Park, Sulawesi, Indonesia [15]. This cultural capital is supported by the presence of civil society actors, represented by a variety of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), which care about environmental issues. NGOs are one of the important non-state actors in the 21st century because of their ability to make changes, both at the community, country, and global level [16]. In Indonesia, NGOs have made substantive contributions to increasing participation, transparency, building institutional infrastructure frameworks for developing democracy, and voicing and advocating for change [17], including contributions to environmental preservation [18], [19]. However, the presence of legal norms, government participation in global initiatives, cultural capital, and the existence of civil society who are concerned with environmental issues do not guarantee the creation of a better environment. Forest fires continue in Indonesia until 2019. After forest fires in 2015, various actors collaborate to prevent and mitigate forest fires in the 2016 – 2019 period. These actors involved the elements of the central government, the elements of the central government in the province and the district level, private corporations in the plantation sector, and international, national and local NGO’s. The question is, how do we understand the complexity policy preferences of policy actors during forest fires mitigation in Indonesia, especially in the legislation process? Previous research show that interaction between policy actors in forest fires policy is influenced by many factors such as dynamics of coordination, transparency of decision making, quality of collective learning, decentralization of the implementation process [20], institutional participation at the village level [21], law enforcement and crony-based political relations [22], the level of scientific knowledge utilization [23], policy communication gaps [24], political commitment, corruption in law enforcement, agenda, actions, policies, different perceptions of the various actors involved [25]. However, the author only finds a limited article that attempts to explain the belief system of policy actors in forest fires legislation [26]. This article will contribute to scientific academics on forest fires legislation. Although Carmenta et al. [27] have identified this topic as an important variable that contributes to forest fires, however, a few research elaborated on this topic. Also, this paper will contribute to scientific knowledge on forest fires that has been built using various perspective such as ecology [28], [29], health [30], politics [31], [32], anthropology [33], remote sensing [34], [35], information and communication technology [36], social network analysis [37], and criminology [38]. Forest fires legislation is one of the manifestations of public policy formulation. Chocran & Malone [39, p. 1] defines policy formulation as the political decision for implementing programs to achieve societal goals. In the context of democracy, every public policy must go through a process of debate in the legislature that allows citizens to influence the substance of the policy. The essence of public policy often relates to the process of allocation of limited resources, allocation of costs and benefits, and changes in citizens’ behavior. Public policy, in many cases, is always wrapped with positive law [40]. Conceptually, the viewpoint of scientists in understanding public policy can be grouped into two categories: the cycle approach and the non-cycle approach. The cycle approach understands the policy process as stages that are linear, chronological, and repetitive [41, pp. 689–690]. Scientists’ arguments about this stage also differ. Although it is descriptive because it says what happens without saying anything about why it happens, it is still considered by many scholars as to the best framework for understanding public policy processes [42]. Meanwhile, the non-cycle approach tries to move beyond the logic of stages and try to explain the public policy process by further elaborating on actors, context, processes, and institutions in the policy process. This approach, for example, is represented by the multiple stream framework approach [43], narrative policy framework [44], institutional analysis, and development [45], including advocacy coalition framework [46]. The belief system is one of the central concepts in the advocacy coalition framework. It can define as a set of fundamental values/priorities, perceptions on cause and effect, the magnitude of the problem, and public policy instruments and how to realize those values. The belief system has three components that are interconnected with each other and hierarchically: deep core beliefs (containing fundamental values and ontological axioms at personal level), policy core beliefs (fundamental policy positions of the to achieve core beliefs), and secondary
beliefs (instrumental decisions made by actors to realize their policy’s primary beliefs). Deep core belief and core belief policy are difficult to change, whereas secondary belief is easy to change [47]. Implicitly, belief systems contain the theory of causality (if X then Y) [46]. This argument is influenced by Wildavsky & Pressman [48], which states that every government policy implicitly contains the theory of causality: how X (policy) embodies Y (policy objectives). In the belief system context, X is a belief system, and Y is the policy objective. The concept of belief system confirms the difference of the advocacy coalition framework with a rational choice approach regarding the motivations of actors to participate in the public policy process. If the rational choice considers the participation of policy actors in the policy process because they pursue short-term personal interests (material objective), then ACF sees actors motivated to realize their belief systems (non-material) [49, pp. 189–222]. Sabatier & Weible [49, pp. 189–222] explains that the behavior of actors in the policy process follows what is called March & Olsen [50, pp. 247–264] with the term logic of appropriateness (actor behavior always follows existing institutional rules) and logic of consequence (the behavior of the actor always follows the consequences of choices made). Although the policy process as a form of the political process is like a market that facilitates negotiations, competition, and exchange of resources regulated by market law, these processes cannot escape the influence of existing rules, norms, and institutional identity in society.

2 METHODS
This study adopted a qualitative research method with a case study design [51, p. 13]. The South Sumatra Province (SSP) was chosen as the location of the study because it was one of the centers of forest fires in Indonesia in 2015. According to the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, the SSP occupies the number two position among the ten provinces that have the most hotspots in 2015, with the total of the burned area is reached 30,984 hectares [52, p. 197]. While this research site is the location of the process of formulation of regional regulations: the DPRD Sumsel (legislative branch) and the Pemprov Sumsel (the executive branch) Data is collected using in-depth interviews, secondary data collection, and documentation and based on three principles of data collection in the case studies: using a variety of data sources, creating primary case study data, in the form of notes, documents, tabulation materials, and narratives, and maintain a series of evidence [51, p. 103]. The researcher chooses 20 research informants purposively representing various actors in the formulation process of the Perda 8/2016. Based on their institutions, these people are the Pemprov Sumsel, the Head of the Forest Agency of the SSP, the Secretariat of the Government of SSP, scientist (4 peoples), political party in regional legislative body (9 party), local environmental NGOs (4 people), local journalist (3 people), and plantation corporations (4 peoples). This study analyses data using an interactive model [53] that consisting of several stages which interconnected each other: data collection, data presentation, data compaction, withdrawal, and verification of conclusions. All data from these various sources were analyzed with a deductive approach [54], [55] using Atlas.ti 8 software for Windows [56].

3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION
3.1 The Setting
Geographically, the SSP is located at 1° - 4° South Latitude and 102° - 106° East Longitude with a total area reaching 87,421.17 km². The SSP is bordered by Lampung Province (south direction), Bengkulu Province (west direction), Jambi Province (north direction), and Bangka Belitung Province (east direction). It has a varied topography ranging from coastal areas, lowlands, highlands, and mountains [56]. When viewed from west to east (see Figure 4.1), the SSP has a stretch of the area with an altitude between 400 meters - 1,700 meters above sea level (masl). The highland area (900 meters - 1200 meters above sea level) is located in the west that is connected with the Bukit Barisan mountain path along the 1,650 kilometers that crosses several provinces on the island of Sumatra [57]. The eastern part is a peatland area with swamps and brackish land affected by tides. Peatland areas are transitional areas between terrestrial and marine ecosystems, which are affected by changes in land and sea. The length of the peatland area in the SSP is around 450 kilometers from the Benu River (Jambi Province boundary) to the Musi River (Lampung Province boundary). While the central part is a large lowland area. Based on indicators of elevation or land surface height from sea level, the area of the SSP can be divided into four groups, namely: (a) 0 meters - 25 meters (23.5 percent); (b) 26 meters - 50 meters (17.7 percent); (c) 51 meters - 100 meters (35.3 percent); and (d) 101 meters and above (23.5 percent). Peatlands that are the location of forest fires are concentrated in areas with a height of 0 meters - 15 meters in the eastern region of the SSP [57].
developmentalism. It indicated by the argument of government actors that prioritize economic considerations and the lack of environmental conservation issues. The tendency of government actors that support developmentalism is also strengthened by the arguments of the scientist, journalist, and environmental activists.

As a deep core belief, environmentalism consists of three concepts: sustainability, human rights, and ecosystem balance. These three concepts are abstractions of several keywords (ecosystem damage, protection of local wisdom, restoring ecosystems, human rights violations, ecosystem balance, and forest sustainability) revealed in the arguments voiced by academics and non-governmental organization activists. Experts and environmental activists assess the root cause of land fires in the SSP is the destruction of peatland ecosystems. The SSP has 1.4 million ha of peatlands with a depth of 2-8 meters. In the context of sustainability as a component of deep core belief, plantation corporations also agree with the value of sustainability. The core belief policy is related to the actor's fundamental strategy to achieve deep core belief. All government actors tend to focus on disaster management (prevention, suppression, and law enforcement around forest fires). Government actors tend to ignore the structural issues (for example, peat land-use policies and concession permits) and cultural (for example, local wisdom) that are at the root of forest fire events identified by environmental activists and scientists. It indicates the consistency of government actors to oversee and realize developmentalism, which is their deep core policy.

Fig. 3 Structure of the actor's belief system in forest fires legislation

Conversely, environmental activists and scientists also consistently voiced solutions to address forest fires that are compatible with environmentalism as their deep core policy. The similarity of views between environmental activists and scientists in terms of protection of local wisdom, revegetation of peatlands, conditional burning for small farmers, and peat land-use policies indicate that the core belief policies of scientists and environmental NGOs are overlapping each other. Meanwhile, palm oil plantation and industrial timber plantation corporations, despite having sustainability values that are aligned with scientists and environmental NGOs, the solutions they choose are more in line with the policy actors representing the government. This strategy cannot be separated from the nature of private corporations. They must obey the regulations established by the government as the holder of political authority. The similarity of belief systems among policy actors in forest fires issues is the foundation of researchers to identify two advocacy coalitions that were formed in the process of formulating the Perda 8/2016: the advocacy coalition of local wisdom consisting of scientist and environmental activists and anti-burning advocacy coalition consisting of all government actors.

3.3 Forest fires legislation
Forest legislation in the SSP begins with the occurrences of forest fires. This event was responded differently by the policy actors. The Central Government and the Pemprov Sumsel focus more on handling forest fires as a national environmental disaster. Meanwhile, various elements of the South Sumatran society built more specific arguments in line with their perspectives on the issue of forest fires. Some focus on law enforcement, victim handling, revocation of company licenses, the moratorium on land clearing, and mobilization of new technological resources in combating forest fires in the SSP. The Pemprov Sumsel and the DPRD Sumsel responded to this public demand, one of which was by initiating a discussion of a draft regional regulation on combating forest fires. Normatively, the discussion of this draft regulation refers to the Regulation of Home Affairs Ministry Number 80 of 2015 concerning the Establishment of Regional Legal Products (the Permendagri 8/2015). Even though the Permendagri 8/2015 regulates public participation in the process of making regional regulations, the process of drafting and discussing the Perda 8/2016 does not open the door for public involvement. It is due to differences in belief systems between government actors and non-government actors. As a result, the process of drafting the Perda 8/2016 was dominated by the anti-burning advocacy coalition. In contrast, the coalition of advocacy for local wisdom shaped public opinion in the mass media and social media more. The difference in value between the anti-burning advocacy coalition and the advocacy coalition of local wisdom and the closed door of participation cause no values convergence in the process of formulating local regulations. As a result, all the substance of the Perda 8/2016 contains material such as (a) criminal fines; (b) special-purpose burning licensing procedures and activities on peatlands during the dry season; (c) cooperation between regions in forest fire prevention; (d) provisions of the investigation; (f) obligations of landowners (corporation or farmers); (g) obligations of the district government apparatus; (h) community participation and education; (i) principles of forest fire control; (j) land rehabilitation, administrative sanctions; and (k) and the prohibition of burning forest for individuals and legal entities, that is in line with the belief system of the anti-burning advocacy coalition. The crucial point in the preparation of the Perda 8/2016 is the issue of the clause 'no burning policy' (Article 3 Paragraph 1). The anti-burning advocacy coalition agreed with this article, while the local wisdom advocacy coalition proposed the 'conditional burning' option. This finding shows a conflict between the anti-burning advocacy coalition and the local wisdom advocacy coalition. In such a situation, ACF predicts that policy brokers will be born to mediate conflict between two or more advocacy coalition. Unfortunately, this prediction did not happen. On the contrary, the central government, who has the potential as a mediator, supports the anti-burning advocacy coalition. Although Law
Number 32 of 2009 on Management and Environmental Protection understands land burning as a form of local wisdom for small farmers and Presidential Instruction Number 11 of 2015 regarding Improved Control of Forest Fire expressly never prohibits burning as a land clearing method by small farmers. However, policy actors from the Central Government, specifically the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, and the Coordinating Minister for Politics, Law, and Human Rights, used their discretionary powers to side with the anti-burning advocacy coalition. Ideally, the two ministers are consistent in obeying Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Management and Environmental Protection. There is only one article (Article 3 Paragraph 1 on the prohibition of burning to land clearing) that is contrary to the belief system of the local wisdom advocacy coalition. However, the presence of this article has a broad and massive impact because it disrupts the activities of some the SSP residents who live in 733 (seven hundred thirty-three villages) villages that still rely on burning techniques as a method of opening agricultural land. Researchers also found that although the anti-burning advocacy coalition had a lot of scientific information about forest fires, scientific information (for example, the number of hotspots, the number of burned areas based produced satellite, etc.) had not contributed significantly to the process of formulating local regulations. On the other hand, the roles of policy brokers that should be played by central government institutions do not run optimally because they are siding with the anti-burning advocacy coalition.

3.4 Discussion
In general, the findings of this study reinforce the ACF theorists' arguments about belief systems that are hierarchical and contain causality theory [58]. It is considered hierarchical because deep core beliefs and core belief policies are the most difficult to change, while secondary beliefs are the easiest to change. Meanwhile, belief systems are considered to contain implicit theories of causality because they can describe how policy actors will realize X (belief systems) through Y (specific policies). The results of the study also reinforce ACF's theoretical arguments regarding homophily beliefs as the basis for the formation of an advocacy coalition as a vehicle for cooperation between policy actors in the policy process [59], [60]. Although the results of this study reinforce Birkland's arguments [61], this research has not answered whether the advocacy coalition formed in the formulation process continues in the policy implementation stage of the Perda 8/2016. As the ACF theorists believe, the roles of the advocacy coalition are seen not only in the formulation stage but also in the implementation and evaluation of policies. In the future, the phenomenon of advocacy coalition in the implementation of the Perda 8/2016 should be listed in further research agenda. ACF theorists pay less attention to the doors of participation that can be open or closed in the context of developing countries. It is reasonable because the ACF was born from a long research process in Western-style democracies whose democracies are well established that the door to political participation in the policy formulation process is always open. When the ACF is used as a framework for understanding the process of policy formulation in Indonesia where the door of political participation may be closed or opened, then the ACF becomes blunt. When the doors of political participation are closed, then it is impossible to explain political interaction between two or more advocacy coalitions during the policy process. In the context of drafting the Perda 8/2016, due to the closed formulation process, the anti-burning advocacy coalition tends to ignore public opinion formed in online media and social media. Consequently, changes in public opinion tend not to affect the outcome of the formulation process of a forest fire regional regulation. Although opinions have not been very effective in influencing the public policy process, this fact still cannot ignore public opinion as one of the resources of actors and policy advocacy coalitions [62]. Because the Perda 8/2016 is an executive initiative, all alternative articles are prepared by the executive. Legislative contributions are minimal and not substantive. Although the executive and legislative branches have scientific information on forest fires, the contribution of this information is very minimal in the process of drafting the Perda 8/2016. This situation is contrary to the arguments of ACF theorists who assume that scientific information will significantly contribute to the process of formulating public policy [63, pp. 177–166]. This finding reinforces the ACF's argument that the advocacy coalition is a vehicle for policy actors to influence the public policy process. When the policy outcomes are in line with the belief system of the advocacy coalition, the effectiveness of the advocacy coalition as a tool for the struggle of policy actors in influencing the policy process is tested and proven. The ACF's argument that sees the effectiveness of the advocacy coalition from indicators of how far the policy outcomes are in line with the belief system of the advocacy coalition confirms that the actions of policy actors are always value-based. However, ACF theorists never questioned how far the outcome of this policy represented public values. In the Indonesian context, the failure of the Central Government, especially the Jokowi-JK regime, to become a policy broker or mediator of the conflict between the anti-burning advocacy coalition and the local wisdom advocacy coalition is an interesting phenomenon to be explored further. If the Indonesian context is ignored, broker policy is also a concept that needs to be further explored. So far, although ACF has been more than 32 years old (1986 - 2018) years and has been studied literature four times by Jenkins-Smith & Sabatier [46], Weible, Sabatier, & McQueen [64], Weible et al., [65], and the most recent is Pierce et al., [66], but there are no scientific articles that are explicitly mapping the concept of policy brokerage in empirical research using ACF. In the future, a review of the literature on policy brokers in the ACF tradition needs to be put on the agenda of further research. The researcher offers several policy recommendations related to the process of formulating local regulations at the local government level, both provincial and district/city. First, government actors need to revise the Perda 8/2016 to better respect the traditions and habits of the indigenous people of the SSP. Second, the nature of complex public problems because it involves a variety of sectors, actors, and institutions and their attributes (for example, values, points of view, opinions, interests, power, resources, strategies and so on), then policymakers, practitioners, and researchers can utilize the concept of belief systems and advocacy coalitions as conceptual tools to understand the complexities of various actors in the public policy process. The classical viewpoints, as reflected in the concept of trias politica and the iron triangle, are no longer enough to explain the policy process in the era.
of industrial society, which must respond to complex public problems amid limited resources owned by the government. Also, policy practitioners must begin to change their way of thinking from ‘centered to actor’ to ‘centered on the relationship’. Third, the presence of scientific information in the public policy process is intended to make the policy process more rational, the final decision meets the logic of causality, not subjective because of the influence of the domination of specific policy preferences. To encourage the contribution of scientific information in the policy process, some scientists develop an evidence-based policy approach [67], [68], [69], which seeks to link scientific findings with the policy-making process, so that policy outcomes are more objective. This approach can be adopted by local governments in the formulation of public policies, both in the form of regional regulations and technical regulations. In the context of forest fires, the Pemprov Sumsel as a political authority needs to facilitate the formation of a multi-stakeholder forum that will promote a variety of actors with diverse belief systems to learn from each other, understand each other and increase the level of trust in each other. This forum, in the shadow of the researchers, is one method for institutionalizing three strategies to influence the policies proposed by Weible et al. [70]: building in-depth knowledge, building networks, and participating for extended periods (> 10 years). The Pemprov Sumsel and the DPRD Sumsel also need to consider the use of information and communication technology to improve the quality of transparency, the active participation of citizens, and the process of formulating more inclusive policies. The attitude of government actors who maintain a technocratic, non-participatory, and exclusive style of policymaking is out of date with the times marked by the ease of conducting public communication through various media. ACF has four main research topics: belief systems, advocacy coalitions, policy learning, and policy change. Due to limited time and resources, this research only focuses on belief systems and advocacy coalitions. In the future, the topic of policy learning and policy change needs to be made a further research agenda to understand the dynamics of the public policy process, both at the national and local levels. Although this research pays special attention to the advocacy coalition, because the interaction of the two advocacy coalitions did not occur, the study has not been able to reveal, for example, the various processes of exchange of resources or information that occur between the advocacy coalition. In the future, the interaction between two or more advocacy coalitions needs to be made into the ACF application research agenda in Indonesia. Except for bureaucracy, the core members of the anti-arson advocacy coalition (executive and legislative) will change every five years. Does this change cause the attributes of the advocacy coalition to change from nascent to mature? So far, ACF’s research has only classified and looked at the growth of advocacy coalitions from nascent to mature [71], [72], [73]. However, no research tries to explain the possibility of an advocacy coalition changing from mature to nascent. The pattern of slash and burn agriculture, which is considered a coalition of local wisdom advocacy as a practice of local wisdom, needs to be explored further to see how far these practices are truly “wise” so that they are worth defending and protected in the current era. So far, the findings of scientific research regarding the contribution of slash and burn agriculture to the forest and land fires are still contradictory. Some research says slash and burns agriculture is only one of the causes of forest and land fires connected with other causes [74]. Others stated that there was insufficient evidence to accuse slash and burn agriculture as the cause of forest and land fires [75], [76]. Other research clearly states that slash and burn agriculture as a cause and must be replaced by other methods that are more economical [77]. However, no research tries to explain the content of local wisdom with a slash and burn farming methods in the SSP. Finally, public opinion can be assessed with specific approaches such as critical discourse analysis [78], quantitative text analysis [79], [80], discourse analysis network [81] by integrating the use of big data. Because of its dynamic nature, public opinion must be updated so that it is useful for policy actors to read the latest developments in public preferences on specific policy issues.

4 CONCLUSION

Forest fires in Indonesia triggered the presence of a variety of policy actors at international, national, and local levels. Each policy actor has different, complex, and value-based policy preferences, not solely because of momentary economic or political interests [65]. These values can be different or the same between policy actors. The similarity of values will trigger cooperation among policy actors [63, pp. 349–360]. Conversely, differences in values will result in the marginalization of policy actors in the policy process, which results in the closure of the possible process of value convergence among advocacy coalitions. This research shows that the complexity of policy preferences of policy actors can be simplified by using the belief system concept as developed by ACF theorists.
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