

To:

Office of the Special Project Facilitator
Asian Development Bank
Manila

Dear Sir or Madam,

According to SPF-ADB procedure for the consultation process, the community making a request for consultation received the SPF-ADB Review and Assessment report in April 2005, and must now comment on this report.

We hereby enclose comments from the communities of the five villages that made the request for consultation. Also enclosed is an official report of the comments made by the community on the Indonesian language version of the review and assessment report, each with a clear reference to the page number, paragraph and line.

Attached are the following appendices :

Appendix 1. Corrections from the community to the OSPF-ADB Review and Assessment Report

Appendix 2. Comments from the community and NGO intermediaries on the OSPF-ADB Review and Assessment Report

Appendix 3. Comments from the community and NGO intermediaries on the proposed course of action

Appendix 4. Request for Confidentiality of the Corrections, Comments and Proposals

This concludes our letter. We hope that this will provide input for the next step in the process.

On behalf of the Communities Requesting the Consultation

NGO intermediaries

1. Appendices

Appendix 1. Corrections from the Community to the OSPF-ADB by Review And Assessment Report

VILLAGE REPORTS (Appendix 3)

Handil Negara Village

- **Page 3, Paragraph 8, Line 9:** The words *terkena banjir* (flooded) should be replaced by *tergenang air* (covered in water), because the word *banjir* implies all the village roads, whether elevated or not, were swamped with water. Handil Negara is located in a tidal zone, so although it never floods, it gets covered with water at high tide.

Kali Besar Village

- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 11:** Should read, *dana O+P digunakan untuk menutup tepi kedua gorong-gorong tersebut dengan tanah dan siring yang terbuat dari kayu ulin* (...the O+M fund was used to close the sides of two culverts with soil and 'siring' made out of 'galam' wood)

Kiram

- **The entire content of the report on Kiram:** References to the RT in almost all paragraphs on pages 1, 2, and 3 are incorrect and unclear. Desa Kiram actually consists of three RT: RT 1 (consisting of the former RT 1, RT 2 (called Jarak) and RT 3 (called Guntung Lua); RT 2 (the former RT 4, commonly known as Sungai Tabuk); and RT 3 (former RT 5, known as Kiram Atas. It is essential that this very basic error be corrected.

Mandiingin Barat Village

- **Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 4:** None of the inhabitants of Mandiingin Barat are workers on rubber plantations. This should be changed to rubber farmers, because not only is there no rubber plantation here, these farmers manage their own plantations.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 3:** *Jarak antar RT sangat jauh*, (The distances between RTs are considerable...) should be replaced with the words, *tidak terlalu jauh dan masalah komunikasi tidak terlalu sulit*. (The RTs are not far from each other, and there are no serious communication difficulties between the RTs)
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 3:** The R & A report mentions that the road built was 500-m long. This is incorrect. SP3 No. 32/PIMPRO-CERD/2002 states that a 700-m road was constructed, but in fact the road built by Poklak is 750 meters long.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 20:** *Jalan yang berlubang tergenang banjir saat hujan* (...the constructed road has potholes and gets flooded in rainy season). The words *tergenang banjir* should read *tergenang air* (covered with water), because in fact there are never floods here, but the road does get covered with water in the rainy season.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 17:** *dana OP yang di gunakan untuk memperbaiki sarana air bersih* (O+M budget was used [in 2003] to maintain the water supply). Add here that it was also used to extend the water distribution pipe to the mosque in RT 2.

- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 4:** The original plan was that the contractor would build just one bridge, 120 meters long. But because only 60 m of land was available and there were funds left over, the contractor built another 60-m bridge of the same quality in a different location (RT 2), for a total of 120 meters of bridge.

Handi Baru Village

- **Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 12:** The SPF RAR state that the signatories of the complaint letter showed OSPF the CERDP road on 5 April 2005, but the signatories remember this happening not 5 April 2005, but on 4 April 2005, because on April 5 the SPF team were conducting a review and assessment in Kiram, and it is impossible for the SPF to have been in two places at one time.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 20:** Actually no sand (*pasir*) was used in the construction of this road. It was constructed only with mud from the paddy fields. So the SPF RAR is incorrect on this point.

Appendix 2. Comments from the Community and the NGO intermediaries on the OSPF-ADB Review And Assessment Report

COMMENTS ON THE PRESENTATION OF THE RAR (17-20 MAY 2005)

- **Handil Negara.** The villagers were dissatisfied with the information given by Karin Oswald (Senior SPF-ADB) when presenting the Review and Assessment Report in the village, because some of the data presented in this report was incorrect and could not be corrected, even though it is crucial. This data should be corrected so that there are no errors in the data presented.
- **Handil Baru.** During the presentation in Handil Baru, SPF's refusal to change incorrect data in the report disappointed the villagers. Although this data is crucial, SPF did not give the community a chance to change it.
- **NGO Intermediaries.** SPF presented the Review & Assessment Report by reading the report to the audience. SPF did not use any audio, visual, or audio-visual media to convey information to the villagers. As a result, many of the villagers did not really understand what the SPF was saying.
- **NGO Intermediaries.** We were disappointed with the attitude of the SPF when making the presentation in the first village (Handil Baru, 17 May 2005) for refusing point-blank to accept any of the corrections the villagers made to the report. This and the SPF's inability to understand the local condition soured the atmosphere, which was not conducive to making a presentation (although it was finally agreed that the comments/corrections from the community would be included in an appendix to the report).
- **NGO Intermediaries.** The SPF made the presentation through an interpreter using very formal language, which made it difficult for the villagers to understand. Fortunately, the NGO intermediaries helped out by giving simple explanations in the local language to the villagers in the remaining four villages. The SPF should have a procedure for this, taking into consideration the local condition.
- **NGO Intermediaries.** In the opinion of the SPF, it was not particularly important that some of the people attending the presentation had not brought a copy of the report, even though the villagers have shown to have a better understanding of issues when following a dialogue rather than reading about them. The SPF should have a procedure for this. This point should also be taken into account in joint activities between the community and the SPF and project management in the future.

COMMENTS FROM THE VILLAGERS ON THE REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT REPORT

Handil Negara Village

- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 2:** The physical infrastructure constructed actually consisted of paving (*pengerasan*) to 2,125 m of road and covering 1,100 m with soil.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 4:** The actual cost is not known for sure, nor are any details of this physical infrastructure development plan, because there has been no review and there are no details available about the planning process
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 8:** To confirm, three culverts were covered up, but only one as a result of the CERD project. The other two were covered as a result of a previous project.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 15:** This 400-m road has actually not been completed yet, because only a small portion of the available O&M funds were used.

- **Page 2 , Paragraph 4 Line 1:** The root cause of this conflict was not the wage difference per se, but the villagers lack of clear information about the project. As a result, there was miscommunication between the villagers that made them suspicious of each other.
- **Page 2, Paragraph 5, Line 3:** The contractor did not go searching for workers in the village, it was the villagers and the village head who requested that workers be employed from the village. The villagers remember asking to be employed as workers, but received no response.
- **Page 2, Paragraph 5, Line 7:** Poklak 2002 had nothing to do with and was not involved in construction of the physical infrastructure since Poklak was appointed at a meeting at sub-district level after the contractor had completed the work in the village.
- The SPF Review & Assessment Report is incomplete because it does not contain the recommendations made by the community in the request for consultation. This report should also include a review of the content of the request for consultation as information and data presented.

Kali Besar Village

- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 3:** The words *masyarakat di RT 4 dan 5 tidak merasakan manfaat dari jalan* (RT 4 and RT 5 do not benefit from the road) should read *masyarakat di RT 4 dan 5 juga merasakan manfaat jalan yang dibangun namun tidak merasakan secara langsung* (RT 4 and RT 5 also benefit from the road, although not directly).
- **Page 1, Paragraph 4, Line 7:** RT 4 and RT 5 are priorities too, not just RT 1 and RT 3. Because this program did not engage the community in the planning and decision-making processes, it is impossible to say which physical infrastructure is priority.
- **Page 2, Paragraph 9, Line 5:** What is meant by the words *dibesar-besarkan* (exaggerated) in the SPF RAR? What we said in the request of consultation is what actually happened. Components A, B, and D were not implemented. There were problems with the physical infrastructure. There was no CERD project approach and design in this village.
- **Page 3, Paragraph 13, Line 1:** The villagers and village government agreed to support the request for consultation, and there was a unanimous agreement to participate in subsequent activities.
- **Page 3, Paragraph 10, Line 1:** Problem solving will not be difficult to achieve because the whole village has expressed its commitment to solving this problem together.

Kiram Village

- **Page 2, Paragraph 5, Line 8:** In Kiram, the villagers are in no doubt about the appropriateness of the complaint. The request had the support of many of the villagers. In fact, members of the village apparatus and the villagers are willing to participate in the next stage in the process.
- **Page 2, Paragraph 6, Line 4:** There was never such a meeting. Even the RT3 head does not remember being invited to such a meeting, because if he had been he would certainly have tried to attend, as usual.
- **Page 2, Paragraph 6, Line 8:** *Sebagian masyarakat yang mana yang tidak ada waktu untuk rapat apapun ?* (Some villagers explained, however, that they would

not have time to attend any meetings)? Every meeting held in the village, including meetings to discuss the process of compiling the request for consultation, was attended by the village apparatus and most of the village leaders, with the exception of the village head. The villagers even hold routine weekly meetings that are very well attended.

- **Page 2, Paragraph 7, Line 7:** Support for the complaint from villagers in Kiram is very strong. They are in no doubt about the appropriateness of the complaint, it is just that they are not used to studying documents/requests for consultation and so do not have a detailed understanding of the problem.
- **Page 2, Paragraph 8, Line 3:** The current village apparatus fully supports the complaint, so there is no reason to doubt the willingness of the village government to participate in the consultation process.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 6:** Pursuant to SP3 No. 34/PIMPRO-CERD/2002 dated 28 October 2002 concerning provision of a water supply system in Kiram, the amount of funds available were Rp 40,120,000, which differs from the figure from the 2003 report quoted by the SPF.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 3** Pursuant to the project plan for Kiram (No. 26/PIMPRO-CERD/2002 dated 28 October 2002 concerning rehabilitation of Kiram roads), the cost was Rp 127,000,000.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 7 :** O&M funds were not only used to build a water supply system, but also to make repairs to the roads.
- The SPF report should contain not only the results of interviews, but also draw from the important points in the request for consultation, so that they are part of the data presented in this report.

Mandiingin Barat Village

- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 9:** O&M funds used in 2004 did not amount to Rp 25 million. According to the CERD Field Transfers/2004 O&M funds in 2004 amounted to Rp 13,292,000. So the SPF should cross check important data like this, to avoid errors in the data presented that could cause new problems in the village.
- **Page 2, Paragraph 5, Line 4:** In our village, the inhabitants absorb far more information listening to an explanation than reading, so some of the signatories of the supporting list did not study the contents of the letter in detail, but they did understand its purpose and goal.

Handil Baru Village

- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 1:** According to project plan No. 18/PIMPRO-CERD/2002 on rehabilitation of village roads, the funding was for Rp. 402.500.000, quite different from the figure presented by the SPF based on the 2003 project management report.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 4:** CERDP in 2002 built two bridges.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 7:** Three village bridges were dismantled to allow access to the excavator used in construction of the village roads. These were bridges that had been constructed previously by another project.
- **Page 1, Paragraph 2, Line 10:** We need to explain a little about the bridges that were dismantled during implementation of the 2002 CERDP and reassembled later, but not to their original condition. In 2003, these bridges could still be used,

but in 2004 they collapsed completely, and then in 2005 were rebuilt. Where did the funds for this construction come from? We don't know whether they were from CERDP or from another project.

- **Page 2, Paragraph 4, Line 3:** This difference of opinion was not only due to social envy, but also to a lack of clear information about the project and its process, which made the villagers suspicious of each other.
- **Page 2, Paragraph 5, Line 6:** Poklak in 2003 and 2004 did the job they were meant to do, which was managing the O&M funds. It was only in 2002 that Poklak did not function, because the physical infrastructure was constructed by a contractor.
- SPF is not fair because the report contained only the data from one side (not balanced). Why did so much of the information we gave not appear in the report? This data is crucial and should be corrected.

COMMENTS FROM NGO INTERMEDIARIES

- The Review & Assessment Report does not differentiate clearly between facts and conclusions made by the SPF team. This makes it difficult for the community, and us, to make comments.
- The information presented in the report is not balanced. SPF took data from one source only. For example, figures for the cost of construction of physical infrastructure were taken only from the 2003 project management report. If the problem is that there are substantial differences in information, then the SPF team should use the data triangulation method to validate the data. Also, the SPF should explore the reasons for the differences in perceptions.
- SPF did not mention/explain why the solutions presented in the request for consultation were not included in the report.
- **Page 8 Paragraph 23:** This information is misleading! What method was used to assess this? To correct this, the SPF should include this report as an appendix to the Review & Assessment Report.
- **Page 10 Paragraph 29 Line 10:** The SPF report does not provide clear details as to when, where and what information was offered to the NGOs. Project management should know that as NGOs it is not our job to convey information from project management to the local community (we are not an extension of, nor a part of, project management). Project management must learn how to understand the community so that the villagers can understand and accept the information disseminated.
- **Page 11 Paragraph 31 Line 7:** It is not only the NGOs and villagers that have to be ready to give government, the project management and IRM a chance; we want a solution to these problems that have been around for the past two years. The villagers, NGOs and project management have made serious efforts to cooperate, but no agreements have been reached.
- **Appendix 4 Page 2 – Information on Government and Consultants:** These problems arose during implementation of the project in 2002. We have been monitoring the project with the villagers since 2003. This monitoring includes collecting data at village level and from project management at all levels, from head office in Jakarta to the district (village and subdistrict facilitators have yet to be recruited). This data has been clarified at seminars organized at the sub-district, district and provincial levels. Also, this monitoring involves review of project documents received.

- **Appendix 3/Village Report Paragraph 13:** The English version of the report mentions that the contractor will be involved in the joint fact finding, but this is not mentioned in the Indonesian version of the report.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION

Handil Negara Village

- **Page 4, Paragraph 14:** The project specifications/plan should be included in the review as a reference for assessment and for comparison with the actual physical infrastructure. Also, local knowledge of the village condition and its bearing on the physical infrastructure constructed must be taken into account, so not only engineers from project management should be involved, but also villagers who have knowledge of this development.

Kali Besar Village

- We insist that the community receives the project specifications/plan before the joint fact finding takes place, to ensure that the joint fact finding is effective.

Kiram Village

- **Page 2, Paragraph 3, Line 4:**The villagers not only request components A&B, it should be checked whether or not components A&B have already been implemented. If not, agreements could be made about future plans for provision of these components.

Mandiangin Barat Village

- The SPF makes no mention of the demand for project reconstruction made in the request for consultation sent to the SPF. Project reconstruction must be viewed as a matter of urgency since from the very outset this project has contravened procedure by beginning with component C and not providing components A, B and D. Therefore, the villagers insist on comprehensive and complete reconstruction of the project.

Handil Baru Village

- **Page 4, Paragraph 13, Line 3:** We insist that the community receives the project specifications/plan before the joint fact finding takes place, to ensure that the joint fact finding is effective. It will also be useful in deciding what needs to be built and improved in the future.

COMMENTS ON PRIORITY ISSUES

Handil Negara. Most stakeholders focus on the demands for improvements to physical infrastructure, but they, and the villagers, also want an assessment of the need for components A and B.

Kali Besar. Page 4, Paragraph 16, Line 14: The problem is not just one of physical infrastructure, but also relates to the order in which the components are implemented, and the fact that only component C has been implemented so far. Therefore, the joint fact-finding should not only focus on the problems with the physical infrastructure, but also make an assessment of the facts concerning implementation of components A, B and D.

COMMENTS ON THE GROUND RULES

The communities of the five villages making the request for consultation to the SPF-ADB agree unconditionally to the ground rules set by the SPF-ADB

COMMENTS ON THE SCHEDULE

As discussed between the SPF and NGO intermediaries and between the villagers and the NGO intermediaries the best time for the next **course of action, including the joint fact finding and multi-stakeholder consultation**, would be before the end of July because the inhabitants of the five villages will begin their harvest at the end of July, and this will take up most of their time.

Therefore, we ask the SPF to bring the schedule forward to ensure that the joint activities are effective.

Appendix 3. Comments from the community on the Proposed course of action

Handil Negara Village

- **Page 4, Paragraph 14, Line 9:** Two hours is not enough to survey the project location and assess the physical infrastructure.
- **Page 4, Paragraph 14, Line 1:** The villagers feel it is important to attend this meeting, so we propose that villagers in addition to those mentioned in the report be involved.
- There should be a multi-stakeholder meeting before the joint fact-finding activity.

Kali Besar Village

- **Page 4 , Paragraph 16, Line 10:** We need to agree on how much time will be needed and what will be done during the joint fact-finding at a meeting prior to the joint fact-finding activity.
- **Page 4, Paragraph 17, Line 2:** The villagers feel it is very important to attend this meeting, so villagers in addition to those mentioned in the report should be involved.

Kiram Village

- **Page 4, Paragraph 14, Line 10:** With all the problems there are, will 2 hours been enough for the fact-finding? We think it will take at least 3 hours.

Handil Baru Village

- **Page 4, Paragraph 13, Line 10:** The villagers are concerned that two hours will not be enough. This must be discussed first or meeting should be held first before the fact-finding to discuss how much time needs to be allocated for the fact-finding and what needs to be done.
- The road built by CERDP must be repaired, as requested by the villagers. In the future, project management must work together with the community and must be transparent with all stakeholders.

NGO Intermediaries

- **Page 13 Paragraph 39:** Before the fact-finding activity there should be a multi-stakeholder meeting (community, project management, government, SPF, NGOs) to discuss the technical aspects of the joint fact-finding. (This point was made to SPF during discussions between the NGOs and SPF on 20 May 2005 at the YCHI office).

Appendix 4. Request for Confidentiality of the Corrections, Comments and Proposals

These comments made by the villagers are written in Indonesian, and include details about the people who made the comments. For this reason, the NGO intermediaries received several requests that the Review & Assessment Report not be published and that a copy of the report not be given to government, unless their comments on the Review and Assessment Report are included as an appendix to the report.

It was agreed with Senior SPF-ADB, Karin Oswald, at the time of the presentation of the Review & Assessment Report to the villages on 17 – 20 May 2002 that these comments would be included as an appendix to the OSPF-ADB Review & Assessment Report, and that once these comments were included as an appendix, the report could be published and a copy given to government.

To avoid any untoward consequences, the villagers who made comments on the Review & Assessment report request that their identities, including their names and positions, be kept confidential.