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Indigenous Peoples Development Framework

E. Indigenous Peoples

15. A few subprojects will affect indigenous communities. Some are relatively well integrated into Indonesian society and culture, while others, especially in Papua, sharply differ in race, culture, society, and political organization from the national mainstream. These differences have been carefully factored into project activities to ensure compliance with the ADB indigenous peoples policy.

16. General indigenous people policy and procedural provisions are developed in an IPPF. Specific subproject issues will be dealt with through an IPDP based on intensive participatory planning. Depending on the impact’s gravity and the degree of indigenous people’s vulnerability, the IPDP will either be included in the subproject LARPs or prepared as a stand-alone document. One core subproject (Merasap) will affect indigenous people. For the identified noncore subprojects in Papua, the preparation of individual IPDPs will be a condition for ADB financing. Community infrastructure that may be provided by an IPDP will have to be constructed before the land needed by the subproject is acquired.

1. Indigenous People Policy Framework

17. The IPPF provides a general introduction to indigenous people issues for the Project, outlines the criteria established by the ADB policy, identifies indigenous people, and provides an overview of indigenous communities to be or likely to be affected by the Project. The IPPF also sets the policy and procedural framework relevant for the Project as a whole; outlines the content of a model IPDP; and describes the strategy to be followed in defining different IPDP types fitting the degree of impact intensity and relative vulnerability of affected communities.

18. As for the indigenous people identification criteria, the IPPF establishes that indigenous people are those who in various degrees (i) descend from groups present in specific areas before the establishment of modern states and relative borders, and (ii) maintain distinct self- or non-self-ascribed identities. Other identification criteria will be used to establish the degree of vulnerability of affected indigenous people and the type of action to be developed for an IPDP: (i) use of distinct languages; (ii) active maintenance of sociocultural systems and institutions that differ from the sociocultural system and institutional-political tradition of dominant societies; (iii) pursuit of livelihood in the margins of the market system; and (vi) maintenance of unique ties and attachments to natural resources and ancestral territories.

19. The IPPF establishes that IPDP interventions for affected indigenous people will have to (i) reflect local culture, beliefs, needs, and preferred options of affected communities; (ii) reflect the outcome of participatory planning methodologies; (iii) consider traditional procedures and functions of local institutions; (iv) fit local production systems; (v) promote self-reliance among the affected communities; and
(vii) ensure that adequate lead time and arrangements are established for IPDP implementation.

20. The IPPF establishes that IPDPs will be prepared by specialists familiar with indigenous people issues and with anthropological and sociological expertise. IPDPs will include the following:

(i) an indigenous people identification assessment (IPIA) extensively describing (a) the affected community, identifying the name of the indigenous people; (b) type and magnitude of direct and indirect impacts; (c) number of households and persons affected; (d) social organization; (e) livelihood and land tenure patterns; (f) history of relations with outsiders (including eventual transmigrasi [migrating] communities); (g) degree of adaptation to mainstream society and culture; and (h) local political forms and degree of participation into formal state administration mechanisms; (ii) an assessment of (a) the degree of vulnerability of the affected indigenous people communities and of the type of IPDP needed based on the ISA and type of physical impacts of a subproject; (b) IPDP implementation capacity of affected communities, local government, and subproject teams; and, if necessary, (c) a capacity-building plan to reinforce IPDP implementation; (iii) a thorough participatory planning exercise (to be documented in the IPDP text) involving affected communities, local governments, subproject teams, and the PLN social development unit; and (iv) a community development action plan (CDAP) (a) formally endorsed by the affected communities and reflecting the results of the ISA and participatory planning activities; and (b) detailing needed IPDP provisions, organization framework, monitoring schemes, and specific IPDP implementation schedules and budgets.

21. IPDP type and initiatives will be commensurate to the variety of indigenous people affected by the subproject, to their degree of vulnerability, and to the type of impacts:

(i) The IPDP will be limited only to the IPIA and will not require a specific a CDAP if (a) negative impacts affect indigenous people who are fully integrated in mainstream society and culture and are fully in control of the national administrative system, and (b) impacts do not have specific sociocultural dimensions. The IPDP in this case will be included as a chapter in the LARP. (ii) The IPDP will include with the IPIA directions to compensate affected persons as needed if (a) negative impacts affect IP groups maintaining a degree of sociocultural and institutional distinction from mainstream society; and (b) impacts carry a sociocultural dimension but do not have broad community effects (i.e., the houses to be reconstructed are of a specific traditional type, or compensation needs to follow specific traditional procedures). The IPDP will be included as a chapter in the LARP. (iii) The IPDP will include an IPIA and CDAP and will be prepared as a stand-alone document if (a) negative impacts affect IP groups maintaining a degree of sociocultural and institutional distinction from mainstream society, and (b) impacts not only carry a sociocultural dimension but also have broad community effects. A stand-alone IPDP will also cover LARP issues. If whole
communities hold land tenure collectively, the IPDP may include special land compensation features involving direct provisions for land users and generalized provisions, in the form of community development packages, for what concerns communal land property.

2. Core and Noncore Subprojects

22. One core subproject, Merasap (West Kalimantan), impacts on indigenous people, whose issues are addressed in a LARP chapter. The indigenous people are Dayak villagers who are relatively well integrated into the broader administrative system. Therefore, no stand-alone IPDP will be prepared. The LARP contains a chapter on indigenous people, indicating the features of the local sociocultural situation and detailing a number of specific interventions requested by the affected community: rehabilitation and improvement of a Christian sanctuary and the construction of a wall to protect the cave where the sanctuary is from eventual floods.

23. Four noncore subprojects in Papua (Tatui, Amai, Prafi, and Genyem) will involve indigenous people. Considering local sociocultural features and the specific claims on local land and natural resources held by the Papua communities under the new autonomous province status, these subprojects will require the preparation of stand-alone IPDPs. For these subprojects the consultation process leading to the conceptualization of the IPDPs has been initiated.
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