Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 30-May-2018 | Report No: PIDISDSA24078

BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country	Project ID	Project Name	Parent Project ID (if any)
Indonesia	P160661	Acceleration Program of Agrarian Reform and One Map Policy Implementation	

Region	Estimated Appraisal Date	Estimated Board Date	Practice Area (Lead)
EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC	25-Apr-2018	02-Jul-2018	Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice

Financing Instrument	Borrower(s)	Implementing Agency	
Investment Project Financing	Ministry of Finance	Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning / National Land Agency (ATR/BPN), Geospatial Information Agency; Badan Informasi Geospasial (BIG)	

Proposed Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective is to establish clarity on actual land rights and land use at the village level in the target areas.

Components

Participatory Mapping and Agrarian Reform
Geospatial Data Infrastructure for Environmental and Natural Resource Management
Project Management, Institutional Development and Monitoring

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	240.00
Total Financing	240.00
of which IBRD/IDA	200.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS

World Bank Group Financing

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)	200.00

Non-World Bank Group Financing

Counterpart Funding	40.00
National Government	40.00

Environmental Assessment Category

A-Full Assessment

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

Other Decision (as needed)

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

1. Indonesia has over 6,000 inhabited islands, and the world's third-largest tropical forest, which is globally significant due to its extent, biodiversity and carbon storage capacity. Indonesia is the fourth largest country by population and among the richest in cultural diversity[1]. Indonesia is also the largest economy in Southeast Asia[2], and the tenth largest overall, and the only Southeast Asian member of the G-20. The economy is based largely on extraction of non-renewal resources (16% of GDP, 40% of exports). Agriculture and forestry count together 34% of GDP, although farm productivity is low and limited by wide-spread land degradation, the world's highest rate of deforestation, erratic access to water, and dated methodologies and equipment. Still, 33% of labor force depends on agriculture, forestry, hunting or fishing, and many others in downstream activities and 1% on extractives. The forests and rural livelihoods depending people are disproportionally poorer than the national average with a higher impact to women than men and including many *Adat*[3] communities. While the commodity boom of the last decade halved the Indonesian poverty to 11.2%, the economic growth slowed and by 2014, 34 million people (14% of the population) lived below the poverty line

---

[1] 250 million people, 300 native groups, 2,300 ethnic communities, over 700 languages/dialects, 208 districts, 642 sub-districts, and 71,771 villages.
[2] Indonesia's gross domestic product (GDP) was $1.3 trillion in 2015.
[3] *Adat* refers to the indigenous peoples, communities and their customs in Malaysia and Indonesia.

of $21 per month, and another 65 million people (27%) lived just above it.

2. Indonesia is among the biggest emitters of greenhouse gases (GHG) globally, two-thirds of which come from land use conversions[4]. Expanding agriculture, logging, mineral extraction, and globally leading rate of urbanization[5] and housing development have increased land conversions. As a consequence, forests have diminished and degraded, reducing environmental benefits they provide (e.g. biodiversity, carbon sequestration, etc.), disrupting rural livelihoods and settlements, and further exacerbating poverty. Meanwhile, hydro meteorological hazards (floods, drought, storms, and sea level rise) are projected to increase with climate change[6], threatening natural assets (e.g. mangroves, watersheds, etc.), physical assets (e.g. shelters, infrastructure), and agricultural production. In particular communities in Sumatra and Kalimantan face high to very high risk of floods and coastal inundation[7], which also increases the risk of temporal internal displacement. Investments in climate change adaptation and mitigation are critical to address these challenges. However, weak land governance and administration, poor tenure security, and uncertainties over access to land and resources incentivize quick-win approaches to cash-out on natural resources rather than longer term climate-resilient investments, management, and stewardship. These undermine efforts to conserve, restore and sustainably manage forests and landscapes including peatlands. Therefore, the Government of Indonesia (GoI) recognizes the importance of land-based climate actions and identifies improving land tenure security and spatial planning as key enabling conditions for a low carbon and climate resilient society.[8]

3. As a response, President Joko Widodo's *Nawa Cita* vision recognizes that reducing extreme poverty requires sustainable management of natural resources and improving the rural economy broadly. The vision places agrarian reform as a foundation for national economic policy to reduce poverty and income gaps, and create rural jobs. Clarity on land-use, access rights and licenses is seen a key to improving the management and protection of natural resources, and reducing poverty.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

4. An unclear policy, regulatory and institutional framework and a fragmented and incomplete land administration system hinder the management and governance of land and natural resources in Indonesia. Land administration is divided between the Forest Area hosting Titled Forests and State Forests[9], which are managed and de facto administered by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) and cited to cover 65% of the territory, and the non-Forest Area administered by the Ministry for Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency (ATR/BPN[10]). Land management and administration system dualism causes duplication, overlap and weak governance, which is why global experience encourages a unified system to

---

[4] Currently arable land represents 14% of land use, forests 52%, and meadows and pastures 10%.

[5] 54% of Indonesians lived in urban areas in 2010, and prediction is 67% by 2050.

[6] GoI (2016), Indonesia's Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs – UNFCCC).

[7] GoI (2013), National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation (RAN-API) - Synthesis Report.

[8] GoI (2006). Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs – UNFCCC).

[9] The Forest Law 41 of 1999 stipulates the Forest Area *(Kawasan Hutan)* including State Forests *(Kawasan Hutam Negara)* and individually held Titled Forests *(Hutan Hak)* that is to be retained as forest. However, in reality GoI declared Forest Areas host a wide variety of land uses including other than 'forest' land use. On the other hand, non-Forest Areas include 'forests'.

[10] The Basic Agrarian Law (BAL) 5 of 1960 vests the Indonesian Land Registry to ATR/BPN, and all non-Forest Area lands and the Titled Forests of the Forest Area are registered in ATR/BPN. The Forestry Law 1991 vests the management of State Forests to the MoEF, but as Titled Forests are rare and boundaries unclear, the MoEF is the main authority for the entire Forest Area.

register all lands and rights including state lands. As Forest Area boundaries have not been demarcated in most of Indonesia, uncertainty over tenure arrangements prevails and hinders recognition of land rights. For example, regularization of *Adat* communities' rights on land have been slow[11]. The unclear tenure also impacts GoI's ability to optimize land use and protect resources. Licensing for use of natural resources (extractives, timber and forest products and estate crops including oil palm) is spread across ministries and government causing issues with transparency and overlaps, which are further complicated by the absence of a common base map and data platform. Progress with Forest Area boundary affirmation[12], clarity between Titled and State Forests, and adoption of a single map and platform is a key to success with agrarian reform and sustainable management of natural resources.

5. The overall lack of clarity makes it difficult to enforce laws and regulations designed to manage land use, including to prevent land conversion. The situation encourages agricultural expansion onto Forest Areas often through the use of fire under the assumption that cultivation will provide direct returns to the community and lead to permanent property and resource rights. State Forests are regularly encroached (and/or State Forest boundaries may have been enacted in a clandestine/erroneous way splitting historical land uses and causing conflicts). Also, uncertainty on access to land increases business risks of land based investments, in particular of industries with high upfront costs, such as geothermal energy.

6. Land disputes between communities and large-scale land users are common. Unclear land tenure arrangements and lack of formal land rights decrease landholders' negotiation power against potential displacement, and loss of access to land, resources and livelihoods. More intangible, large land-based investments cause disputes over environmental impacts, the availability of formal employment to community members, and an influx of a transient male workforce. Land use conversion, industrial expansion and deforestation impacts women disproportionally more than men, as women tend to bear the brunt without enjoying the potential benefits. Discriminatory customs on women's land rights increase the negative impact on women.

7. More generally, land administration and customs in Indonesia do not provide equal protection and opportunities for all women and men. Tenure uncertainty and unequal recognition of land rights is particularly acute for women. There is a common lack of awareness about the benefits of registering family land holdings to the names of both spouses, resulting to male dominant ownership of land. According to a Demographic and Health Survey (DHS, 2012) 58% of men own land, with about half under a joint ownership. In comparison, an Asian Development Bank study (ADB, 2016) finds only 36% of married women owning land individually or jointly. This disadvantages women in the event of a divorce as spouses are legally required to divide joint assets equally and retain whatever property they owned prior to marriage. Despite the provisions of equality as specified in the Indonesian Constitution and Book Two of the Indonesian Civil Code on inheritance, the DHS 2012 found that women were in danger of losing their land rights upon widowhood, divorce, or desertion with some ending up landless and destitute.

8. At the local government level, lack of access to reliable land records and spatial data inhibits infrastructure investments and service delivery, and perpetuates lack of clarity and transparency in decision-making, spatial planning and resource allocation. The central government's fiscal transfers under the Village Law[13] and village

---

[11] According to a Constitutional Court ruling of 2012 *Adat* lands in Forest Areas are (to be recognized as) Titled Forests.

[12] An inter-agency Forest Boundary Committee (MoEF Regulations No P.93, 2016; P.44, 2016; and P.62, 2013) affirms forest boundaries through a Boundary Map and Minutes.

[13] Law No. 6 of 2014.

fund budgeting depend on demarcation of administrative boundaries (by the Ministry of Home Affairs, MoHA), which is often left pending due to the considerable cost of surveying the boundaries[14].

9. As a response, in 2011 the GoI introduced the Geospatial Information Law and the One Map Policy (OMP) aiming to establish a unified base set of geospatial data (i.e., topography, land use, and tenure) and the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI[15]) to inform decision-making. Progress includes a common geospatial reference system[16], a publicly available portal (INA-Geoportal), and OMP coordination mechanism led by the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs (CMEA). However, only a limited range of geospatial data is accessible, and there are significant inconsistencies among geospatial datasets of key line ministries[17]. In 2017, CMEA compiled 1:50,000 scale One Map databases on Kalimantan and Sumatra with 80 thematic land use datasets from over 20 Indonesian authorities. While this is an important step forward, the data has not been field-verified, and the resulting One Map shows overlaps and has not been released for public use.

10. Taking a step further, the GoI's Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJM) for 2015 - 2019 adopted ambitious targets for 1:5,000 scale mapping, Agrarian Reform and Forest Area demarcation[18]. Firstly, the aim is to foster community forestry partnerships[19] in 12.7 million hectares of State Forests, and release 4.1 million hectares of State Forests to non-forestry uses. MoEF has launched the PPTKH[20] participatory mapping process to regularize land rights, resolve disputes, and register titles on Forest Areas to the Land Registry in ATR/BPN[21], as well as to issue communal land use licenses under the Social Forestry program. Secondly, RPJM calls for issuance of 23 million land certificates[22] (4.1 million hectares) in non-Forest Areas making the participatory land registration (PTSL)[23] work ATR/BPN's priority task[24] with the production growing from 1 million land parcels in 2016 to 5 million in 2017. The target is 7 million for 2018, and then 10 million land certificates annually until completing the land registry for non-Forest Areas by 2024. Achieving the targets require streamlining participatory parcel mapping approaches and quality control, and significantly involving the private sector. Mass scale parcel by parcel approach, close collaboration between ATR/BPN and MoEF, and linking of the PPTKH and PTSL processes are the keys for success. Consequently, in February 2018, President Joko Widodo issued Presidential Instruction Number 2/2018[25] to accelerate inter-ministerial collaboration on parcel mapping and instructed ATR/BPN to use the PTSL process to identify

---

[14] The Village Law stipulates unusually high positional accuracy for the administrative boundary surveys and requires consensus over the boundary demarcation between villages, which is often an issue.

[15] Indonesia adopted a NSDI framework in 2007 (through Presidential Decree 85/2007) instating the BIG as the lead agency.

[16] SRGI 2013, i.e. *Sistem Referensi Geospasial Indonesia*. BIG and ATR/BPN operate separate Continuously Operating Reference Station (CORS) systems to facilitate accurate surveys in the SRGI, but aim to unify them to a national CORS network.

[17] The NSDI line ministries and key agencies include: ATR/BPN; BIG; MoEF; MoEMR; the Ministry of Public Works and Human Settlements; the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration (MoV); the Agency of Maritime Meteorology and Geophysics; the Central Bureau of Statistics; the Institute of Sciences; the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries; the Ministry of Transportation; the National Agency for Disaster Management; and the Meteorological Agency.

[18] 100% coverage requires 189,000 km of forest boundary demarcation, and creation of 629 Forest Management Units (KPH).

[19] The Social Forestry component of the *Tanah Obyek Reforma Agraria* (TORA).

[20] *Penyelesaian Penguasaan Tanah Dalam Kawasan Hutan* (PPTKH), the Presidential Regulation 88/2017.

[21] ATR/BPN's regulation No. 10 of 2016 stipulates registering communal lands in Forest Areas and beyond.

[22] The RPJM targets for 60% coverage of parcel mapping and 70% coverage of land certification in non-Forest Areas. Total 126 million land parcels exist in non-Forest Area, 49 million registered and 24 million both registered and surveyed.

[23] *Pendaftaran Tanah Sistimatis Lengkap* (PTSL) refers to "first-time [systematic, area by area] land registration".

[24] The PTSL targets were set in Minister of BPN/ATR's Regulations No 1 of 2015, 28 and 35 of 2016, and 1 of 2017.

[25] The instruction obliges ministries/agencies (ATR/BPN, MoEF, the Ministry of Public Works and Human Settlements, MoHA and BIG) to provide data and support to PTSL including for defining the boundary for Forest Areas.

Forest Area boundaries for affirmation.

Proposed Development Objective(s)

11. The proposed project development objective (PDO) would be to establish clarity on actual land rights and land use at the village level in the target areas.

12. The increased clarity over land rights and land use would enhance agrarian reform, sustainable landscape management, land governance, social stability, access to land for investments, inclusive growth, conflict resolution, and environmental protection and conservation including positive co-benefits to climate change adaptation and mitigation, and women's awareness and access to legal land rights individually or through joint ownership.

13. The objective would be achieved by (i) participatory mapping including fit-for-purpose mapping of parcels, land use, indicative village administrative boundaries, and other land use occupation (Forest Area boundaries and mining concessions, etc.); (ii) land rights regularization and registration in the Electronic Land Administration System (eLand); (iii) enhancing the availability and access to up-to-date geospatial information; (iv) promoting access to and availability of electronic land administration services; (v) improving capacity, procedures and legal framework for accelerating implementation of Agrarian Reform, OMP and modern e-Land Administration; (vi) assessing, addressing and monitoring social and environmental vulnerabilities and monitoring project impact to vulnerabilities; and (vii) promoting gender disaggregated monitoring and reporting, awareness raising and regularization of indigenous peoples and women's land rights. The project would target Agrarian Reform and the GoI's priority fire-prone provinces in Sumatra (Riau, Jambi and South Sumatra) and Kalimantan (East, Central, West and South).

Key Results

14. **The key development performance indicators would be:**
   (i)   Share of land parcels mapped in a parcel map (%), and number of land parcels mapped in the project target areas (number);
   (ii) Direct project beneficiaries (including landholders, concessionaires, government agencies, communities, men and women) in the project target areas with land parcels mapped (number, gender disaggregated);
   (iii) Share of districts in the project areas with forest boundaries reconstructed from a MoEF enactment or demarcated for an enactment by MoEF (%);
   (iv) Area of country with publicly accessible ortho-rectified satellite imagery equivalent to map scale 1:5,000 (sq.km), and the number of core government agencies using it for its activities (number).

D. Project Description

15. The project costs are estimated at 240 million USD (200 million USD IBRD, 40 million USD[26] Parallel

---

[26] The land registration and certificate activity would be financed through Annual National Budget in Indonesian Rupiah. 40 million USD is an estimation based on unit costs and can vary also based on the currency exchange rate.

Financing from the National Budget). The project would include three components:

(i) Component 1; Participatory Mapping and Agrarian Reform, 202 million USD
(ii) Component 2; Geospatial Data Infrastructure for Environmental and Natural Resource Management, 10 million USD
(iii) Component 3; Project Management, Institutional Development and Monitoring, 28 million USD

Component 1 – Participatory Mapping and Agrarian Reform (US$ 202 million)

16. The objective of this component would be to produce village level parcel boundary maps in the project target areas, record all land right claims, and facilitate land rights regularization and registration in the Electronic Land Administration System (eLand), covering all legal rights including communal rights, and joint and individual ownership registration for women. The approach would be participatory and inclusive with regular community consultations and engagement during the implementation. The component would implement ATR/BPN's systematic and complete land registration process (PTSL) through an inclusive fit-for-purpose approach resulting in a comprehensive map of tenure rights (ownership, possession, occupancy, concessions, licenses, leases, etc.), land use, indicative Forest Area boundaries and eventual affirmation (through a legal MoEF process), and other agreed boundaries, and significant features of the project target provinces. Also, areas of overlapping rights and interests, and areas or boundaries under dispute would be identified. Legal assistance would be made available to disadvantaged groups, and local dispute resolution and court appeal line would be facilitated. The component would strengthen the local land office infrastructure and services including by adopting the eLand system and digital archives. The component would finance: (i) preparatory data acquisition, collection and processing for PTSL; (ii) inclusive and participatory implementation of PTSL in project target provinces; (iii) development of eLand; and (iv) rolling out of eLand in target provinces; and (v) land rights regularization and registration in the eLand system, and (vi) land certification[27]; and (vii) legal assistance, and support to dispute resolution and appeals.

Component 2 –Geospatial Data Infrastructure for Environmental and Natural Resource Management (US$ 10 million)

17. The objective of this component would be to improve the access to and the availability of geospatial information for agrarian reform, land and tenure rights regularization and administration, and environmental and natural resource management in the target provinces. The project would (i) support the densification of the CORS network; (ii) strengthen the NSDI technology infrastructure and services; and (iii) support the geo-referencing of existing data of high-resolution satellite imagery (in LAPAN) for the Working Map in project target areas.

Component 3 – Project Management, Institutional Development and Monitoring (US$ 28 million)

18. The objective of this component would be to ensure efficient implementation of the Project; full inclusion and transparency in the project conduct, and compliance with the World Bank's safeguards policies; and improve the institutional capacity and operational framework to implement participatory mapping based on regular community consultations and practical experiences from piloting innovative approaches and technologies. The component would also finance legal assistance to indigenous peoples, small holders and

---

[27] Activities v) and vi) are 100% GoI funded from the National Budget in the Indonesian Rupiah amount estimated at US$ 40 million using the exchange rate at the time of Appraisal.

identified disadvantaged groups including women for claiming land rights in the project target areas. Also local dispute resolution and court appeals during PTSL implementation would be facilitated. The component would support: (i) project management, monitoring and evaluation to meet the procurement, fiduciary and safeguards requirements; (ii) conducting studies and analysis to strengthen the policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks; (iii) pilots to test new practical approaches, capacity development, regulatory and institutional arrangements and innovative technologies in support of participatory mapping; (iv) awareness raising, vulnerability mapping and social monitoring for PTSL; (v) legal assistance, and support to dispute resolution and appeals for PTSL; and (vi) policy dialogue to promote land and geospatial system integration in Indonesia.

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

19. ATR/BPN would be the Executing Agency of the project and host the Project Management Unit (PMU), small Provincial Implementation and Monitoring (PIM) offices[28] in target provinces, and take on the overall management and coordination responsibility for the project, as well as directly manage the implementation of the Project Components 1 and 3. The BIG would establish a Project Implementation Unit (PIU) for managing activities of the Component 2. PMU, PIMs and PIU would be responsible for day-to-day implementation of project activities by ATR/BPN and by BIG, respectively, the project's fiduciary functions, social and environmental safeguards implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

20. MoEF, MoHA, MoEMR and possibly other line ministries and agencies would participate in the project as equal partners funding their involvement through the national budget, or through project resources on cost-recovery basis as agreed upon with ATR/BPN. A Project Coordination Committee (PCC) would be established at the national level, co-chaired by ATR/BPN and BIG with members from the various stakeholder agencies including CMEA, BAPPENAS, MoHA, MoEF, and MoEMR, to facilitate inter-agency coordination and cooperation of project activities.

21. The PMU would be headed by a Senior ATR/BPN official as the Project Director (government appointee) who would report to the Head and the Director General of ATR/BPN and would oversee the work of the PMU and liaise with other participating institutions and stakeholders both at national and subnational levels. it will also include a: (i) Project Manager/Coordinator (consultant); (ii) Financial Management (FM) specialist (consultant); (iii) Procurement specialist (consultant); (iv) Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) specialist (consultant); (v) Contract Management specialist(s) (consultant(s)); (vi) Survey and Mapping specialist (government appointee/consultant); (vii) Land Registration specialist (government appointee/consultant); (viii) Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) specialist (consultant); (ix) Capacity Development, Outreach and Communications specialist (consultant); (x) Community Development, Indigenous Peoples (IP) and Gender Specialist (government appointee/consultant); (xi) Secretarial, Translation and Support staff (government appointees).

22. The PIU and PIMs would be headed by appointed officers who also serve as Project Officers/Commitment Making Officers (PPK) for the project in the GoI's governance system. The PIU would include: (i) Project

---

[28] *Kansil*

Coordinator (government appointee); (ii) Geospatial specialist (consultant); and (iii) Secretarial, Translation and Support staff (government appointees). The fiduciary services to the PIU would be provided by the PMU staff. ATR/BPN and BIG may also decide to implement a joint PMU. The PIM would include: (i) Provincial Project Coordinator (government appointee); (ii) Provincial Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) specialist (consultant); (iii) Fiduciary assistant (consultant); and (iv) Support staff (government appointees).

23. The PMU would be responsible for submitting Interim Financial Reports (IFRs) every quarter. The PMU would also provide implementation progress reports biannually reporting: (i) progress with reaching project targets, (ii) environmental and social safeguards status, (iii) procurement and disbursement progress, and (iv) general qualification of the project progress. The PMU would implement the project in accordance with the provisions of the Project Operational Manual (POM) that elaborates the planning and implementation arrangements, roles, responsibilities, reporting lines, communication procedures, procurement and financial management procedures, M&E and outreach programs, social monitoring and vulnerability mapping under the project in the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), and oversight of the project in the targeted provinces. User-friendly formats, checklists and templates for monitoring and evaluation would be included in the POM.

.

F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The project would target Agrarian Reform and the GoI's priority fire-prone provinces. The target provinces would be mostly rural areas in seven provinces in Sumatra (Riau, Jambi and South Sumatra) and Kalimantan (East, Central, West and South) that have suffered from forest and peatland fires, partly attributed to lack of clarity of Forest and non-Forest Area boundaries, land use right allocation and land ownership, and poor natural resource management compounded by weak law enforcement. Across Indonesia, and particularly in Sumatra and Kalimantan, poor farmers and forest dwellers have been displaced by rapid agrarian change, with land and forests once used for shifting cultivation and customary uses transformed into large-scale timber concessions, plantations, and mining concessions. Many communities, including Adat communities, have lost their lands to private concessions or demographic shifts due to in-migrants from other areas who arrive in search of work or to settle on newly cleared land. The project would aim to establish clarity on actual land rights and land use at the village level in the target areas. The increased clarity over land rights and land use would enhance Agrarian Reform, sustainable landscape management, land governance, social stability, access to land for investments, inclusive growth, conflict resolution, and environmental protection and conservation including positive co-benefits to climate change adaptation and mitigation, and women's awareness and access to legal land rights individually or through joint ownership. The project would support community-driven participatory mapping including fit-for-purpose mapping of parcels, land use, indicative village administrative boundaries, and other land use occupation (Forest Area boundaries and mining concessions etc.) aiming to create a level playing field by bringing key stakeholders, particularly communities, to collaboratively identify, record actual land use and claims and assess where existing and potential disputes are located. Based on this the project would facilitate land rights regularization and registration in the electronic land administration system (eLand). The project would also assess, address and monitor social and environmental vulnerabilities and impact to vulnerabilities; and promote gender

disaggregated monitoring and reporting, awareness raising and regularization of indigenous peoples and women's land rights.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Krisnan Pitradjaja Isomartana, Environmental Safeguards Specialist
Lucy Madeline Mitchell, Social Safeguards Specialist
Fajar Argo Djati, Social Safeguards Specialist
AMY CHUA FANG LIM, Environmental Safeguards Specialist

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The project is designed to establish clarity on actual land use and land rights at the village level. By doing so, the project is expected to enhance sustainable landscape management, land governance, social stability, access to land and tenure security, inclusive growth, and conflict resolution. The project has been designed to enable participatory community mapping process, including appeals, community-based dispute mediation, community engagement and facilitation, and registration of legitimate land rights, as well as application of a screening mechanism to treat disputed land parcels and those with litigation cases before legal processes to formalize land titles can be initiated. Key risks are mostly associated with possible third party downstream impacts to communities living in Forest Areas, and with lack of community participation and willingness to participate. The communities reluctance to join project activities could affect the legitimacy of parcel maps generated with project support on the basis of which land rights would be registered. This could result in incomplete registration and land disputes. In addition, the project could exacerbate dormant tension and conflicts related to land rights and in the

event of lack of access to correct information, and absence of community-level mediation. The project could also raise community and civil society expectations to address land tenure regularization issues in Forest Areas and areas under territorial land disputes, which fall outside the project scope focusing on non-Forest Areas and Forest Area's outer boundary.

Since the project would provide clarity of land claims, land parcel boundaries in non-Forest Areas, as well as demarcation of Forest Area outer boundary, which is often contested, the project could have downstream access restriction and eviction risks by triggering third party actions (e.g. MoEF) to regularize forest tenure settlements as well as concerning informal settlements on State Lands including State Land under concessions.

These risks are compounded by the fact that they would materialize through third party actions, i.e. decisions of government agencies that are not project implementing agencies, such by the MoEF as the custodian of Forest Areas. The Forest Areas are outside the scope of the project, but risks may materializer as a result of the project. These risks have informed the project's risk categorization. Given these risks, particularly third party and downstream risks associated with the project scope not covering Forest Areas, the project has been proposed to be Category A.

The project's potential risks and impacts have been assessed as part of Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) process, and the risk mitigation will be implemented through the ESMF.

Key measures in the ESMF have been incorporated into the project design. It is mandatory to screen all land mapping and registration sites beforehand for environmental and social impacts to assess: social risks and need for environmental protection; vulnerable and disadvantaged groups; Indigenous Peoples; and governance. Where screening indicates that an environmental or social impact may occur,

		the level of risk must be assessed and followed-up with mitigation measures, including community consultations, preparation of grievance redress mechanisms, and facilitation support. These must be in place prior to project implementation. If negative environmental or social impacts are imminent and considered significant, a proportional environmental and social impact assessment for each site must be completed by Systematic and Complete Land Registration (PTSL) taskforces, including "no-go alternatives". Following the completion of the PTSL, there would be a small technical assistance component (under Component C) to carry out environmental and social monitoring to understand impacts, which would inform future mitigation measures and/or improvements in the current ESMF, including resourcing. The ESMF has also incorporated relevant instruments to address downstream access restriction and eviction risks, and risks to Indigenous Peoples as described in the sections on OP 4.12 and OP 4.10 below.
		The potential adverse environmental impacts from mapping activities and minor construction financed by the project would not be large-scale and can be avoided or minimized through screening and mitigation measures set out in the ESMF developed by the ATR/BPN.
		Under Component A.4, minor impacts are expected from small renovation work at the land offices and would be addressed by Codes of Practices for Health, Safety, and Environment that forms an integral part of the ESMF. Prior training to the Project Management Unit (PMU) and contractors would be conducted as part of capacity building investments and dissemination of good practices.
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The project as planned does not involve conversion or degradation of natural or critical natural habitats. The project aims to support asset legalization and tenure protection through a systematic identification of actual land use, occupation, and claims, particularly in non-Forest Areas through the

		PTSL approach. The project supported PTSL community based participatory mapping process would also demarcate natural habitat State Lands in non-Forest Areas as a standard practice. The policy is not triggered as most natural habitats in Indonesia are in Forest Areas, which falls in the domain of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) and it is beyond the project's scope of activities.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The project would not finance commercial logging or activities that could lead to degradation and/or conversion of critical forest areas or other natural habitats. However, the policy is triggered in order to monitor that the project activities trigger positive improvements in management, protection and clarity over Forest Area boundaries. The mitigation measures associated with this policy have been incorporated into the ESMF.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project will not trigger any pest management activities and/or the procurement of pesticides.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The activities supported by the Project would have potential positive impact on PCRs during the land registration exercise. If applicable, a PCR Management Plan is a requirement under the ESMF in case there is a chance find under Component A.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	The project activities have the potential to affect Adat communities and/or other community groups that meet the World Bank's Indigenous Peoples criteria in non-Forest Areas or in areas where these communities reside such as areas close to boundaries of Forest Area under demarcation, since the mapping activities would likely take place in areas claimed by these communities. This includes areas around and/or near Forest Area boundaries, and possible communal tenure holdings in non-Forest Areas. By far most Adat land rights claims are likely to be located within Forest Areas and in State Forests where there may have been on-going tensions and disputes over tenure rights, particularly with MoEF and land concession holders. However, some Adat communities may also claim land rights outside the Forest Area. Such claims may be identified in non-Forest Areas or in the vicinity of undemarcated Forest Area boundary.

Since Forest Areas and thus State Forests are outside the project scope a process to ensure due diligence and address potential impacts an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) has been prepared as part of the ESMF to ensure compliance with national requirements as well as the World Bank's Policies, specifically OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples. The framework will be applied to enable meaningful engagement, including gaining broad community support from affected Indigenous Peoples and Adat communities, enabling participation in participation in identification of impacts and development of measures to address those impacts as well as opportunities for benefits.

The project is expected to benefit Indigenous Peoples and Adat communities through increased awareness and participation, registry of customary claims in the ATR/BPN's database and tenure security for Adat customary claims in non-Forest Areas and not contested areas. Once site-specific areas are identified, the PTSL Taskforces will screen for the presence of Indigenous Peoples and Adat communities in the project areas. In cases where Indigenous Peoples and Adat communities are present in the project areas, an additional scoping measure is required during the preliminary preparations phase. The results of the scoping will inform potential risks before their participation in the mapping processes is sought. Site-scoping will commence with consultation with leaders of Indigenous Peoples and Adat communities, local bodies and community representatives, including women and youth to document local traditions and practices in land allocation and use practices. This will lead to more community-wide consultations to identify risks and opportunities for land mapping and registration.

The IPPF also outlines key measures of handling customary claims upon identification. The IPPF would require PTSL taskforces to consult Adat communities based on the principles of free, prior and informed consultations to obtain broad community support with regards to their tenure preferences (i.e. collective or individual titles) and if

		their claims are located in non-forest areas and categorized as eligible for titling. All Adat land claims in target PTSL areas, including areas near or within Forest Area boundary areas, would be identified and registered in the eLand system.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	While the direct footprint is limited, the project has potential for downstream, indirect impacts related to subsequent forced evictions and restrictions of access by third parties. These would materialize, if MoEF and/or State Land concession holders used the new affirmed forest areas and/or state land boundaries to regularize informal tenure settlements. This could happen in State Forests in Forest Areas or in State Lands in non-Forest Areas, if the custodian of the State Land chose to evict people from these settlements based on the project affirmed (outer) Forest Area boundaries of, for example Conservation or Protection Forests. In response to this risk, the World Bank Policy (OP 4.12) on Involuntary Resettlement has been triggered as a pre-cautionary measure and a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and Process Framework (PF) have been prepared to manage such potential risks if they happen during project implementation. The RPF and PF also serve as instruments to guide ATR/BPN to avoid and/or minimize potential resettlement risks considered under the projects. The PMU would need ensure that institutional commitments and capacity to handle risks associated with Forest Area boundary demarcation were in place before the Forest Area boundary demarcation activities commenced. To address the risks, institutional collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) will be key. The collaboration will help address the complex nature of land governance in Indonesia and issues arising from Forest Area outer boundary demarcation activities. MoEF will be needed to implement the RPF and PF if forced displacement and access restrictions occur in

		Forest Areas demarcated under the proposed project. As such the RPF and PF has been produced to outline necessary measures, including institutional arrangements and roles and responsibilities to manage any potential displacement impacts arising from increased scrutiny and regularization of land tenure by the MoEF as the custodian of the state forests. Supervision of this framework will be retained within the project PMU at the ATR/BPN, with oversight provided by the provincial PIM units and technical implementation by the district land offices (Kantah). A Project Coordination Committee (PCC) would be established at the national level, co-chaired by ATR/BPN and BIG with members from the various stakeholder agencies including CMEA, BAPPENAS, MoHA, MoEF, and MoEMR, to facilitate inter-agency coordination and cooperation of project activities. Section I of the RPF and PF further elaborates on implementation arrangements. The costs for the implementation of the RPF and PF are integrated into project design and the ESMF specific budget described in Chapter 6, Section Overall costs of alternative livelihoods support and/or resettlement cannot be determined at this stage, since the number of people who might be affected (it could be zero), as well as the when or where remains unknown as does the nature, extent and scale. If any resettlement were to occur then the RAP would be prepared with the Component C support. In most cases, the resettlement would concern State Forests, and most likely Conservation or Protection Forests, and while GoI is broadly responsible of implementing this ESMF, MoEF would be the responsible executive agency that would have to prepare the RAP or PoA and specify the dedicated source(s) of Government funding to be used to carry out the budgeted resettlement-related commitments.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The activities supported by the project will not involve any dam-related activities.

Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The activities supported by the project will not involve any waterways related activities.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The activities supported by the project will not be located in any disputed areas.

KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

The change of the project scope from the Concept State land use mapping and social forestry to supporting ATR/BPN's Agrarian Reform and land administration has changed the typology and level of environmental and social risks. Furthermore, leading up to the Decision Meeting, additional concerns with regards to downstream indirect impacts associated with potential access restrictions and involuntary resettlements have warranted an upgrading of EA category from B to A.

The project would map and regularize land rights in non-Forest Areas and demarcate Forest Area boundaries. ATR/BPN's systematic registration approach (PTSL) has an in-built mechanism to exclude areas under territorial land disputes from PTSL, and a mechanism to facilitate dispute resolution and appeal avenues over individual land disputes. These measures minimize the risks of exacerbating existing disputes and/or tension or of restricting people's access to their assets and properties by formally recognizing claims challenged by other parties.

Potential environmental and social risks and impacts (direct, indirect and induced) have been identified during the development of the ESMF. The potential environmental and social risks of the project are mostly associated with Component A (Participatory Mapping for Agrarian Reform), particularly A.1 (Land Registration), A.3 (Forest Boundary Demarcation) and A.4 (Strengthening Local Land Offices). A summary of general issues which can be anticipated during project implementation is as follows:

a)   Lack of participation stemming from lack of prior information, exclusion of certain groups including IPs and women in the village structures and consultation processes, the mapping process would not take into account availability of certain groups and women to participate where and when the mapping process takes place resulting to errors;

b)   Lack of willingness to participate by certain village governments and communities due to existing practices of village-level titling with land tax implications which they see as a disincentive to participate in the project;

c)   Potential for tension and conflicts, stemming from lack of relevant information and socialization (about the process and rights and responsibilities), and from suspicion that lands would be taken away;

d)   Heightened tension as a result from Forest Area boundary affirmation by groups whose land is locate inside a State Forest and face low prospects for regularization;

e)   Land market risk. Uninformed, landholders with new certificates may be lured to quick sales for cash without fully comprehending the livelihoods impact;

f)   Reputational risks and heightened political tension due to public expectations that the project would deliver tenure security in disputed areas and address land claims within Forests Areas, private concessions and/or classified as government assets. Resolution of tenure in areas classified as Forest Areas is outside ATR/BPN's mandate and is currently being dealt with by MoEF under the Forest Area Land Tenure Settlement (PPTKH) and Social Forestry

programs; and

g) Potential involuntary resettlement impacts are recognized in the form of indirect, downstream impacts in cases where third parties, e.g. MoEF or State Land owners, would use the mapping data developed by the project to displace people or introduce or expand access restrictions to protected and conservation areas.

The GoI is aware that the proposed mapping of village boundaries and registration of land rights can be a contested and conflict-laden process and at the most severe case could result in the unintentional exclusion of marginalized and vulnerable households and community groups. Past experiences indicate that participatory mapping may raise conflicts and tensions at local level that would have to be addressed with effective outreach and socialization efforts. This is all the more important as both formal and informal (and traditional) decision-making institutions and structures at the local level often exclude marginalized groups (such as, women, Adat communities, and poorer households) and disregard their priorities when determining the allocation and use of community assets. PTSL has been developed as a method to address all land-parcel mapping needs, however it lacks some mechanisms for communication, certain steps in socialization and clear links to dispute resolution processes. Inadequate support to households and communities in conveying the process and benefits of the project could therefore potentially result in decisions that have unintended social and environmental consequences.

Overall, the potential adverse environmental impacts would not be large-scale and can be avoided or minimized through mitigation measures that have been applied in similar Bank-supported land projects. The project would be expected to yield positive environmental benefits by a) documenting changing patterns of land use and deforestation for improved oversight and management; b) providing accurate physical demarcation of Forest Area boundaries, thereby enhancing the government's capacity to provide the necessary protection; c) reducing the probability of issuing conflicting or inappropriate land use licenses; d) providing incentives for improved land management; and e) improving community livelihoods based on sustainable natural resource management.

The only direct potential environmental impacts from the project would be associated with minor renovation of land office facilities. Such renovation activities are expected to have low impacts. Potential risks would be improper disposal of construction waste (e.g. asbestos materials) and injuries resulting from not using proper personal protection equipment (PPE). Most of those impacts would be addressed by Codes of Practice for Health, Safety and Environment embedded in the ESMF and subsequent renovation contracts. If asbestos-containing materials are encountered during renovation work, handling and disposal would be in accordance with standard asbestos management measures that are included in the ESMF. Other potential risks would be improper recording of areas with high-biodiversity values (such as wetlands, mangroves, etc.). The ESMF seeks to strengthen the current PTSL protocols to include measures for environmental screening and potential findings of any physical cultural resources prior to the mapping activities by developing a Physical Cultural Management Framework, as well as coordination with relevant agencies managing conservation and protection.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:
The project will mostly operate in non-Forest Areas, with an added component of forest boundary demarcation. The current PTSL system has an in-built mechanism to exclude disputed areas or land parcels with overlapping and/or competing claims from being titled, and hence minimize risks of further exacerbating existing disputes and/or tension or restricting people's access to their assets and properties by formally recognizing claims challenged by other parties.

Although the Project does not acquire any land nor directly displaces people and/or their resources, it triggers OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement. The policy is triggered due to risks associated with the potential forest boundary

reconstruction and boundary affirmation. This may subsequently result potential evictions through third partly actions with regards to informal settlement in State or Public properties in Forest and non-Forest Areas.

In the context of PTSL and the project overall, indirect impacts that emerge following the PTSL completion and/or are triggered in other locations and/or communities beyond PTSL target areas may include several scenarios, including:
a.   Increased land-speculation and presence of influential land speculators. Despite their understanding of the benefits of land titles, land holders may be encouraged to use their certificates as collaterals or sell their lands for cash;
b.   Potential land use changes/conversions due to erroneous classification and subsequent titling of lands with high-conservation values and natural habitats;
c.   Potential future disputes due to erroneous titling which may not be detected and/or identified during the project implementation; and
d.   Land use changes with potential positive and negative impacts on local community livelihood options.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
One Map Policy implementation acceleration through participatory parcel mapping without direct linkage to Agrarian Reform was the initial approach considered for the project. However, the adoption of Agrarian Reform and land certification targets to the project became necessary for linking the project to the ATR/BPN's mandate and programs, and also for providing incentives of participation for the land holders in the project target areas.

As part of the project design to avoid and minimize adverse impacts ATR/BPN's systematic registration approach (PTSL) has an in-built mechanism to exclude areas under territorial land disputes from PTSL, and a mechanism to facilitate dispute resolution and appeal avenues over individual land disputes. These mechanisms minimize risks of exacerbating existing disputes and/or tension or restricting people's access to their assets and properties by formally recognizing claims challenged by other parties.

4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.
In response to the identified risks, the government has put in place several measures, through the PTSL process, and has developed this ESMF, to mitigate impacts.

Key approaches to the ESMF cover: citizen engagement; safeguards screening and risk mapping; enhanced stakeholder engagement during project preparation and implementation; addressing downstream impacts associated with evictions and/or access restrictions; complaint handling/GRM; addressing environmental risk; mainstreaming gender; proactive engagement with Indigenous Peoples and Adat communities; community monitoring; and capacity building.

Instruments prepared as part of the ESMF include:
a.   Community Participation Framework
b.   Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework
c.   Resettlement Policy Framework and Process Framework
d.   Grievance Redress Mechanism
e.   Environmental Codes of Practice for Construction
f.   Physical Cultural Resources (PCR) Management Framework

ATR/BPN, has long years of experience in conducting participatory community mapping and land titling programs

across Indonesia. In addition to its own programs, ATR/BPN had previous engagement with the Bank's Safeguards policies implementing different land administration projects since mid-1990s (LAP-1 and 2; LMPDP, and RALAS) and has developed familiarity with Bank's safeguard policies, although further capacity building for personnel in charge for the project and additional resources would be necessary for the implementation of the ESMF. The organization has an in-house unit to promote public awareness-raising and engagement on land administration programs and complaints handling. ATR/BPN has continuously strengthened its capacity in citizen engagement (e.g., LARASITA program) by providing mobile land administration services at the site level. The organization also has a training center (Diklat) that would manage capacity-building activities for related project implementing-entities.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

The ESMF was developed based on review of information, field visits and consultations undertaken at the central and subnational level. Engagement has taken place with both internal stakeholders within ATR/BPN at the national and subnational levels as well as external stakeholders, including relevant ministries (i.e. MoEC, MoHA) and CSOs in the land sector. As well as informing project design, the engagement has informed identification of social risks and the development of measures to address those risks.

The project involves several key stakeholders, including landholders, local authorities at the village and sub-district levels, line departments representing various ministries and agencies (e.g. Provincial Forestry Offices, Forest Management Units, District Village Empowerment Agencies, local police force, and the Office of District Secretary and District Heads, local parliaments, etc.) as well as CSOs/NGOs, both at the national and sub-national levels (i.e. AMAN, KPA/Consortium for Agrarian Reform, JKPP/Participatory Mapping Networks, and local CSOs/NGOs). At the implementation level, stakeholder engagement, through community consultations, participatory mapping, joint-monitoring, etc. is integral to the overall PTSL process proposed under the ESMF. The main objective is to create effective, constructive, and regular communication with local communities, various line departments, local organizations and civil society. Strengthened multi-sectoral collaboration is expected to minimize administrative and bureaucracy hurdles and by so doing reduce potential disputes and/or complaints stemming from dissatisfaction with results and prolonged dispute settlements.

Preparation of the ESMF has involved various stakeholders from ATR/BPN and BIG at both central and sub-national levels. The draft ESMF has been disclosed at the BPN's website www.bpn.go.id since 10 April 2018, and two public consultations have taken place involving national and regional stakeholders including CSOs/NGOs:

The first formal public consultation on the ESMF was conducted on 19 April 2018 at the ATR/BPN office. The public consultation was chaired by Minister of Agrarian Reform and Spatial Planning Mr. Sofjan Djalil and attended by representatives from national and local civil society and advocacy groups on Agrarian Reform, indigenous peoples and local community rights, governance reform, and women affairs, as well as representatives from the Indonesian Surveyors Association. Among the leading sector activists that attended were the Executive Director of Consortium for Agrarian Reform/KPA (that represents 85 CSOs including local chapters of AMAN (representing Adat / indigenous communities), and 68 local and national NGOs), and representatives from DGMI National Steering Committee, the Samdhana Institute, and Kemitraan. Discussion was vivid, and representatives provided multiple suggestions to the ESMF including on the risk and risk mitigation measures related to communal and indigenous peoples' rights. Subsequently, these inputs have been incorporated by ATR/BPN in the ESMF. The consultation ended to a consensual agreement to continue discussion on the project implementation arrangements and risk mitigation with the civil society organizations periodically throughout project implementation.

The second public consultation was held on 28 May 2018. The consultation was undertaken following the revision of the ESMF taking into consideration feedback from the first consultation. The revised ESMF, in Bahasa Indonesia, was disclosed on the ATR/BPN website prior to the consultation. Consortium for Agrarian Reform KPA, two representatives of AMAN representing the regions, Serikat Petani Pasundan, Sayoga Institute, and the Indonesian Surveyor Association. Representative of the MoEF including from the Forest Investment Program-2, as well division heads from provincial land offices were also present. The consultation session discussed the revisions made to the ESMF as a result of the 1st consultation which then were confirmed by the stakeholders. The addition of Annexes 4 on CPF and IPPF and 6 on RPF and PF were presented. Inputs to these instruments, including representing regional perspectives were requested at the start of the meeting. Participants from AMAN, KPA, and Sayoga Institute provided many useful inputs aimed at ensuring that communal and Adat claims are provided with clear administrative procedures for tenure regularization. The meeting also discussed the resettlement option currently included in the PPTKH. Participants both from Government and civil-society generally viewed that resettlement should be avoided, and therefore the policy (PPTKH) would need to be revised and options for avoiding resettlement to be prioritized to be clearly defined and would be considered under Component 3 of the Project. If indeed involuntary resettlement is unavoidable, the standards and processes will need to be defined as part of implementation procedures of PPTKH. The meeting reached important consensus that the results of participatory mapping of Adat claims covering 9 million hectares facilitated by AMAN proposed sites for Agrarian Reform in 406 locations facilitated by the KPA will be available for the Project to support the risk mapping and screening.

[Note: Indonesian Laws and regulations refer to Adat rights based on Government recognition to an indigenous community group as Legally Recognized Adat Community (Masyarakat Hukum Adat). Such a legal recognition falls within the realm of broader National Unity and Politics (Kesatuan Bangsa dan Politik) along with recognition of other civic rights. The jurisdiction for Adat recognition rests within the Local and Provincial governments (not under land administration or forest management). Therefore the 9 million hectares mapped through the participatory process may not necessarily covering all legally recognized Adat community. But the information serves as an important baseline for the project in managing Adat and communal claims.]

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
16-Apr-2018	30-May-2018	30-May-2018

"In country" Disclosure

Indonesia
19-May-2018

Comments

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
16-Apr-2018	30-May-2018

"In country" Disclosure
Indonesia
19-May-2018

Comments

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
16-Apr-2018	30-May-2018

"In country" Disclosure
Indonesia
19-May-2018

Comments

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting)

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment

Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?
Yes
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?
NA
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?
NA

OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?
Yes
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?
Yes

OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples

Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?
Yes

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?
NA

If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?
NA

OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement

Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?
Yes

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?
Yes

OP/BP 4.36 - Forests

Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?
Yes

Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?
Yes

Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?
No

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure?
Yes

Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?
Yes

All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?
Yes

Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?
Yes

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?
Yes

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?
Yes

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Mika-Petteri Torhonen
Lead Land Administration Specialist

Iwan Gunawan
Sr Natural Resources Mgmt. Spec.

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Ministry of Finance

Implementing Agencies

Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning / National Land Agency (ATR/BPN)
Sofyan Djalil
Minister
humas@bpn.go.id

Geospatial Information Agency; Badan Informasi Geospasial (BIG)
Prof. Dr. Hasanuddin Zainal Abidin
Head
info@big.go.

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: http://www.worldbank.org/projects

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Mika-Petteri Torhonen Iwan Gunawan

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Peter Leonard	30-May-2018
Practice Manager/Manager:	Jorge A. Munoz	30-May-2018
Country Director:	Rolande Simone Pryce	31-May-2018