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FOREWORD

This publication was prepared in conjunction with an Asian Development Bank (ADB) regional technical assistance (RETA) project on Capacity Building for Indigenous Peoples/Ethnic Minority Issues and Poverty Reduction (RETA 5953), covering four developing member countries (DMCs) in the region, namely, Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, and Viet Nam. The project is aimed at strengthening national capacities to combat poverty and at improving the quality of ADB’s interventions as they affect indigenous peoples. The project was coordinated and supervised by Dr. Indira Simbolon, Social Development Specialist and Focal Point for Indigenous Peoples, ADB.

The project was undertaken by a team headed by the author, Mr. Roger Plant, and composed of consultants from the four participating DMCs. Provincial and national workshops, as well as extensive fieldwork and consultations with high-level government representatives, nongovernment organizations (NGOs), and indigenous peoples themselves, provided the basis for poverty assessment as well as an examination of the law and policy framework and other issues relating to indigenous peoples. Country reports containing the principal findings of the project were presented at a regional workshop held in Manila on 25–26 October 2001, which was attended by representatives from the four participating DMCs, NGOs, ADB, and other finance institutions. This report integrates the project’s main findings and recommendations, together with elements of a proposed regional action plan.

The report is one of a series of documents produced by the project. They comprise four country reports (on Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, and Viet Nam, respectively), a regional report covering these four countries, and the proceedings of the regional workshop, which resulted in recommendations for a regional action plan for indigenous peoples/ethnic minorities. In addition, a regional report on the subject in Pacific DMCs was prepared under a separate consultancy.

It is hoped that the information in this publication series on the issues and concerns of indigenous peoples/ethnic minorities will help guide national governments and development partners in improving future interventions to recognize, promote, and protect the rights of these peoples.

ROLF ZELIUS
Chief Compliance Officer and
Deputy Director-General
Regional and Sustainable Development Department
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In the course of 2001, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) implemented a regional technical assistance project for capacity building for indigenous peoples/ethnic minorities and poverty reduction. The project was undertaken in four countries of the Southeast Asian region, Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, and Viet Nam.

The regional technical assistance represents the first major regional activity on this subject undertaken by ADB since it adopted its Policy on Indigenous Peoples in 1998. Under this policy, ADB has pledged to work with borrowing member countries as appropriate and necessary to support and assist the development of capacities for addressing indigenous peoples’ matters. As appropriate and necessary, specific institutional development and capacity-building support would be provided to both indigenous peoples’ communities and to governments, consistent with ADB’s policies and approaches addressing institutional development and capacity building.

This regional technical assistance was endorsed by the First Indigenous Peoples Forum, which was conducted in Thailand in conjunction with the 33rd Annual Meeting of ADB’s Board of Governors. It has two general objectives: first, to strengthen ADB’s Policy on Indigenous Peoples with a poverty assessment of this sector in selected developing member countries (DMCs); and second, to develop, using participatory methods, an appropriate agenda for action to ensure poverty reduction for indigenous groups.

Its more specific objectives have been threefold, namely: (i) to conduct a poverty assessment of indigenous peoples/ethnic minorities and examine in each of the participating countries the relevant national policies and legislation, programs, projects, and initiatives pertaining to indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities as these address the multifaceted dimensions of poverty; (ii) to evaluate and assess the impact of ADB’s interventions that address the vulnerability and poverty of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in the countries concerned; and (iii) to provide capacity building for governments, nongovernment organizations (NGOs), and indigenous and ethnic minority groups so that they can participate actively in the formulation of action plans and ADB-sponsored programs and projects.

The importance of this study has been increased by recent developments and initiatives, both within ADB and within the Southeast Asian region as a whole. ADB has unambiguously declared poverty reduction to be its overarching goal. There are increasing concerns to channel its loans and other interventions to the poorest sectors in its DMCs, and also to finance new projects in geographical areas where the incidence of poverty is the most serious. As ADB’s poverty interventions grow, there are clear signs that more and more projects are being implemented in areas of traditional indigenous or ethnic minority habitation. A basic reason for this is that—in Southeast Asia, as in other developing regions of the world—these peoples often bear the most serious burden of material poverty. Very often, they live in remote areas where the provision of basic services has been weak or nonexistent. Of equal importance moreover, their access to the lands, forests, and other natural resources that have been the source of their traditional livelihood is being threatened by the processes of development and modernization, as their traditional land areas are opened up for settlement by nonindigenous groups and outside investment. In each of the countries participating in this study, some similar processes have been detected. The penetration of these once isolated areas by new commercial and development interests is now causing some of the governments to rethink their policies. As will be discussed at greater length in later sections of this report, the present study has taken place at a very dynamic time. There has been a series of law and policy proposals, either generally to recognize indigenous rights, or to have special protection for indigenous rights within the
context of new land and forestry laws, or to have targeted programs for addressing the needs of indigenous and ethnic minority groups.

Economic, political, and social developments within these Southeast Asian countries are of equal importance, making this project a particularly timely exercise. The ethnographic composition of the four countries is very diverse, and the nature of laws, policies, and programs on behalf of indigenous and ethnic minority groups also varies accordingly. In one of the countries, highland indigenous peoples are a very small proportion of the overall national population, and are located in just a few provinces.

The study was undertaken between February and November 2001, having to achieve a number of activities in a brief time period. National consultants were recruited to carry out activities in the four countries. They acted under the direction of the international consultant for the project. Each of the governments selected a focal agency for the project. In Cambodia, this was the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Highland Peoples Development (IMC), located in the Ministry of Rural Development; in Indonesia, the Directorate of Human Rights Protection, of the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights; in the Philippines, the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP). However, as the NCIP was under restructuring for much of the project, activities were coordinated closely with the Office of the Presidential Advisor for Indigenous Peoples Affairs. In Viet Nam, the focal agency was the Committee for Ethnic Minorities and Mountainous Areas (CEMMA).

Six provincial workshops and four national workshops were held. The provincial workshops were held in Ratanakiri, Cambodia (21–22 May); Kon Tum, Viet Nam (31 May and 1 June); Baguio, Philippines (4–5 June); Palu, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia (5–6 June); Samarinda, East Kalimantan, Indonesia (28 June); and Cagayan de Oro, Mindanao, Philippines (21–22 July). These provincial workshops provided the opportunity for local assessment, with the participation of indigenous/ethnic minority representatives, local government officials, and other relevant stakeholders. Participatory poverty assessments were carried out by the national consultants in select villages and communities in preparation for the provincial workshops.

The national workshops were held in Phnom Penh, Cambodia (13–14 September); Hanoi, Viet Nam (18–19 September); Jakarta, Indonesia (25–26 September); and Manila, Philippines (1–2 October). A country report was prepared for each of the national workshops. A draft country report containing the principal findings of the study was presented to each workshop, and a country-specific plan of action was adopted.

The regional workshop was held at ADB headquarters in Manila (25–26 October 2001). It was opened by ADB President Tadao Chino, and the four participating governments were represented at high level, including cabinet ministers of the governments of Cambodia and Indonesia. Indigenous representatives from the four countries also participated. Several international organizations were represented, including: the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), International Labour Organization (ILO), International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Health Organization (WHO), and World Bank. A draft of a regional plan of action was approved at this workshop, and its main elements are presented at the end of this report.

This regional report contains a synthesis of the study’s main findings and recommendations, together with proposed elements of the regional plan of action. It is structured as follows.

The second chapter examines questions of definition of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in each of the participating countries, as well as the geographical location of these peoples and some of their key characteristics.

The third chapter reviews the law and policy framework relating to indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, in particular as relevant to programs and policies for poverty reduction. Rather than a detailed analysis, it aims to portray some key similarities and differences between the policy frameworks of the project countries.

The fourth chapter discusses the progress and difficulties in measuring poverty trends for indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, in particular as relevant to programs and policies for poverty reduction. Rather than a detailed analysis, it aims to portray some key similarities and differences between the policy frameworks of the project countries.

The fifth chapter turns to the more qualitative dimensions of poverty and poverty reduction for indigenous and ethnic minority groups. Based mainly on fieldwork by the national consultants, it aims to
present these peoples’ own perceptions. Issues include the meaning of poverty and wealth for the peoples consulted, their own perceptions of poverty trends and their causes, and their principal needs and aspirations with respect to poverty reduction programs. This is a very preliminary exercise, based on only very limited assessment in the short time available.

The sixth chapter turns to the role of international assistance, including the experience of ADB itself. In accordance with the terms of reference for the regional technical assistance, a certain amount of attention is paid to ADB projects in the four countries. However, it was considered useful to spread the net more widely, examining how these issues have so far been addressed in programs and poverty partnerships, as well as in specific projects. The finding of the study is that a purely project-specific approach may have difficulty in giving adequate treatment to complex concerns, which need to be part of a broader policy dialogue with the country concerned.

The seventh chapter summarizes the principal conclusions and their policy and program implications. The final chapter sets out the main elements of the proposed regional action plan.
INTRODUCTION

If greater attention is to be paid to indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in poverty reduction programs, the first task is to identify exactly who they are, where they are located, and if possible what their numbers are and their proportion of the overall national population. It is important to determine whether or not they are small minorities, what is their role in the national economy, and in particular whether or not they live and earn their livelihood apart from other population groups. These questions are important for determining whether the main policy approach should be one of "safeguards," protecting vulnerable peoples and their resources from the possible adverse effects of development projects; or whether it might instead be one of "mainstreaming," ensuring that these peoples have equal access to the benefits of modernization and development without undermining their cultural values and traditional institutions.

Throughout Asia these are difficult questions. The terminology used is itself important, because the policy and practical implications of being defined as either indigenous or ethnic minority can be potentially quite different. Peoples and communities who formulate their demands under the "indigenous umbrella" are often seeking a differentiated status with regard to their land and resource rights, recognition and application of their customary laws, and the role of their traditional institutions in social and also political life. On the world stage, indigenous peoples in some regions are seeking a high degree of control over their own development, addressing issues that include autonomy and self-determination, and a measure of veto power over any investment and development projects undertaken within their areas of habitation or ancestral domain. A conceptual entry point for these claims by indigenous peoples is that they have prior or "aboriginal" rights over the resources contained in their traditional areas, rights which they have held since time immemorial, and which predate the formation of the modern Nation State. These issues are being addressed in emerging international law, as will be discussed further below.

The use of the term ethnic minorities may have somewhat different connotations. There may be no suggestion that the groups in question have any prior, ancestral, or aboriginal claims over land, territory, or related resources. The term means largely what it says. There are certain ethnic groups in individual countries, which are numerical minorities vis-à-vis the predominant ethnic population. However, as experience shows, the ethnic groups that are numerically in the minority are by no means always disadvantaged or vulnerable. In economic terms at least, they may be the most successful groups with the highest income levels. This can be the case of ethnic groups of European or Chinese origin. There may, however, be some risk of political or social disadvantage, if any impediments are placed on full participation by these groups in national civil or political life. Yet for poverty reduction strategies the emphasis needs to be placed on ethnic minority groups for whom there is some evidence of economic disadvantage vis-à-vis other sectors of the national population.

It is possible that, whether such vulnerable and disadvantaged groups are classified as indigenous or ethnic minority or any other term, their functional characteristics are very similar. Throughout the Southeast Asian region such groups may be predominantly rural and largely isolated from other population groups (at least until quite recently). They may be nomadic, or shifting cultivators, blending swidden (slash-and-burn) or sedentary agriculture with income-earning strategies that depend on hunting or access to forest products. They may have communal
forms of land tenure and allocation, although perhaps working land plots on an individual or family basis. They may have their own language, and unique cultural and religious practices. They may have their own recognized authority systems for resolving local conflicts including land, family, and minor criminal concerns. But the existence today of such cultural or traditional practices and institutions may not be a necessary condition for defining certain groups as indigenous (or even ethnic minority). An equally important thing can be the aspirations of certain groups to be identified as such, and to be differentiated from other sectors of the national population for certain policy or practical reasons.

It is for this reason that, at least as far as indigenous peoples are concerned, both emerging international law and the policy guidelines of multilateral development banks are placing much emphasis on the issue of self-definition. Ethnic groups often choose to define themselves as indigenous as a defensive mechanism, because they share certain cultural values that are considered by them to be under threat. There tend to be some unifying features behind the “indigenous” paradigm, including the communal or collective nature of land use and natural resource management, the importance of language, and the importance of traditional forms of representation. But the agenda would also appear to be an open-ended one. There is no compelling evidence that the groups that define themselves as indigenous or ethnic minority wish to pursue an exclusively subsistence lifestyle, or to be isolated altogether from the market economy and its institutions.

As regards the question of definition, the law and policies of the four countries participating in the present study present very considerable differences. Only the Philippines makes specific reference to the term indigenous in its pertinent legislation and administrative arrangements. Viet Nam refers to ethnic minorities. There are administrative arrangements at both national and provincial levels for attending to the concerns of ethnic minorities in development policies and programs. There are considerable statistical data and analysis concerning the economic and social situation of ethnic minorities. Cambodia uses different terms to refer to the ethnic minority groups living in the northeastern and other regions, mainly in upland areas. The terms hill tribes, highland peoples, indigenous peoples, and ethnic minorities have all been used on different occasions. A Department of Ethnic Minorities Development has recently been created within the Ministry of Rural Development and a draft General Policy for Highland Peoples’ Development has been prepared by the IMC. Thus, the assumption appears to be that the vulnerable ethnic minorities located in highland areas should be singled out for special attention.

Indonesia presents a special case. The Government has expressed its reluctance to use the term indigenous peoples. It as yet has no policy or administrative arrangements to deal with indigenous peoples or ethnic minorities as such. However, both the Constitution and the Basic Agrarian Law recognize the concept of customary law communities or adat communities. Several recent laws, policies, and ministerial decisions refer to adat concerns. Moreover, the creation of a National Alliance of Adat Communities (AMAN) in 1999, with representatives from different islands and provinces, has considerably raised the visibility given to adat concerns. The term masyarakat adat (adat community) appears now to enjoy increasing acceptance in official circles, possibly paving the way for a more coordinated national policy. Further groundwork would still appear to be needed to identify the criteria under which groups or communities might be covered by a national policy on masyarakat adat concerns.

Country-specific issues of definition will be examined in more detail below. First, it is useful to see how ADB’s own Policy on Indigenous Peoples deals with the question of definition.

THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK’S DEFINITION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND ITS OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

ADB’s 1998 Policy on Indigenous Peoples deals at some length with problems of definition. It is accepted that developing “a single, specific definition or identification for indigenous peoples would be difficult”. The term indigenous peoples is seen as a “generic concept,” used by ADB solely for convenience. While accepted or preferred terms or definitions vary “by country, by academic discipline, and even by usage of groups concerned,” the terms relating to the concept of indigenous peoples as addressed in the ADB policy include cultural minorities, ethnic minorities, indigenous
cultural communities, tribals, scheduled tribes, natives, and aboriginals.

Indigenous peoples’ communities in the Asian region reflect tremendous diversity in their cultures, histories, and current circumstances; and the relationships between indigenous peoples and dominant groups of society vary. The ADB policy uses as its starting point for defining indigenous peoples two significant characteristics displayed by them, namely: (i) descent from population groups present in a given area, most often before modern states or territories were created and before modern borders were defined; and (ii) maintenance of cultural and social identities; and social, economic, cultural, and political institutions separate from mainstream or dominant societies and cultures.

Additional characteristics identified by the policy are (i) self-identification and identification by others as being part of a distinct cultural group, and the display of a desire to preserve that cultural identity; (ii) a linguistic identity different from that of the dominant society; (iii) social, cultural, economic, and political traditions and institutions distinct from the dominant culture; (iv) economic systems oriented more toward traditional systems of production than mainstream systems; and (v) unique ties and attachments to traditional habitats and ancestral territories and natural resources in these habitats and territories. Indigenous peoples are also described with reference to their ways of life. In many cases, indigenous peoples live in separated communities, often in areas geographically distinct from urban centers; and often functioning at the periphery of the political, social, cultural, and economic systems of the dominant or mainstream society. In other cases, indigenous peoples’ communities can be found on the fringes of urban areas, comprising peoples who have migrated but remain distinct from the mainstream. Thus indigenous peoples’ communities in a given country can reflect varying degrees of acculturation and integration into the dominant or mainstream society.

On this basis, ADB’s policy employs the following working definition for its operations as they affect indigenous peoples.

Indigenous peoples should be regarded as those with a social or cultural identity distinct from the dominant or mainstream society, which makes them vulnerable to being disadvantaged in the processes of development.

ADB also accepts that indigenous peoples should be defined at the national level. In specific development interventions it supports, “the national legislation of the country in which the development intervention is taking place contributes to a basis for defining indigenous peoples.” This includes constitutional, statutory, and customary law, as well as international law, including any international conventions to which the country is a party. Furthermore, the application of any definition of indigenous peoples should “work to differentiate between indigenous peoples and other cultural and ethnic minorities for which indigenous status is not an issue.”

ADB’s policy also sets itself the objective of assisting member countries to develop knowledge of their indigenous peoples. Among the constraints to more effective development efforts that affect indigenous peoples are the lack of “detailed and objective knowledge and information about indigenous peoples and their circumstances.” This is clearly important for ADB, because of the need to identify whether indigenous peoples covered by the policy are located in a project area. In project preparation, if the initial social assessment identifies indigenous peoples specifically as a significantly and adversely affected population (or vulnerable to being so affected), it is required that an indigenous peoples’ development plan acceptable to ADB be prepared by the government or project sponsor.

National Definitions and Main Characteristics in the Participating Countries

Cambodia

Cambodia is a multi-ethnic society in which the dominant and mainstream population is the ethnic Khmer who represent some 90% of the population. Significant nonKhmer minority groups include the Muslim Cham, Vietnamese, Laotians, Chinese, and Europeans, as well as the highland groups most often referred to as indigenous ethnic minorities.

The main government agency responsible for the development of indigenous or ethnic minority groups, the IMC, has a clear focus on the more vulnerable highland groups. However, in the absence of clear legal definitions of the concepts of indigenous peoples,
ethnic minorities or highland peoples, it is difficult to estimate the numbers involved. In 1995, the Ministry of Interior stated that there were 442,699 ethnic minority peoples (or 3.8% of the population). This estimate included the Chinese and Vietnamese populations within the ethnic minority groups. The total indigenous ethnic minority population was estimated at 70,030 (or 1.0% of the total population in 1995). In 1997, the IMC reached higher estimates, of 105,000 indigenous highland peoples for only the 3 northeastern provinces of Mondulkiri, Ratanakiri, and Stung Treng. And based on IMC figures, the 1998 census data would point to a total of 112,000 indigenous highland peoples in the 4 northeastern provinces of Kratie, Mondulkiri, Ratanakiri, and Stung Treng.

These can only be rough estimates. Provisional figures under the new population census indicate that indigenous highland peoples, with characteristics similar to those found in the northeastern provinces, are also located in other provinces including Preah Vihear, Kampong Thom; and in the mountainous massifs of Koh Kong, Pursat, Kampong Speu, and Sihanoukville.

Of the highland indigenous peoples, two main linguistic families can be distinguished, each of them broken down into several subgroups (Table 1). The first

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Number (approx.)</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jarai</td>
<td>Chamic</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Austro-Thai</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>Ratanakiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhade</td>
<td>Chamic</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Austro-Thai</td>
<td>a dozen</td>
<td>Mondulkiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachac</td>
<td>North Bahnaric</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Ratanakiri and Chamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampuon</td>
<td>West Bahnaric</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Ratanakiri &amp; Mondulkiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brao</td>
<td>West Bahnaric</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>Ratanakiri &amp; Stung Treng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kreung</td>
<td>West Bahnaric</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>Ratanakiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kravet</td>
<td>West Bahnaric</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Ratanakiri (Veunsai) &amp; Stung Treng (Siempang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lun</td>
<td>West Bahnaric</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Ratanakiri (Taveng, Veunsai) &amp; Stung Treng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phnong</td>
<td>South Bahnaric</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>Mondulkiri, Stung Treng &amp; Ratanakiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stieng</td>
<td>South Bahnaric</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>Kratie (Snuol) &amp; Mondulkiri (Keo Seyma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>Kratie &amp; Mondulkiri (Koh Nyek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Bahnaric</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>Kratie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poar (Eastern Pear, Western Pear)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Pearic</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>Kampong Thom &amp; Pursat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saoch (Saoch)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Pearic</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Kampong Thom &amp; Pursat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suoy –</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Kampong Speu (Oral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer Khe</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>Stung Treng (Siempang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuy –</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Katuic</td>
<td>Môn-Khmer</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>Preah Vihear, Kampong Thom and Stung Treng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other groups identified in 1995 but without any other data available:
Robel (1,640), Thmaun (543), Loemoun (280), Kola (31), Kaning (150), Poang (260) and Rohong (in Keo Seyma, Mondulkiri)

Note: = = unknown.
is the Austro-Thais or “Malayo-Polynesians,” comprising the Jarai people in Ratanakiri and the Rhaide and Phnong peoples in Mondulkiri. The second is the Môn-Khmer family, with its several ethnic subgroups including the Tampuon, Brao, Kravet, Lun, Phnong, Stieng, Kroal, Mel, Saoch, Poar, Suoy, Kuy, Khmer Khe, Thmaun, and Raong.

These ethnic groups have resided in sparsely populated areas of the north and northeast, in regions that have until recently been covered by dense forests. Their traditional habitat borders the neighboring countries of Lao People’s Democratic Republic (Lao PDR), Thailand, and Viet Nam, and several ethnic groups are to be found on both sides of these national borders. The Jarai of Ratanakiri and the Phnong of Kratie and Mondulkiri can also be found respectively in the provinces of Gia Lai and Dac Lac in Viet Nam’s central highlands. The Kuy of Preah Vihear and Kampong Thom are also to be found in Lao PDR and Thailand. The Brao and Kraveth groups of Ratanakiri are also related to those living in southern Lao PDR. The border demarcations first imposed under the French colonial government in the early 20th century divided these groups artificially, placing restrictions on their freedom of movement.

Most indigenous farmers in northeastern Cambodia still use traditional farming techniques of seminomadic slash-and-burn or swidden agriculture. Although some are cultivating lowland rice fields after an integration process that commenced in the 1960s, they still maintain swidden fields where they farm upland rice and other crops for security. Very few crops are grown outside the village, as it is difficult to protect these from domestic animals. Other crops grown for subsistence use within the household include vegetables, root crops, gourds, fruits, and nonfood crops such as tobacco and cotton. Indigenous communities have also been turning to some cash crops for income purposes, including coffee, cashew nuts, green beans, jackfruit, and durian. However, poor infrastructure and the lack of market support have reduced the motivation to expand cash-crop cultivation.

Forest fruits, wildlife, fish, traditional medicines, and construction materials have all played a key role in the indigenous economy. This is particularly important at times of food scarcity between harvests. Forest vegetables, leaves, and tubers have been important for the diet of indigenous highland communities. Wild tubers were collected in particular during the period of civil conflict, when cultivation was difficult and people fled their home communities, and also in years with poor rice harvests. Forest vegetables are used mainly for consumption, although some such as bamboo shoots, mushrooms, and yams are sold in limited quantity by some villagers. Forest fruits complement the diet in the dry season. Resin can also play an important role in household income generation. The cash is used to buy rice and other necessary consumption items. Bamboo, rattan, and small trees have been used for house construction and handicrafts. Wildlife has been hunted for food and in the absence of fish is an important source of protein in high altitude areas. In recent decades however, some wildlife species have been hunted by outsiders for sale to neighboring countries.

**Indonesia**

Indonesia is an ethnically diverse and populous country, its 210 million people made up of some 500 different ethnic groups speaking over 600 languages. Yet during the lengthy New Order period of President Suharto’s government, with its emphasis on centralized rule and uniformity, there was a firm policy to play down any ethnic differences. While the principle was characterized by the slogan Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (Unity in Diversity), the emphasis was on unity rather than diversity in the area of ethnic identity. Throughout the vast archipelago, uniform policies were pursued with regard to village and local administration, the educational curriculum, and natural resource management. In the words of one analyst: “Although, or perhaps because, Indonesia is such a diverse society, it has always been government policy to emphasize national unity and to play down the cultural and ethnic differences. Giving priority or special attention to a particular group or community is sometimes even qualified as being adverse to the national interest.”

Numerous terms have been associated with the concept of indigenous peoples in Indonesia. Under the New Order government, the Ministry of Social Welfare used the concept of masyarakat terasing (or “isolated communities”) to refer to the more remote and vulnerable groups. Under Ministerial Decree 5/1994, such isolated communities were described as groups in dispersed and isolated areas, following a sociocultural
system considered to be “isolated” and “backward” in comparison with the rest of Indonesian society. The National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS) identified certain characteristics of these isolated communities: (i) nomadic or seminomadic lifestyles, or living in small and dispersed bands; (ii) a livelihood system strongly dependent on the natural environment, such as hunting, gathering, fishing, or swidden agriculture; (iii) inadequate standards of personal hygiene or cleanliness of environment; (iv) meager or no clothing; (v) a low standard of housing; (vi) very limited knowledge and low use of technology; (vii) animistic belief systems; and (viii) strong attachments to cultural and belief systems, making these communities culturally closed.

“Empowerment” programs, designed to uplift communities from their state of isolation, give some idea of the numbers previously considered by the Ministry of Social Welfare to fall into this category. According to a 2000 publication, 227,377 households had not been empowered, 97,763 households were being empowered, and 10,482 had already been empowered. Available data suggested that approximately 1.2 million persons have been considered to fall under the “isolated peoples” category in 18 provinces of different outer islands. Some 65% of these were in Irian Jaya (West Papua). The next largest numbers were in Kalimantan and Sulawesi, and then Sumatra. The figures and locations nevertheless appear to have been provided on a somewhat arbitrary basis.

During the New Order period, the concept of indigenous was also applied to communities engaging in traditional practices of forest resource utilization. For example, the term was frequently used by the Department of Forestry to refer to peladang berpindah (shifting cultivators). In the early 1990s, the Ministry of Forestry stated that the number of shifting cultivators was some 6 million, but there are insufficient data to estimate the present numbers.

Today, perhaps the closest Indonesian equivalent to the term indigenous peoples is that of masyarakat adat (customary law peoples or communities). The term adat was first used during the Dutch colonial period by scholars and policymakers who aimed to preserve indigenous customary laws and traditions rather than to introduce a uniform western legal system. The then Dutch colony was divided into separate adat law areas of “law circles” (rechtskring), based on cultural and geographic units and perceived differences. The adat approach was also reflected in judicial administration, with native courts established by their own codes of procedure, and customary (adat) law was applied by native judges when it was not in conflict with other legislation. However, an interpretation of the adat community was that it should have lived permanently in an area with fixed boundaries. The implication was that nomadic communities and shifting cultivators did not have rights over their traditional territory and natural resources.

Since independence in 1945, there has been considerable ambiguity over the situation and status of adat communities. The 1945 Constitution recognizes the existence of the adat community (although referring to the Adat Law Community in one of its sections, and to the traditional community in another). The 1960 Basic Agrarian Law is actually based on the principles of adat, although only to the extent that customary law and procedures are not in conflict with the national interest. Moreover, the Act would clearly need various implementing regulations to make it truly effective, and very few of these have been adopted. Yet, some recent agrarian legislation provides that customary adat lands will be duly recorded in the land register.

Forestry law, however, still equates adat forest areas with state forest.

Since the late 1990s, with the onset of democratization, there has been a clearer trend toward recognizing the existence of adat communities and their role in development. The Human Rights Act, No. 39 of 1999, provides for explicit recognition and protection of the adat community and its cultural identity as a fundamental human rights issue. The right to customary (ulayat) land is seen as an explicit manifestation of cultural identity. The Local Government Act, No. 22 of 1999, is also of much importance. Replacing the earlier 1979 legislation on Village Government, the new law provides the opportunity for revitalization of adat communities and institutions. Such communities can revitalize their specific communal entities, norms, and values if they so wish. And these customary norms can also be incorporated within village regulations.

The year 1999 appears to have marked a watershed in the Government’s willingness to refer more openly to indigenous peoples or adat communities in its laws and policies. Under Presidential Decree No. 111 of 1999, reference was made to “remote indigenous communities” rather than to “isolated communities.”
While considerable law and policy reform is taking place in Indonesia, there have also been nongovernment initiatives to create networks of adat institutions. An initial step was the formation of a network in 1993, which aimed among other things to clarify the criterion of an “adat community.” The chosen definition was “Groups of people who have inter-generational origins in a particular geographic territory, and who also have their own value system, ideology, economy, politics, culture, social identity and territory.”

In 1999, a national congress of Indonesian indigenous peoples took place, reportedly attended by over 200 adat community representatives from 121 ethnic groups. The Congress agreed to establish a national alliance of indigenous peoples, AMAN. By 2001, AMAN had 24 affiliated organizations in islands and provinces ranging from Bali to Kalimantan, Lombok, East Nusa Tenggara, West Papua, Sulawesi, and Sumatra (including the conflict-ridden Aceh). It has several objectives, including the restoration to adat communities of sovereignty over their socioeconomic laws and cultural life, and control over their lands and natural resources and other livelihoods. It also urges the Government to sign or ratify international agreements on indigenous rights, including the ILO’s Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (No. 169) and the United Nations Draft Declaration on Indigenous Peoples.

Under present conditions, it would still be difficult to identify the numbers and location of indigenous peoples or adat communities in Indonesia. There is a clear change in attitude and approaches in recent years. Some years ago, the government approach was to identify isolated, remote, and forest-dwelling communities as communities that needed to be changed and uplifted in both economic and social terms, in order to achieve their eventual integration within mainstream Indonesian society. The approach was strictly objective, and attached little importance to the intrinsic value of traditional institutions and cultures.

Over the past 2 years there have been very significant changes. Under the AMAN structure, the criteria for self-identification as indigenous or adat communities are eminently subjective, based on self-identification, the desire to revitalize traditional institutions, and to maintain a certain lifestyle. In Indonesia’s transitional stage toward greater decentralization and regional autonomy, as it seeks to find the appropriate balance between traditional and “national” institutions, indigenous identity may be more a question of ideology and aspiration than of ethnology and objective classification. The rapid growth of AMAN since 1999 indicates that identification with the adat concept is held widely throughout the outer islands. But it is an evolving concept, and in these circumstances an estimate of the numbers concerned would not be very useful.

Philippines

The Philippines, as noted, has an Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA). This contains a definition of indigenous cultural communities/indigenous peoples. These terms refer to

a group of people or homogeneous societies identified by self-ascription and ascription by others, who have continuously lived as an organized community on communally bounded and defined territory, and who have, under claims of ownership since time immemorial, occupied, possessed and utilized such territories, sharing common bounds of language, customs, traditions and other distinctive cultural traits, or who have, through resistance to political, social and cultural inroads of colonization, non-indigenous religions and cultures, become historically differentiated from the majority of Filipinos. [They] shall likewise include peoples who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, at the time of conquest or colonization, or at the time of inroads of non-indigenous religions and cultures, or the establishment of present state boundaries, who retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions, but who may have been displaced from their traditional domains or who may have resettled outside their ancestral domains.

The IPRA also defines the concept of indigenous political structures. These refer to

organizational and cultural leadership systems, institutions, relationships, patterns and processes for decision-making and participation, identified by indigenous cultural communities/indigenous
peoples as such, but not limited to, Council of Elders, Council of Timuays, Bodong Holders, or any other tribunal or body of similar nature.

The definition draws largely on the ILO’s Indigenous and Tribal Peoples’ Convention, No. 169. It blends the concept of self-definition or self-ascription with the concerns of language and culture, the maintenance of traditions and institutions, and also the biological criterion of descent. The question of indigenous identity is closely linked with such territorial concerns as ancestral domain, one of the key substantive issues addressed by the IPRA.

Assessing the numbers and location of these peoples in the Philippines presents considerable difficulties. There is consensus that indigenous peoples and their communities are located throughout the Philippine archipelago, in the main islands of Luzon to the north and Mindanao to the south, and in several islands of the Visayan chain in the central Philippines. Indeed, the organic structure of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), established under the IPRA, itself indicates that indigenous peoples are spread broadly throughout the country. The NCIP is to be comprised of seven Commissioners, three of these from different parts of Luzon including the Cordillera Autonomous Region; one from the Visayan island groups; and one from respectively Northern and Western Mindanao, Southern and Eastern Mindanao, and Central Mindanao.

As to the total numbers of indigenous peoples and their proportion of the overall Philippine population, various estimates have been put forward. The NCIP itself estimated in 1998 that they were between 12 and 15 million altogether. The Philippine research foundation IBON, comparing 1995 population figures from the National Statistics Office with the NCIP’s 1998 estimate, has suggested that the present indigenous population might actually comprise more than 20% of the national total. As will be discussed further below, however, this depends on both objective and subjective criteria for determining the nature of indigenous peoples.

The Philippines certainly displays immense ethnic and cultural diversity with respect to language, cultures, and institutions. A preliminary listing by the Office of the Presidential Advisor for Indigenous Peoples Affairs identified approximately 150 ethnic groups. The Summer Institute of Linguistics has estimated as many as 170 different languages, 168 of these in active use.

As regards location and lifestyles, the diversity is also very great. In northern Luzon, various indigenous ethnic groups are concentrated in the mountainous ranges of the Cordillera region, generally occupying the interior hills, narrow strips of flat land along deep valleys and plateaus. The Tingguian, Isneg, and northern Kalinga are to be found in the watershed areas of the Abulag, Tinog, and Chico rivers. These groups, largely swidden cultivators by tradition, depend on rice, root crops, and vegetables for their food. Along the slopes of Mount Data and neighboring areas are the Bontoc, Sagada, Ifugao, and Southern Kalinga peoples. Mainly wet-rice cultivators, they grow crops in both terraces and swidden fields. The Ifaloy and Kankanaey inhabit the southern Cordillera region, also basing their subsistence economy on wet and dry agriculture. In recent years, these groups have become more integrated into the market economy through the growth of commercial vegetable production.

In northeastern Luzon, several lowland indigenous groups including the Ibanag, Itawes, Yogad, and Gagand inhabit the Cagayan valley. Toward the south of this region, the Caraballo range is home to the Ilongot, Ikalahan, Isinai, and some Aeta groups who continue to practice wet-rice agriculture, swidden farming, hunting, gathering, and some commercial activities.

Other indigenous groups are to be found in the rest of Luzon. Along the Sierra Madre range of eastern Luzon live the Dumagat, Pugot, and other Aeta groups whose economy is based on swidden agriculture, hunting and gathering, fishing, and some trading activities. Paan Pinatubo communities inhabit the Zambales range, and the Balugala the northwestern part of Pampanga and the southwestern area of Tarlac. Along the Pacific coast in the provinces of Quezon, Polillo Island, and the Bicol peninsula are the various Aeta groups, known as the Kabihug in Camarines Norte Province; and the Agta Tabangnon, Agta Cimarron, and Iton in Camarines Sur, Albay, and Sorsogon. These groups tend to combine agriculture, fishing, and the gathering of forest products with wage labor activities.

Of the Visayan islands, seven Mangyan groups are to be found on the island of Mindoro. The Sulod and Ati peoples inhabit the interior foothills and remote coastal areas of Negros and Panay islands. And on the island of Palawan, the Tagbanua inhabit northern and central areas, and Batak are present in small pockets north of the Palawan capital of Puerto Princesa, and in
northeastern areas. The Palawanon live in southern parts of the island.

The ethnic composition of the main southern island of Mindanao and its neighboring smaller islands in the Sulu archipelago is extremely diverse and complex. There is considerable debate as to whether the members of the various Islamized ethnic groups might be included under the term indigenous. This can be a highly political issue, and also one in which there may be “shifting identities” in accordance with the nature of claims and the benefits that can be derived from a particular ethnic, political, or religious status.

There are at least 31 ethnolinguistic groups indigenous to Mindanao and the Sulu archipelago. All of these groups can claim the same ancestry in their folklore, but the introduction of Islam served to divide them into two distinct categories. Those who adopted Islam became known as the Muslim or Moro peoples. Those who did not became known collectively as the Lumads.

The 13 Islamized groups indigenous to Mindanao are the Badjao, Iranun, Jama Mapun, Kalagan, Kalibugan, Maranao, Maguindanao, Molbog, Palawani, Samal, Sangil, Taussug, and Yakan. The 18 nonMuslim Lumad groups include the Bagobo of Davao del Sur, North and South Cotabato, and Sultan Kudarat; the Mansaka of Davao del Norte; the Mandaya of Davao Oriental; the Subanen of the Zamboanga peninsula; the B’laans of Davao del Sur, North and South Cotabato, Maguindanao and Sultan Kudarat; the T’boli of South Cotabato; and the T’boli people of North Cotabato, Maguindanao, and Sultan Kudarat. In addition, the Manobo people encompass various tribal groups found in different provinces of Mindanao, mainly in Agusan del Norte and Sur, Cotabato, and Davao provinces.

In the 1960s, a group of Moro intellectuals promoted the concept of a distinct Moro or Bangsamoro (Moro nation) identity. The movement escalated into armed conflict, with Muslim insurgents pursuing claims to a separate nationhood. The complexities of this drawn-out conflict are beyond the scope of the present study. The movement split into different armed groups in the course of the 1980s. Peace negotiations eventually led to the creation of an Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) in 1989, following the adoption of the 1987 Constitution. Demographic changes throughout Mindanao, including several provinces where Muslims have until recently been in the majority, mean that it is difficult to identify large or contiguous territorial areas where only one ethnic group is present. Due to past government efforts to promote outside or “Christian” settlement in these regions, it is commonplace to find Ilonggo, Cebuano, Tagalog, or Ilocano speakers together with a mixture of Maranaw, Taussug, Maguindanao, and Arabic speakers. Small ethnic groups such as the B’laans, T’bolis, and Manobos may also have their own distinct languages within pockets of these same geographic areas.

The relationships between the claims of Moro and Lumad groups in Mindanao are inevitably highly complex. In simple terms, what sets them apart is the more political demands of the former for nationhood, and the more specifically “indigenous rights” agenda of the latter for ancestral domain and land recognition, together with respect for their traditional cultures and institutions. However, in peace negotiations in 2001, the Moro Islamic Liberation Front has reportedly listed the recognition of ancestral domain as a primary item in their agenda. Moreover, the extent of the challenges ahead were reflected in the resolutions adopted by a Mindanao Indigenous Peoples Peace Forum, held in Davao City in early 2001 with the participation of over 65 Lumad leaders. Among other things, this urged Philippine Congress to enact a law declaring Lumad territories as autonomous, including Lumad territories within the Autonomous Region for Muslim Mindanao. All concerned were urged to recognize and respect the territories and boundaries established by elders during D’yandi and Pakang times. This includes territorial agreements among Lumad tribes, between the Lumads and Moros, and between the Lumads and Christian settlers.

The broad definition of indigenous in the IPRA suggests that self-ascrion will be a key factor in determining indigenous identity in the Philippines. While the lifestyles may be largely or partly ones of subsistence, there is ever closer integration with the market economy, and in many areas a growing participation in the wage labor force. They may even be urban dwellers, such as the Negrito, Bajao, and Cordilleran groups who come at least on a seasonal basis to Metro Manila. There is also an educated indigenous elite, whose members may retain a strong sense of indigenous identity. But perhaps the main purpose of self-identification as indigenous in the Philippines is the pursuit of ancestral domain claims.
In this sense, the existence of favorable legislation, recognizing special rights for indigenous peoples over their ancestral lands and related natural resources, may well lead to an increase in the numbers who choose to identify themselves as indigenous. In Mindanao in particular, both political and religious factors, as well as the advantages offered by a certain status, will continue to affect the choice of ethnic identity.

**Viet Nam**

Vietnamese ethnographers have used the criteria of language, cultural traits, and also self-identification to classify ethnic groups. Several censuses have been undertaken in recent decades to define the number of ethnic groups in the country. According to the censuses conducted in 1959, 1973, and 1979, the number of such groups was listed as 64, 59, and 54, respectively. Thus, the Vietnamese population is now broken down into 54 officially recognized ethnic groups, of which the majority Kinh account for some 87%. The remaining 53 groups are significantly smaller in size as well as in economic and political power (Table 2).

According to the National Program of Ethnic Classification carried out by the Institute of Ethnology, ethnic groups are defined as

*A stable or relatively stable group of people formed over a historical period, based on common territorial ties, economic activities, and cultural characteristics; on the basis of these common characteristics arises an awareness of ethnic identity and a name of one's own.*

Ethnic minorities are referred to as the *dan toc thieu so* or *dan toc it nguoi* in the Vietnamese language. The term *indigenous* as such is not officially used.

While the ethnic classification has until now served its purpose for activities of administration, development, and research, its inherent weaknesses have been recognized by Vietnamese researchers and policymakers. A new ethnic classification project is currently being conducted by the Institute of Ethnology. Some researchers have argued that the number of ethnic groups should be expanded. Research findings point to the dissatisfaction of some small ethnic groups that they are merged within larger ones, while their historical and cultural backgrounds are very different. The need for a new and more comprehensive ethnic classification has also been expressed at the local level, during the implementation of development programs and projects.11

Viet Nam’s ethnic minorities belong to three main linguistic families (Austro-Asiatic, Malayo-Polynesian, and Han-Tang), each comprising different ethnic groups. Language is a key feature of cultural differentiation. Each of the ethnic minority groups has its own spoken language, while in each region the language of the largest group present in the area tends to be used as a common language for communication. Vietnamese is sometimes used as a communication language, mainly among men who have more access to outsiders. Ethnic minority people often speak their own language, some Vietnamese, and one or two other local languages.

Ethnic minorities are amply spread throughout the country, present in some three quarters of the national territory. They are located predominantly in mountainous areas of the northern and central highlands. Very few communes are comprised of only one ethnic group. Of the 53 ethnic minority groups, only the Cham, Khmer, and Hoa live along the central coast and the Mekong delta. Some other groups with higher populations and with the skills to practice wet-rice cultivation (such as the Tay, Thai, and Muong) live in lowland and valley regions along rivers and streams, where they have access to water resources and transportation. Apart from these, most of the ethnic minority populations inhabit remote or mountainous areas, featuring high mountains and historically dense forest coverage. However, many of these areas have experienced heavy deforestation in recent years, and now suffer from serious environmental degradation.

Ethnic minority relationship with traditional lands and resources is a complex issue in Viet Nam, given migratory trends, recent patterns of Kinh settlement, and the introduction of commercial farming and forestry in upland areas. By no means are all the 53 ethnic minority groups indigenous to the land areas where they currently reside. Some of the Tay-Thai ethnic groups have been in northeastern Viet Nam since time immemorial. Others in the northwestern and mountainous regions of Nghe An Province migrated in large numbers several centuries ago. The first members of the Tibeto-Burmese ethnic group probably arrived
in Viet Nam between the 17th and 19th centuries. Ancestors of the Malayo-Polynesian ethnic group have resided in their present areas in the central highlands for countless generations.

Recently, there has been more migration by the ethnic minority groups themselves, mainly from northern and central parts of the country to the central highlands. Some have migrated on a voluntary basis in response to land scarcity, due to the natural disasters in their places of origin. There have also been cases of involuntary resettlement due to the construction of large hydropower plants. In Kontum Province, for example, many of the Thai, Tay, Hmong, and other ethnic minority groups have only arrived in recent years. There can be friction between the ethnic minorities indigenous to a particular region, and other minorities who have only recently migrated there.

The traditional upland livelihood is swidden agriculture. The cultivation period has been of brief duration, after which fields have lain fallow until trees have regrown and the land has recovered. Since the 1960s, a campaign of fixed settlement and cultivation has limited the mobility of ethnic minority communities. More recently, since the early 1990s, the allocation of land and forest areas to individual households has transformed the forest and mountainous areas previously held under communal and collective forms of tenure. Households of the groups practicing shifting cultivation were also allocated a fixed area for cultivation, with the term of leasehold ownership ranging from 20 to 30 years. In consequence, the living space of groups that formerly depended on shifting cultivation has now been limited to the few hectares of land allocated to them.
### Table 2. List of Ethnicities in Viet Nam, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Population (person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ba-na</td>
<td>Ro Ngao, Ro Long (Y Lang), To Lo, Go Lar, Krem</td>
<td>189,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bo Y</td>
<td>Bo Y, Tu Di</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brau</td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bru-Van Kieu</td>
<td>Van Kieu, Tri, Khua, Ma Coong</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cham</td>
<td>Cham Hroi, Cham Pong, Cha Va Ku, Cham Chau Doc</td>
<td>114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cho-ro</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chu-ru</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chut</td>
<td>May, Ruc, Sach, Arem, Ma Lieng</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cong</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Co-ho</td>
<td>Xre, Nop (Tu Nop), Co Don, Chil, Lat (Lach), To Ring</td>
<td>98,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Co Lao</td>
<td>Co Lao Xanh, Co Lao Trang, Co Lao Do</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Co-tu</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td>Dao Do, Dao Quan Chet, Dao Lo Gang, Dao Tien, Dao Quan Trang, Dao Thanh Y, Dao Lan Ten</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>E-de</td>
<td>Kpa, Adham, Krung, Mduh, Ktul, Dlie, Hru, Bih, Blo, Kah, Kdrao, Dong Kay, Dong Mak, Ening, Arul, Hwing, Ktle, Epan</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Giay</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gia-rai</td>
<td>Chor, Hdrung (Hbau, Chor), Arap, Mthur, Tobuan</td>
<td>320,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>GieTrieng</td>
<td>Gie (Gie), Trieng, Ve, Bnoong (Mnoong)</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ha Nhi</td>
<td>Ha Nhi Co Cho, Ha Nhi La MÝ, Ha Nhi Den</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Hmong Trang, Hmong Hoa, Hmong Do, Hmong Den, Hmong Xanh, Na mieo</td>
<td>710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hoa</td>
<td>Quang Dong, Quang Tay, Hai Nam, Trieu Chau, Phuc Kien, Sang Phang, Xia Phong, Thang Nham, Minh Huong, He</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hre</td>
<td></td>
<td>101,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Khang</td>
<td>Khang Dang, Khang Hoac, Khang Don, Khang Sua, Ma Hang, Bu Hang, Ma Hang Ben, Bu Hang Coi</td>
<td>4,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Khome</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kho-mu</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>La Chi</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Population (person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>La Ha</td>
<td>La Ha can (Khla Phlao), La Ha nuoc (La Ha ung)</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>La Hu</td>
<td>La hu na (den), La-hu su (vang), La-hu phung (trang)</td>
<td>6,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>Lao Boc (Lao Can), Lao Noi (Lao Nho)</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lo Lo</td>
<td>Lo Lo hoa, Lo Lo den</td>
<td>3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lu</td>
<td>Lu Den (Lu Dam), Lu Trang</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Ma Ngan, Ma Xop, Ma To, Ma Krung</td>
<td>27,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mang</td>
<td>Mang Gung, Mang Le</td>
<td>2,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mnong</td>
<td>Mnong Gar, Mnong Nong, Mnong Chil, Mnong Kuenh, Mnong Rlam, Mnong Preh, Mnong Prang, Mnong Dip, Mnong Bu Nor, Mnong Bu Dang, Mnong Bu Deh</td>
<td>70,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Muong</td>
<td>Ao Ta (Au Ta), Moi Bi</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ngai</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Nung</td>
<td>Nung Giang, Nung Xuong, Nung An, Nung Inh, Nung Loi, Nung Chao, Nung Phan Slinh, Nung Quy Rin, Nung Din</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>O-du</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Pa Then</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Phu La</td>
<td>Phu La Lao-Bo Kho Pa, Phu La Den, Phu La Han</td>
<td>6,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Pu Peo</td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ra-glai</td>
<td>Rai, Hoang, La Oang</td>
<td>77,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ro-mam</td>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>San Chay</td>
<td>Cao Lan, San Chi</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>San Diu</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Si La</td>
<td></td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Tay</td>
<td>Tho, Ngan, Phen, Thu Lao, Pa Di</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ta-oi</td>
<td>Ta Oi, Pa Co, Pa Hi</td>
<td>29,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Nganh Den (Tay Dam) Nganh Trang (Tay Don or Khao)</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tho</td>
<td>Keo, Mon, Cuoi, Ho, Dan Lai, Li Ha, Tay Poong</td>
<td>58,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Kinh</td>
<td></td>
<td>61,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Xinh-mun</td>
<td>Xinh Mun Da, Xinh Mun Nget</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Xo-dang</td>
<td>Xo Trng, To Dra, Mnam, Ca Dong, Ha Lang, Ta Tri, Chau</td>
<td>108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Xtieng</td>
<td>Bu Lo, Bu Dek (Bu Deh), Bu Biek</td>
<td>54,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Committee for Ethnic Minorities and Mountainous Areas/Central Ideology-Culture Department (2001).
INTRODUCTION

The ADB Policy on Indigenous Peoples identifies a number of “structural constraints” to be overcome in order to achieve the effective realization of policy objectives in development and poverty reduction programs for the target groups. These include an appropriate legislative framework in DMCs; the necessary capacity of relevant development institutions and agencies; and an accurate and effective representation of indigenous peoples. Key issues include the recognized legitimacy of the indigenous social and legal institutions of indigenous peoples; and the recognition of the right of indigenous peoples to direct the course of their own development and change. Institutional strengthening and capacity-building support for indigenous peoples’ communities should be provided as necessary and appropriate. Similarly, as necessary and appropriate, support should be provided to relevant government entities.

The terms of reference for the regional technical assistance required a review of these concerns at the country level. The consultants were instructed to “review the policies, laws, guidelines, and directives at the national level, identifying any areas or sectors that can address the needs of indigenous peoples/ethnic minorities in poverty reduction, and indigenous peoples/ethnic minority policy”.

This is a large subject, difficult to encapsulate in a few pages. As already discussed, the four project countries display great diversity with regard to their treatment of the target groups. At one end of the spectrum is the Philippines, with its relevant law and administrative structures now firmly in place, together with formal mechanisms for consultation with indigenous peoples over development policies and programs at different levels. The key issue in the Philippines is the low degree of implementation of law and policies that have now been in place for several years. At the other end of the spectrum is Indonesia, where there is no law or policy dealing specifically with adat customary law or indigenous groups. An intense and informed debate is nevertheless under way, examining questions of ethnicity in development and poverty reduction programs, and putting forward broad policy principles in the context of land issues, education, decentralization, and regional autonomy. There was animated discussion of these issues at the national workshop held in Jakarta in September 2001, and key questions of policy formulation are addressed in the Indonesian action plan.

Somewhere between these two extremes lie the Mekong countries of Cambodia and Viet Nam, in each of which the situation is rather different. Cambodia has a reasonably clear definition of the vulnerable groups considered to be indigenous for practical development purposes. Although a national policy has as yet to be formally approved, an active NGO movement has been lobbying with much success to have reference to indigenous rights incorporated within sectoral law and policies, in particular those relating to land. In Viet Nam, with its longer history of state law and policies toward officially recognized ethnic minorities, there is a quite intensive policy debate at the present time. Key issues of discussion include classification procedures, consultation and representation mechanisms, land and forestry policies, and the effectiveness and efficiency of projects in a context of increasing investment in mountainous areas. Policy concerns also received prominent attention during the project’s national workshop held in Hanoi in September 2001, and recommendations have also been put forward in the Viet Nam action plan.
The law and policy framework in each of the participating countries is now examined.

**CAMBODIA: ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF SMALL MINORITY GROUPS**

**Ethnic Minorities and the Constitution**

Article 32 of the Constitution affirms that all Khmer citizens are equal before the law, enjoying the same rights and freedoms. In the debate on the Constitution in the National Assembly, the definition of “Khmer citizens” was discussed. It was agreed that the term would include some Cambodian ethnic minorities, such as the hill tribe people known as the Khmer Leu, and also the Khmer Islam.

**Inter-Ministerial Committee for Ethnic Minorities Development**

The principal government agency with responsibility for policies and programs toward ethnic minorities is the IMC, formed in 1994 at the same time that a Highland Peoples Programme (HPP) was established by UNDP. Its secretariat has since been based at the Ministry of Rural Development.

In 2001, the Government decided to create a new Department of Ethnic Minorities Development, also within the Ministry of Rural Development, to follow up the work of the IMC. Its roles include the planning of programs for ethnic minority development; improving the current draft policy for highland peoples’ development; research on the identity, culture, and traditions of ethnic minorities; and training for development workers in cooperation with local and international development agencies active in highland areas.

**Current Policies for Ethnic Minorities: Overall Appraisal**

It cannot be said that Cambodia at present has an active policy toward ethnic minorities. In September 1997, the IMC submitted to the Government draft general policy guidelines for the development of highland peoples. This emphasized the right of highland people to practice their own cultures, to adhere to their own belief systems and traditions, and to use their own languages. It stressed that the Government should strongly encourage and support local organizations or associations established by highland peoples. The draft policy also included guidelines for different aspects of development, ranging from the environment to infrastructure. As of October 2001, it had not been approved by the Council of Ministers.

**Land and Forestry Policies**

In late 2000, the Government established a Council for Land Management Policy and issued a statement on the subject. Its main objectives were to strengthen land tenure security and land markets, and prevent or solve land disputes; manage land and natural resources in an equitable, sustainable, and efficient manner; and promote equitable land distribution. At the same time, attention was given to new forestry legislation. Substantial technical assistance was provided by international organizations including ADB, in the form of advice on the new draft legislation.

Security of indigenous peoples over their traditional lands and access by them to communal forests and their produce have been the main concerns of NGOs and international organizations working on behalf of indigenous highland groups in northeastern Cambodia, particularly Ratanakiri Province. These have pointed to the adverse effects of new investment in the province—commercial agriculture, logging concessions, and expanded Khmer immigration from the lowlands—and have insisted that the most serious issue facing indigenous communities of Ratanakiri is the rapid loss of lands and natural resources to meet their livelihood needs. They have undertaken strong advocacy campaigns, urging that new legislation contain special provisions to safeguard indigenous rights. These initiatives have received support from international funding agencies, which have urged the Government to curb illegal logging activities.

After an intensive period of analysis and public debate, a new land law entered into force in July 2001. It contains a special chapter on the immovable properties of “indigenous ethnic minorities,” which
recognizes the right of indigenous communities to use and manage their communal lands according to their traditional tenure systems. Implementing regulations for these important provisions have as yet to be adopted.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) prepared a draft forestry law after several public consultations in 1999. By October 2001, the draft had been approved by the Council of Ministers, and sent to the National Assembly for its approval. Certain articles of the draft contained reference to the livelihood and rights of indigenous communities. Concerns have been expressed, however, that the rights of rural communities to forest products and resources may be restricted.

Policies for Poverty Alleviation

The Government has a longstanding overall commitment to poverty reduction. It was included as a primary objective of the First Socioeconomic Development Plan, 1996–2000 (SEDP1), which first introduced market economy principles to national planning. The draft second Socioeconomic Development Plan, 2001–2005 (SEDPII), is based on four key objectives: broad-based and sustainable economic growth, social and cultural development, the sustainable management and use of natural resources, and improvement in good governance. It also has sectoral plans to achieve synergy in approaches to poverty reduction, covering agriculture, rural development, health, and education. Some specific strategies could potentially incorporate the concerns of indigenous peoples. At the Phnom Penh national workshop held in September 2001, mention was made of the need to reflect these concerns in revised versions of the plans.

INDONESIA: TOWARD A COORDINATED POLICY?

The policy debate concerning indigenous or other ethnic minority groups is as yet at an early stage in Indonesia. The background and the reluctance of governments until the late 1990s to consider ethnic differentiation were discussed in the earlier section on definition. Under the centralizing policies of the New Order era, the Village Government Law of 1979 is often singled out as the law and policy instrument which had most effect in dismantling customary institutions and practices.

Since 1999, there have been many signs of an emerging new policy on adat concerns. The policy measures have not been coordinated by any single ministry or agency of the central Government for reasons mentioned earlier. There is no agency with specific responsibility for these concerns, or any real consensus as to the groups that could be defined as indigenous or adat communities.

Indonesia’s original independence Constitution of 1945 recognizes the existence of traditional political entities derived from indigenous cultural systems. The principles of adat are recognized in agrarian and forestry law. Yet, a number of issues of law and its enforcement have not been adequately resolved because of the unresolved tensions between customary and positive law. For example, the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law provides explicitly that adat law must not be contrary to the “national interest of the State based on national unity.” Ambiguities can be illustrated with regard to the traditional hak ulayat (right of disposal). Because this right can only be exercised in accordance with the national interest, an adat community has no legal power to prevent the Government from granting an outside party the right to use the land, if this is deemed to be in the national interest. Large-scale land registration has not taken place, in particular in the outer islands. In the absence of adequate mechanisms for registering land rights enjoyed under customary law, problems have occurred throughout Indonesia when traditional lands have been appropriated for development projects.

The 1967 Basic Forestry Law also undermined adat communities’ claims to natural resources, by declaring that all Indonesian forests including natural resources are controlled by the State. Adat was not to interfere with the implementation of forestry law and policy. Moreover, 1970 regulations to implement the forestry law specified that adat rights should not interfere with forest exploitation and could be secondary to those of concession holders.

Since 1999, certain laws and regulations issued by different ministries have reinforced different aspects of adat rights. The 1999 Human Rights Act recognizes rights over ulayat land as part of cultural identity. A
1999 Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs provides guidance for resolution of ulayat claims by adat communities. It calls for baseline studies to determine where such ulayat lands still exist and to record them on land registration maps.

**THE PHILIPPINES: TAKING THE LEAD?**

**Indigenous Peoples Rights Act**

Analysts and policymakers in other Southeast Asian countries are now looking toward the Philippines as a possible trendsetter in indigenous identity and rights in development. The 1997 IPRA is a comprehensive piece of legislation and needs to be placed in some context. Earlier legislation over the past decade had given progressively greater recognition to the concept of indigenous rights. The 1987 Constitution, for example, contains provisions that recognize the “rights of indigenous cultural communities within the framework of national unity and development.”

**Ancestral lands and domain.** The IPRA restores the rights of indigenous peoples over their ancestral lands and domains. Ancestral land refers to the lands occupied by individuals, families, and clans who are members of
indigenous cultural communities, including residential lots, rice terraces or paddies, private forests, swidden farms, and tree lots. These lands are required to have been “occupied, possessed or utilized” by them or their ancestors “since time immemorial continuously to the present.” Ancestral domain is defined as areas generally belonging to indigenous cultural communities, including ancestral lands, forests, pasture, residential and agricultural lands, hunting grounds, worship areas, and lands no longer occupied exclusively by indigenous cultural communities but to which they had traditional access, particularly the home ranges of indigenous cultural communities who are still nomadic or shifting cultivators. These are also required to have been held since time immemorial continuously to the present. The rights recognized include those of ownership of the ancestral lands and domains, the right to develop and manage lands and natural resources, the right to regulate entry of migrants and other entities, the right to safe and clean water, the right to claim parts of reservations, and the right to resolve conflicts according to customary law. Indigenous peoples also have the right to transfer their lands and property among their own members and to redeem those that have been acquired from them through fraudulent transactions. Indigenous peoples are required to maintain ecological balance and to restore denuded areas.

Self-governance and empowerment. These rights and their exercise are defined by the IPRA and its implementing rules and regulations. They include the right of indigenous peoples to pursue their economic, social, and cultural development; to use commonly accepted justice systems, conflict resolution mechanisms, peace building processes, and customary laws; to participate in decision taking; to maintain and develop indigenous political structures; to have mandatory representation in policymaking bodies; to determine their own priorities for development; and to establish tribal villages. A key instrument for indigenous empowerment is the principle of free and informed consent. Indigenous peoples within their communities shall “determine for themselves policies, development programs, projects, and plans to meet their identified priority needs and concerns,” and “shall have the right to accept or reject a certain development intervention in their particular communities.”

Cultural integrity, social justice, and human rights. The IPRA establishes procedures and mechanisms for safeguarding indigenous rights to cultural integrity. It covers the right to establish and control educational systems; recognition of cultural diversity; the right to names, identity, and history; the protection of indigenous sacred places; the right to protection of indigenous knowledge systems and practices; and the right to science and technology. The IPRA also guarantees indigenous rights to basic social services including employment, vocational training, housing, sanitation, social security, infrastructure, transportation, and communication.

NCIP. The Commission, comprised of seven indigenous Commissioners from different regions, is the “primary government agency responsible for the formulation and implementation of policies, plans and programs to promote and protect the rights and well-being” of indigenous peoples, including recognition of and rights to their ancestral domains. Its multiple tasks include: to serve as the medium through which government assistance to indigenous peoples can be extended; to review and assess the conditions of indigenous peoples, and to propose relevant laws and policies to address their role in national development; to implement policies, programs, and projects on behalf of indigenous peoples, and also to monitor the implementation thereof; and to issue certificates of ancestral land and domain title. An Ancestral Domains Office is to be responsible for the identification, delineation, and recognition of ancestral lands and domains; and to be responsible for their management in accordance with a master plan. It shall also issue, upon the free and prior informed consent of the indigenous peoples concerned, leases or permits for the exploitation of natural resources affecting the interests of indigenous peoples and communities. An Office of Policy, Planning, and Research shall be responsible for the formulation of appropriate policies and programs, including the development of a Five-Year Master Plan for indigenous peoples and communities. A consultative body (consisting of traditional leaders, elders, and representatives from the women and youth sectors of different indigenous peoples and communities) shall be constituted by the NCIP on a periodic basis to advise it on the “problems, aspirations and interests” of indigenous peoples.

Delineation and recognition of ancestral domains. The principles and procedures are set out at some length in the IPRA. Self-delineation shall be the guiding principle in the identification and delineation of
ancestral domains. The official delineation of ancestral
domain boundaries, including census of all community
members, shall be undertaken immediately by the
Ancestral Domains Office upon filing of the application
by the indigenous peoples concerned. This is to be done
in coordination with the communities concerned, and
shall at all times include genuine involvement and
participation by its members. There are a number of
requirements as proof of the claimed areas, including
testimony of elders and community under oath, written
accounts of indigenous customs and traditions, written
accounts of the indigenous political structure and
institutions, survey plans, anthropological data, and
descriptive histories of traditional communal forests and
hunting grounds. Other government agencies are to turn
over the areas within ancestral domains that have been
managed by them. All government agencies shall
henceforth be strictly enjoined from issuing, renewing,
or granting any concession, license or lease, or entering
into any production-sharing agreement, without prior
certification from the NCIP that the area affected does
not overlap with any ancestral domain.

In the IPRA law itself, no time frame is set for
dealing with outstanding land claims and issuing the
certificates of ancestral domain titles (CADTs).

Implementation of the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act

Any discussion of the policy framework in the
Philippines needs some review of the implementation
record of the IPRA in the 4 years it has been in force
since 1997. The issuance of the certificates of ancestral
domain or land titles (the CADTs and CALTs) has
certainly been very slow. By February 2001, only 9 out
of the 181 CADT applications and 347 CALT
applications had been approved. Moreover, there have
been ample reports that several of these applications
were approved on a haphazard basis, and did not abide
by the procedures required by law.

Complex issues have arisen over mineral
activities within claimed lands. Under the
Implementing Rules and Regulations for the IPRA,
issued in June 1998, the right of indigenous
communities is recognized to “suspend or stop any
project or activity that is shown to have violated the
process of securing free and prior informed consent,
or have violated the terms and conditions of such
previously granted consent.” Subsequently, an NCIP
Administrative Order18 exempted all leases, licenses,
contracts, and other forms of concession within
ancestral domains, which had existed prior to the entry
into force of the June 1998 IPRA regulations, from the
coverage of its provisions on free and informed
consent.

A serious challenge came to the IPRA in
September 1998, when its constitutional basis was
challenged in a petition to the Supreme Court. The
present Philippine administration has since declared
its support for the IPRA, with a commitment to
indigenous rights generally, and specifically to a quicker
distribution of ancestral domain claims to indigenous
peoples. A new set of NCIP Commissioners was in
place by August 2001 after an intensive round of
consultations with indigenous groups throughout the
country. Steps have been taken to “mainstream”
indigenous concerns within the programs and projects
of different government line agencies. This was, in fact,
the main theme addressed during the Philippine
national workshop under this regional technical
assistance in October 2001.

In the meantime, indigenous organizations and
the NGOs acting on their behalf have expressed different
opinions regarding IPRA. Some point to an exacerbation
of land conflicts at the community level after the law’s
adoption. There are also concerns that rural
communities may for the first time assume or “imagine”
an indigenous identity, in order to enjoy the rights
enshrined in the IPRA. With regard to the concept of
ancestral domain itself, very different concerns have
been expressed. Some argue that it may actually
facilitate the privatization of land that has previously
been held under customary tenure, for example, when
business corporations negotiate with one or only a few
members of an indigenous community in order to secure
access to their lands. Others have expressed the opposite
concern, that the very concept of ancestral domain
reflects a “static” concept of communal tenure, rather
than the prevailing reality in which many indigenous
communities have already adopted or adapted a western
property regime based on individual private tenure.

All of this points to the need to adapt ancestral
domain policy to the context and cultures of specific
areas, taking account of local nuances and tenure
arrangements.
VIET NAM: ETHNIC MINORITIES AND POLICY REFORM IN A TRANSITIONAL ECONOMY

General Principles

Vietnamese basic principles regarding ethnic concerns, as expressed in the Constitution and relevant laws, state the following.

- Viet Nam is a united nation of all its ethnic groups.
- The State protects, strengthens, and consolidates the unity of all peoples, and prohibits any behavior that sows divisions among ethnic groups.
- All ethnic groups are equal.
- All members of all ethnic groups are automatically citizens of Viet Nam, equal in their rights and obligations.
- All ethnic groups have the right to use their own language and script, and to promote their traditional customs and culture.
- The State should conduct plans to narrow the gap between ethnic groups in terms of economic and cultural development.

The 1990s has marked a transition from a centrally planned to a market economy, requiring significant law and policy reform. The decade has seen a new land code in 1993; a new code of forestry protection in 1993; and a number of decisions and decrees relating to socioeconomic development, poverty reduction, sedentary cultivation, health and education, and other important issues in the mountainous and remote areas where ethnic minorities reside. Among more recent developments has been the establishment in 1998 and dissemination of democratic regulations at the commune level. There have also been growing concerns to target economic and social assistance programs directly at ethnic minority groups, rather than at the mainly mountainous areas where they reside together with ethnic Kinh groups. Some of these issues, policies, and programs are reviewed below.

Overall Policy Concerns

The Government of Viet Nam has made many active efforts to include ethnic minorities in the national development process. It has done this through regulations, subsidies, and special development programs. There have also been continued efforts to include ethnic minorities in political structures at both national and local levels. Ethnic groups are represented at the National Assembly by the Council of Nationalities. Within the Government, the lead coordinating agency is CEMMA, which has ministerial status and develops policies for ethnic minorities. Several other government agencies are also involved in projects and programs targeting ethnic minorities, including the Ministry of Planning and Investment, the Ministry of Labor, Invalids and Social Affairs, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), and the ministries of health, transportation, and education and training. At provincial and local levels, each ministry has its own department and office.

While the general principles of national and interethnic relations have been outlined above, the Government has not as yet issued any comprehensive policy statement regarding ethnic minorities. For this reason one of the concerns identified at the project’s national workshop in Hanoi was the need for overall guidelines for a system of policies on ethnic minority groups, leading from basic principles to specific policies and orientation. There is a need to reexamine some conceptual underpinning of present anthropological theory and policies under which ethnic groups have been based on different scales of “civilization and culture.” According to the evolutionary theory followed by conventional Vietnamese ethnology the majority Kinh (with their thousands of years of wet-rice cultivation) have come first. The larger of the ethnic minority groups, also wet-rice cultivators, have been ranked next to the Kinh. The smaller ethnic minority groups, who practice shifting cultivation or hunting and gathering, are seen as needing to be “civilized.”

Such ratings have not only affected attitudes between majority and minority ethnic groups. They have also affected the relationships between minority groups with relatively larger and smaller populations. The national workshop recommended field studies to
examine what effect these policies (and social or psychological attitudes) have had on policymakers, as well as on the smaller ethnic groups. It also recommended more in-depth studies to examine the impact of lowland cultural patterns on approaches toward ethnicity. It urged furthermore that ethnicity be considered as a cross-cutting issue in all policies, programs, and management decisions. All aspects including culture, language, and the characteristics of ethnic groups should be considered in the design and implementation of all policies and programs.

**New Economic Zones and Resettlement**

Since the 1960s, Viet Nam has sought to establish “new economic zones” in mountainous areas, organized as state agricultural or forestry enterprises or as new economic villages. In 1968, it launched its campaign for settlement of shifting cultivators and for fixed cultivation practices. Sedentarization has since been considered a key aspect of the government’s efforts for poverty reduction and hunger eradication. Sedentarization strategies include support for agricultural production, and technical training and technology transfers. It has been estimated that as many as 4.5 million people, mainly Kinh, were settled in the New Economic Zones in mountainous areas or the southern lowlands between 1975 and 1995. MARD continues to implement a resettlement program.

Vietnamese policies on sedentarization have been subject to critical review. It has been observed that poverty levels can remain high after settlement and that some farmers return to shifting cultivation practices. Managers of this program have often attributed its poor results to the remoteness and low awareness of ethnic minority communities, the lack of staff and facilities to carry out the work, and the low levels of investment allocated to it. Recent policy reviews have also focused on alternatives to sedentarization. At a September 2001 meeting of the Poverty Task Force in Haiphong, for example, it was proposed that the current focus on “sedentarizing” ethnic minority groups could usefully be replaced by much more intensive research into agricultural options for upland farming systems.

**Land Allocation Policies**

Until the 1980s, Vietnamese land policy was based on state enterprises and cooperative farming units, although a limited amount of individual landownership was permitted. Reforms to “decollectivize” landownership commenced in 1981, permitting farm households to hold land-use rights to annual cropland for up to 15 years, and to forestland for longer periods. The 1993 land law then granted to farm households the rights to transfer, exchange, lease, mortgage, and inherit, and extended use rights to 20 years for annual crops and 50 years for perennial crops. By 1998, some 86% of classified agricultural land had been allocated to almost 8 million households.

In upland areas, however, the process of land allocation has been slower and more problematic. Some ethnic minority farmers have been able to expand significantly their cultivation of wet rice, thereby supporting their household claims. Others in some localities—such as the Tay, Dzao, Gia Rai, and M’Nong—have been able to develop commercial coffee and fruit farming. There have also been concerns at inequitable land distribution, at a growth in land disputes, and at shortages of land for farming in some ethnic minority areas and households. Policymakers have discussed ways to settle these disputes in ethnic minority areas, including those relating to land occupation, land transfers, and inheritance. The UNDP Poverty Task Force has noted that land allocation has been slow for ethnic minorities; and that enabling ethnic minorities to acquire formal titles as groups or individuals will require additional effort and investment, as well as a different approach by local authorities. On the same issue, the project’s national workshop advocated the immediate implementation of a baseline survey, to see whether there is a need for drastic land and forestry adjustments in the central highlands, based on local characteristics and with special attention paid to traditional ownership.
Hunger Alleviation and Poverty Reduction

The 1996 Communist Party Congress set the goal of reducing the percentage of those living in poverty from 25 in 1996 to 10 in 2000. A hunger elimination and poverty reduction program (HERP) included among its goals addressing the growing problems of landlessness, food subsidies, service improvement, expansion of enterprise in rural areas, reducing school and health fees, and increasing the government budget for rural areas. A special program, known as “Program 135,” was launched in 1998, addressing socioeconomic development in the most disadvantaged communes. It was targeted at 1,715 communes in Region 3 of the country (including over 1,500 communes in mountainous areas), and most of the intended beneficiaries have been ethnic minorities. The target group was more recently increased to 2,000 communes. While the main focus of the program has been on infrastructure, the approach has been participatory. Decisions as to what projects should be funded have been decided in public by local communities.

A program to support ethnic minorities with special difficulties has been implemented at the provincial level since 1994. Activities have included support in agricultural production and support for everyday essential materials. Since 1998, it has been merged with the HERP.

Education Policies

Educational policies in ethnic minority and mountainous areas include the two major objectives of (a) eradicating illiteracy among ethnic minorities, and (b) developing a cadre of trained ethnic minority officials. Vietnamese is the main language used in the schooling system. Special ethnic minority boarding schools have been established in many mountainous areas, but only a small number of ethnic minority students from the better connected families tend to have access to them. The project’s national workshop identified several policy concerns. These include the need to improve children’s access to schools and provide teachers from the same ethnic group; devise a suitable curriculum closely linked to ethnic minority culture; and maintain traditional forms of education through family, family clan, and traditional villages.
INTRODUCTION

It is of obvious importance to identify, and if possible measure, poverty trends for indigenous and ethnic minority communities in comparison with other sectors of the national population. In other parts of the world, notably in Latin America, empirical research has established some clear correlation between ethnicity and poverty. Using conventional socioeconomic indicators, based either on income data or unsatisfied basic needs, this research has demonstrated quite convincingly that indigenous ethnic groups are represented disproportionately among both the poor and the extreme poor. And more disturbingly, there are indications from regression analysis that such trends have been worsening over the past 1 or 2 decades.25

This is an issue of very obvious importance for poverty reduction strategies. As will be seen further below, more and more ADB interventions in recent years have been directed at areas where indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities are located. The interventions may not necessarily be directed at these peoples as target groups. The interest may rather be in developing infrastructure or in resource extraction in regions where previously isolated peoples are physically located. However, there are indications that some recent poverty reduction programs are being prepared or implemented in geographical areas where indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities reside, precisely because these have been identified as poverty target areas.

There can be a considerable difference between targeting the geographical areas where indigenous peoples reside, and identifying the indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities as specific target groups for development assistance. As our earlier review has shown, indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities are only rarely the sole inhabitants of physical and territorial space. In all the four project countries, they are increasingly sharing this space with other ethnic groups. This may be a longstanding historical process, as in the case of the “Christian” settlement in the southern Philippines throughout the 20th century. It may be a more recent development, as in the case of the Indonesian transmigration programs under the New Order era, the Kinh settlement in the Vietnamese uplands, and the very recent Khmer settlement in Cambodia’s northeastern provinces. Moreover, indigenous and ethnic minority lifestyles can be more varied than a subsistence and community-based economy. They may participate in both urban and rural labor markets, often on a seasonal basis, and also undertake migrant labor. Indigenous women may earn their livelihood in urban areas as domestic workers or even in the entertainment industry. There is also likely to be considerable economic differentiation both within and between diverse ethnic minority groups.

Analysis of poverty trends is bound to be a complex exercise. For an overall assessment, the statistical data are generally not available. In most of the countries, census figures and household surveys are not disaggregated by ethnic group or origin. Moreover, a rigorous assessment of poverty trends for ethnic groups would require a far longer time frame than the few months available for this study. Baseline data would have to be collected over a period of at least several years.

In only one of the project countries, Viet Nam, are there sufficient data at the national level to review poverty trends for ethnic minorities over a fixed time period. In the Philippines some attempt has been made to assess the relationship between ethnicity and poverty, extrapolating from the data of the National Statistics Office. In Cambodia and Indonesia, data are inadequate to permit even attempting an exercise of this kind. This
analysis draws mainly on the fieldwork and participatory poverty assessments conducted during the project.

Any correlation between ethnicity and poverty remains inconclusive on the basis of the very limited data presently available, using the more conventional indicators. Some ethnic minority groups are experiencing disproportionate poverty, as appears to be the case in Viet Nam. In the Philippines, there appear to be significant differences between the poverty indicators for indigenous peoples in the north and the south of the country. In Indonesia, despite the lack of data, resource management policies of recent decades that have caused an “impoverishment” of indigenous communities are clear concerns. In Cambodia, where the evidence is particularly anecdotal, a growth in poverty for some highland indigenous peoples can be attributed to the lack of alternative livelihood opportunities when access to forest produce has been reduced.

**CAMBODIA AND INDONESIA**

In neither Cambodia nor Indonesia are data currently available to allow for meaningful disaggregation by ethnic group at the national level.

In Cambodia, 36% of the population is estimated to have a per capita consumption of less than US$14 per month. Some 90% of the poor live in rural areas. It may be noted that a recent participatory poverty assessment of ethnic minorities conducted by ADB focuses on such groups as the ethnic Vietnamese as well as indigenous upland groups.

In Indonesia, poverty incidence was last estimated, in August 1999, at 18.2%. It is widely known that poverty increased dramatically in Indonesia as a whole before the country was affected by the economic and financial crisis of 1997. A recent ADB assessment of poverty in Indonesia shows that one aspect of regional disparities deserves special attention. The resource-rich provinces, which include East Kalimantan and Irian Jaya among others, are among the richest provinces in terms of per capita GDP, and yet the living standards of the population are generally lower in terms of per capita consumption. The discordance arises because a considerable proportion of the GDP is transferred to other parts of the country. “This transfer and the resulting depression of living standards have understandably led to serious discontent and a potentially explosive situation in these provinces.” The ADB study also identifies discrepancies between regional and national averages, covering such indicators as literacy rates. “While most of the provinces had literacy rates close to the national average, there were some significant deviations such as West Nusa Tenggara (66%) and Irian Jaya (68%). It is noteworthy that all these regions are also among the ones that suffer from the highest incidence of poverty measured by consumption expenditure.”

**PHILIPPINES**

In the Philippines there are no reliable data at the national level because ethnicity is not captured in national statistics. During the study, an attempt was made to extrapolate from the data of the National Statistics Office compiled by geographic region. As indicated earlier, this can be only a very rough indication, given the demographic composition of the country and the tendency of different ethnic groups to coexist in the same area. The very tentative findings are that, except in a limited number of regions, indigenous peoples are not likely to comprise the absolute poorest groups in the Philippines, using conventional socioeconomic indicators. Rather, there is a growing risk of impoverishment, as their traditional lands and natural resources come under increasing threat. Moreover, there can be marked poverty gaps within the indigenous communities. There do appear to be cases of significant growth rates for some indigenous communities, but the existence of significant inequalities within these same areas impedes equitable access to the benefits of this economic growth.

Some idea of indigenous poverty trends can be gained from comparing the ethnographic regions of the NCIP with poverty analysis for specific geographic regions. In Mindanao, for example, the poverty indicators are particularly severe. A recent ADB study found that the regions with the highest poverty incidence were the Autonomous Region for Muslim Mindanao (with 56.7% poverty incidence) and the largely indigenous area of Caraga (55.4%). Western Mindanao, which ranked second nationwide in terms of rural poverty incidence, is part of the NCIP’s Northwestern Mindanao ethnographic area. In 1995, the population
of this region was placed at 1.1 million persons, of whom approximately 46% were indigenous with the Subanen as the most numerous ethnic group (Table 3).

The methodology for the preliminary survey given below was to select regions where indigenous peoples comprise at least 40% of the population. As of 1997, one of these regions, Caraga, had the second lowest of all regional average incomes for the Philippines, as much as 42% lower than the national average. For the decade between 1988 and 1997, the growth rate in the regional average incomes nevertheless matched the national trend in general terms.

However, when the data are further disaggregated to focus on poor families and individuals, a somewhat different picture emerges. At the national level, poverty incidence among families declined by nearly 10%, from 40.2% in 1988 to 31.8% in 1997. The decline was much less in the predominantly indigenous regions. In two of the regions, the incidence of poverty actually increased despite average family incomes growing at more than the national rate. Poverty incidence among individuals declined at an even faster rate than for families (from 49.5% in 1988 to 36.8% in 1997). The drop was again much less in the predominantly indigenous areas. In the case of the Cordillera Administrative Region, poverty incidence for individuals remained at the same level throughout the decade. In the case of Region X, it was worse in 1997 than in 1988.

Using “poverty gap indicators”—which help distinguish between the situation of the poor and extreme poor—there are signs that poverty is deeper in predominantly indigenous rural areas than a decade ago. From the Cordillera experience, it is likely that the intensification of extreme poverty levels can be explained by the different returns for their labor to agricultural enterprises at different ends of the spectrum: on the one hand, small and rainfed subsistence farms, and on the other, high-value cash crop enterprises.

The above represents a very preliminary and rudimentary analysis, given the scarcity of basic data. However, ethnic differentiation is clearly accepted in the law and policy framework, and where there is scope for far more systematic assessment of these concerns. It is to be hoped that statistical survey methods will be refined to permit better understanding of these issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region XI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Annual per capita income required to satisfy nutritional requirements (2,000 calories) and other basic needs.

\(b\) Proportion of poor families (whose annual per capita income falls below the poverty threshold) to total number of families.


VIET NAM

Of the four project countries, Viet Nam is the only one where there have been systematic efforts to measure the correlation between ethnicity and poverty. It has proved possible to do this over a period of time, first because the census figures and living standards surveys classify the population according to ethnic origin, and because the data on poverty and poverty trends are quite well organized. Government agencies such as the Ministry of Planning and Investment and the Ministry of Labor, Invalids, and Social Affairs have devoted considerable efforts to this, in the context of the 2001–2010 Socioeconomic Development Strategy, the comprehensive poverty reduction and growth strategy, and International Development Goals. Much international assistance has been provided through a Poverty Task Force (discussed later).

The main sources are the Viet Nam Living Standards Surveys (VLSS) of 1992/93, and 1997/98. The former covered 4,234 Kinh/Hoa households and 566 ethnic minority households; the latter covered 5,151 Kinh/Hoa households and 848 ethnic minority households.

Overall, Viet Nam’s poverty reduction targets and performance have been impressive over the past decade. Poverty incidence declined by over 20% between 1993 and 1998, from 58.1% in 1992/93 to 37.4% in 1998, and Viet Nam has by now exceeded some of its international targets in the areas of poverty reduction and primary school enrolment. Poverty is now concentrated in rural areas, where some 94% of the poor reside. While poverty has declined in all seven geographic regions of the country, it has done so at different rates. The regions with the highest poverty incidence, such as the Northern Highlands with 59% and the Central Highlands with 52%, include those with a high proportion of ethnic minorities in the population.29

During the 1990s, the overall living standards of ethnic minority groups in mountainous areas also improved. The relative poverty rate nevertheless remained high, and the level of improvement was much slower than in other parts of the country. Indicators show that the gaps between ethnic minority and Kinh and Hoa groups increased rapidly. Between 1993 and 1998, while the average expenditure per capita increased by 35%, this figure was only 20% for ethnic groups in the Northern Highlands and 7% in the Central Highlands. While the poverty rate in the country as a whole decreased by 19 points during this period (down from 55% to 36%), the decrease in the Northern Highlands was only 11 points, and the poverty rate remained high (down from 84% to 73%). The poverty rate in the Central Highlands was not reduced at all, at 92% in 1993 and 91% in 1998.

Some data are also available at the provincial level. In April 2001, the Department of Labor, Invalids, and Social Affairs in Kon Tum Province conducted a comprehensive poverty assessment within the province. As shown in Table 4, based on data provided on the “Report of the Situation of the Poor” in Kon Tum, ethnic minority households account for a very high percentage of poor households compared with that in the total population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Poor Households (%)</th>
<th>Kinh Poor Households (%)</th>
<th>Ethnic Minority Poor Households (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kon Plong</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dak Ha</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dak To</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngoc Hoi</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa Thay</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dak Glei</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kon Tum town</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A recent study conducted for the World Bank30 used the VLSS survey data and the 1999 Population and Housing Census to examine the difference in living standards between the Kinh/Hoa majority and other ethnic groups, and how these have changed between the 1993 and 1998 surveys. The study offers an explanation of why many ethnic minority households remain so poor. Despite constituting just 14% population, ethnic minorities now make up 29% all the poor in Viet Nam. Moreover, of 14 provinces with rural poverty exceeding 60%, 12 have populations in which ethnic minorities make up more than half the total. Ethnic
groups found to have performed best economically were those most assimilated within Kinh society, while the least assimilated groups (particularly those in the Central Highlands and the Hmong in the Northern Highlands) have been left behind. Thus, the study observes that the most difficult challenge for public policy is to bring those most unlike the Kinh into the economic mainstream.

The study also aimed to detect differences among ethnic minority groups by examining such items as expenditures and schooling. The analysis was hampered by the fact that the VLSS surveys did not sample enough ethnic minority households to allow for much disaggregation. Moreover, the 1992/93 survey only allowed for 10 different ethnic groupings, rather than the official list of 54 different ethnic groups. However, a distinction among 3 broad categories (the Kinh, Hoa, and Khmer; one composite category for ethnic minorities that traditionally live in the Central Highlands; and another for those that originate in the Northern Highlands) showed major differences. The poorest groups were unambiguously the minorities of the Central Highlands. Their relative position fell from an expenditure level that was half the national average in 1993 to a little more than a third of the national average by 1998. The researchers identified significant differences between the situations of ethnic minorities in different regions. Northern Highland minorities had benefited from economic growth in the 1990s, whereas the position of the Central Highland minorities had stagnated. They then tried to derive policy prescriptions from their analysis, arguing that diversity in the socioeconomic development experiences of the different ethnic minorities indicated the need for a similar diversity in the policy interventions designed to assist them.

Social assessment carried out by ADB in the context of project preparation in Viet Nam’s central region similarly identified higher than average poverty levels for “indigenous” ethnic minority groups. Studies have shown that the rural poor are predominantly from indigenous groups. Indigenous households, together with female-headed households, are poorer than the average. Indigenous peoples’ households suffer an average of 5.5 months food deficit compared to 3.3 months for Kinh groups and appear to have lower access to irrigated land than the Kinh immigrants to the area. The latter are better off than those born in the area, either indigenous or Kinh, suggesting that the Kinh carry skills and knowledge, including knowledge of markets and government services, that allow them to prosper even if they suffer a few initial years of poverty.31

A recent paper on poverty reduction among ethnic minorities, conducted for the Poverty Task Force, aims to identify structural and other factors behind the growing “poverty gap” between mainstream Kinh/Hoa groups and certain ethnic minorities. Minorities have a somewhat lower maximum educational attainment level and substantially less access to water surfaces and benefits from remittances. They may actually have more agricultural land, but it is unlikely to be irrigated. Geographical location, involving remoteness and poor access to infrastructure, is an important explanation for lower consumption compared with local Kinh people. Infant mortality, child mortality, and under-5 mortality rates show enormous geographic differences, which correlate with high concentrations of ethnic minorities.

In the Central and Northern Highlands the regional figures are above the rural average for Viet Nam, and there are indications that in some parts, infant mortality actually increased over the 1989–1994 period, while the national average remained the same.

Issues related to land tenure and farming practices, and ethnic minority perceptions in this regard, are analyzed further in the following section.
## 5 PERCEPTIONS OF POVERTY

### Qualitative Assessment

### INTRODUCTION

A qualitative assessment is in many ways far more important than a more statistical or quantitative effort to measure poverty trends for these groups. Throughout the regional technical assistance and in some of the national workshops, stakeholders preferred to use the term *impoverishment* rather than *poverty.* It is a term with powerful overtones, insinuating that policies, processes, and structural factors may be reducing these groups to a situation of growing poverty.

In each country, the national consultants were requested in their fieldwork to focus on perceptions of poverty trends. Did indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities feel that they were meeting more of their aspirations, or alternatively feel that they were getting poorer? And what were the reasons for this? In focus-group discussions, consultants were advised to ask how things have changed for the communities over a period of 1 or even 2 decades. They were also asked to focus on structural factors, such as land use and occupation, which could affect livelihoods and poverty indicators. For example, did people have more or less land than in the recent past? Did they have more security over the land? Had they been losing land to outside groups? Had they changed their patterns of land use and agricultural cultivation? Similarly with regard to incomes and the marketing of produce, they were requested to detect trends over time. Were communities producing more for the market than a few years ago? Through whom did they market their produce, and did they receive any assistance? Were people seeking more credit than previously? And for what purposes? With regard to health, a key question was whether new problems were emerging. Had there been any recent improvements in the health situation, perhaps as a result of medical services? Were any new problems emerging, perhaps as a result of resettlement, sedentarization, or changing lifestyles?

The consultant teams were free to choose their own methodology, but not to use questionnaire techniques or to tabulate responses. They were encouraged to provoke discussion in an open-ended way. Qualitative assessments were also a main theme addressed in the six provincial workshops.

In this section some main findings are presented by country.

### CAMBODIA

The principal concerns of indigenous highland people in Cambodia appeared to relate to land and food security, health, and education. At the project’s provincial workshop held in Ratanakiri, much discussion related to health and education concerns. In fieldwork held after the workshop, there was ample reference to land and food security, and to the problems caused by increasingly more limited access to forest produce.

#### Threatened Land Security

*At present villages do not have serious problems of land use. But the next generation of indigenous peoples will not have enough land for their field and paddy rice agriculture.*

The above concerns were expressed in Tuy village, Ratanakiri. Until the mid-1990s, villagers had easy
access to lands, forests, and wildlife. But the richness of these resources in Tuy village attracted new settlers and logging companies. Illegal logging was unrestrained between 1997 and 1999. The major problems faced by villagers are now directly related to land pressure. They have increasing difficulty finding good quality land for their swidden fields, and experience declining rice yields and an increase in weed pests. The land in Tuy village is now being encroached upon by outsiders and new settlers. Villages are starting to take protective measures, such as planting cashew nuts and other fruit trees along the main road in order to prevent outsiders taking possession of fallow land. Although the local economy is becoming more monetized, villagers have little means to earn cash income. Some families have begun to sell land that was formerly perceived as belonging to the whole community. Others have only sold part of the land they cultivated, while remaining in the village. They believe it is better to sell the land now and receive some money, rather than lose it to investors without getting anything.

If a villager had cut [trees in] this place the elders would have fined them ever so much. But because it is the Government they will not dare say anything.

In the above case, a private individual had selected an area of forest where he wanted to develop a coffee plantation. The area was the old site of a Phnong village in Dak Dam where sacred trees had been planted. Other cases were described where private individuals not associated with government had attempted to cut down sacred primary forest, such as loggers in Stung Treng Province and commercial farmers in Mondulkiri Province. Although in some cases offerings to the spirits had been negotiated between village elders and these individuals, this was often not the case.

When private individuals seek to buy land, villagers are left prone to exploitation as they are not aware of their legal position or the market value of the land. In several cases, villagers had been misled by individuals who introduced themselves as government representatives. Even if villagers were reluctant to sell their land they felt obliged to do so, and at a very low price. Land sale decisions appear to have been made in the belief that traditional survival mechanisms used by highlanders, when land was under pressure from an increased population, were still an option. Traditionally, villagers would shift their villages and farming sites. With the changes underway and planned for the highlands, this may no longer be an option.

**Lack of Food Security**

Before, we did not know about the value of wildlife. Since outsiders have captured wildlife and taken them in vehicles for sale, many people including provincial official staff, companies, and some villagers see wildlife as equaling money. As yields of swidden fields drop, the forest becomes an increasingly important source of supplementary food. Tubers, forest fruits, and vegetable are essential in periods of rice shortage.

The livelihood of the indigenous people depends mostly on swidden agriculture with a diet supplemented by fishing, hunting, and collecting forest vegetables and fruits. With low yield from their *chamkar* (upland farming plots) they are likely to face rice shortages. An interview with Kanat Touch villagers indicated that paddy rice cultivation is now the most important source of income. The rice yield is higher and ensures enough rice to villagers for the full year. The elders have made this change because for generations they practiced swidden agriculture, which left them little time for other ways of getting income for their family, and there were nevertheless 4-5 months of rice shortage per year.

Case studies in some villages indicated that indigenous peoples had a preference for paddy rice cultivation, but faced problems of poor soil fertility and lack of seeds and equipment. In earlier times, paddy rice cultivation was not a preferred activity of indigenous peoples, but highland communities understood that swidden agriculture could not provide enough rice for their daily needs. The point was emphasized in case studies in several villages of Ratanakiri and Stung Treng provinces. However, indigenous peoples could not immediately abandon swidden agriculture, because of their longstanding mixed crop tradition and other factors including lack of draft animals. Moreover, in some areas paddy fields were either insufficient or too far from the preferred village location. A case study in Mondulkiri indicated that indigenous peoples preferred traditional
upland cultivation techniques to working in paddy fields located some 15 kilometers from their village.

In two villages, respondents complained generally of increasing poverty over the preceding decade. Reasons put forward included population growth; declining agricultural production due to irregular rains, pests, and animal diseases; and such natural disasters as floods. Access to wildlife had also diminished as a result of logging and uncontrolled hunting. Whereas forest products were used previously only to supplement the diet, for construction, and occasional exchange for lowland products, they are now being used as a source of income. Villagers nevertheless experienced difficulty in collecting forest products, competing with better equipped and also armed outsiders.

INDONESIA

In the course of field visits in Kalimantan and Sulawesi, and during the project’s provincial workshops held in Palu and Samarinda, *adat* community members expressed different perceptions of their poverty problems. It was noticeably in Indonesia that indigenous respondents drew attention to the structural factors behind their present-day poverty—to the trend of impoverishment due to land, resource management, and other policy shortcomings. Reference was also made to cultural aspects and to problems deriving from the lack of basic facilities or services. These issues are discussed below.

Lack of Recognition of Customary (*Adat*) Rights over Land and Natural Resources

During the provincial workshop held in Palu, Central Sulawesi, in June 2001, many representatives of *adat* communities identified the main cause of their poverty as lack of recognition and protection of their rights to land and natural resources. This had resulted in dispossession of these communities from their traditional lands and resources. Mention was made of a 1992 provincial decree, which extinguished communal *ulayat* rights over land. In the words of a village elder from Palolo, Donggala, in Central Sulawesi: “How can we afford to live, if the Government takes our farm to be part of a conservation area? This will not only make us poor, but will make us unable to live. We will defend our land, no matter what the risk.”

In East Kalimantan, *adat* community informants insisted that they are wealthy, in terms of their natural resources. However, some villagers feel that they have experienced discrimination with regard to the benefits of this wealth. In the words of one *adat* community member, “The Government only thinks about the incoming people and not us.”

The need for cash has also led some *adat* communities to sell their lands to outsiders, especially since the availability of transport has improved access to their village areas. This process has been evident in villages close to Palu, for example.

Degradation of Lands and Natural Resources

During the East Kalimantan workshop, several *adat* community participants stated that their poverty was also caused by some development activities within their areas, including logging, mining, and plantation agriculture. These had led to the pollution and degradation of the environment. In the words of one informant,

*Before the plantation came in, our lifestyle was prosperous. If we needed fruits, we just went to the forest. It was the same if we needed medicines, we just went to the forest. But since this company came in and burned our forest, everything has gone. Our life became difficult. The forest fire has been a disaster for us.*

Lack of Education and Health Services

Education and health services were often mentioned as a key determinant of poverty. As expressed by the village head of Toro in Central Sulawesi, also an *adat* elder in the community: “The *adat* communities do not feel poor although they live in a subsistence manner. This is because they do not mainly use material criteria when they measure their poverty or prosperity, as the urban people usually do. For Toro people, the main cause of poverty is the low quality of human resources, due to the lack of education and bad condition of health.”
In Benung, East Kalimantan, adat community members complained of the lack of health facilities in their village. The hospital and health center were very far from their village, and the cost of medicine and treatment was very expensive for them, while degradation of forests had made it difficult to secure many of the traditional medicines which had previously been obtained easily enough from surrounding forests. Similar complaints were echoed by persons from Toro and Kalora villages in Central Sulawesi.

Lack of Infrastructure and Transport Facilities, and Marketing Problems

Because of their remote location, adat villages generally lack adequate roads and transport facilities. This makes it difficult to secure fair prices for their products at marketing outlets. Transportation problems have been perceived by the people of the Togian islands in Luwuk Banggai, Central Sulawesi, as a major obstacle to the improvement of their local economy. Indigenous farmers and fishers accept prices well below the mainland market rates from traders who travel through their region.

Toro villagers in Central Sulawesi also complained of the price fluctuations for such agricultural products as cocoa and cloves. In East Kalimantan, informants complained of increases in fuel prices. This had led to increased transport costs, in turn causing price increases for such basic commodities as rice, sugar, and salt. These commodities are transported from distant cities to the remote adat community areas.

Limited access to information can also contribute to poverty problems. An example was provided by the community of Sekolaq Darat, East Kalimantan. In a project supported by ADB, farmers without access to information on how to choose good seed for their rubber trees received seed of inferior quality. For a number of years following, the poor seed quality affected productivity and outcomes in rubber cultivation.

Perceptions of Laziness and Vices

As in the other project countries, laziness was often put forward by the indigenous peoples themselves as major factor behind their poverty.

Examples can be cited among the Manggarai and Sumba peoples of East Nusa Tenggara. Adat communities distinguish between three categories of people based on their socioeconomic status. The ata ndengo (poor people) are those who do not own livestock and do not cultivate commercial crops, possessing only a parcel of subsistence land, which is likely to be small and infertile. According to the perceptions of the Sumba, such poverty can be attributed mainly to the weak or lazy character of the persons concerned. The ata kabisu are the common people who are neither poor nor wealthy. The ata rato are the wealthy strata of their society, those with wide kinship and human relationships, who have many animals and extensive lands cultivated with cash crops, have influence and authority in the village, and have the capacity to host adat festivities including burial ceremonies. Sumbas see the ability to develop good social relationships, as well as diligence and capacity to work, as important factors behind wealth creation.

In East Kalimantan, it is recognized that the gambling habits of some community members have caused their poverty. Gambling is seen originally as a recreational pastime, for example, during the kewangkey festivities to commemorate the death of family members. However, gambling has now become a professional business, run either by individuals from the cities or by village members themselves.

Marginalization of Adat Institutions

During the provincial workshop in Palu, some adat communities and NGOs stated that the marginalization of adat institutions has indirectly caused the poverty of these communities. It was stated that, as a result of government policies, communities lack persons with the capacity and authority to manage and control the use of lands and natural resources in their territorial areas. This had led to conflicts and to uncontrolled use of natural resources. Moreover, these conflicts are drawn out in the absence of an authoritative figure to resolve them, as people are either unwilling or unable to bring these conflicts before the official state courts.
PHILIPPINES

Indigenous perceptions of poverty in the Philippines are presented here from the Cordillera region of northern Luzon and from Mindanao.

Cordillera

Each of the ethnolinguistic groups in the Cordillera has its own terminology to refer to the “poor” and to “poverty.” For example, the Ifaloi of southern Benguet and the Kankanaey of northern Benguet refer to the poor as ebiteg, and nabiteg, respectively. Both terminologies refer to one who has no land to till and lacks the resources to be able to work. These resources are capital, transportation, machine sprayer, and kuliglig (a small farm machine). An ebiteg is also one who lacks opportunities like time and money to learn new skills and ideas. He/she is usually indebted, without a regular source of income, and does not have amenities like a television, appliances, or liquefied petroleum gas for cooking.

The Kankanaey of Mountain Province call the poor person a kudo. He/she is one who has no property like a payew (irrigated rice field) and therefore works on the land of the landed kadangyans. Since the kudo is frequently without enough food and money, he/she is forced to stay with better-off relatives. The Box on this page explains their concept of poverty in terms of the inverse — wealth.

The Tinggian of Abra identify the poor as pobre or panglaw. This refers to a person who is sangkasapulu, sangkaapuyan, which literally means hand to mouth existence. They lack food to eat, money to buy basic commodities and to send children to school, cannot read and write, and their children are not properly clothed. This is so because they lack resources such as land and work animals.

Notions of poverty are socioculturally defined. For example, the Tinggian of Abra believe that one indicator of poverty is the physique of the person: being thin is an indicator of being poor, while being stout is an indicator of being rich. One Tinggian elder even suggests that the smell of a person is a marker of poverty. He said: “you can tell that one is poor when he/she stinks—he/she cannot even afford to buy bath soap.”

Kankanae Traditional Notions of Poverty and Wealth

To understand the Kankanaey notions of poverty, one must understand their notions of wealth or who are considered rich.

Traditionally, those considered rich are those who host thanksgiving feasts called sida or pedit. These religious feasts are offered to gods and the spirits of the ancestors. These feasts are ranked according to the number of pigs the host family can offer to the gods and spirits. Ranking starts from 3 pigs, then 5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17 and so on. The sequencing is always based on odd numbers because of the belief that the pig without a pair will again attract more pigs when the host family raises pigs again after the feast.

The bigger the feast a family hosts, the wider the circle of relatives and clans can be invited. The host family gains more prestige as it invites a wider circle from within and outside the community. With the prestige comes the status of kadangyan or baknang, which connotes wealth and the ability to share such wealth. One was thus considered rich if he/she was able to hold feasts, during which the wealth was shared with many people in the community. One may have dozens of cattle and livestock but cannot gain the community’s respect without sharing the wealth through a feast.

Being rich is not synonymous with accumulating wealth. Being rich is being able to share one’s wealth through a sida or pedit. It follows, therefore, that poverty, at least according to old tradition, is the opposite of the Kankanaey notion of wealth: being poor means being unable to invite a wide circle of relatives and clan members to a feast.

It is also useful to consider indigenous notions of well-being. The poor people of the Cordillera, just like anyone else, also desire a better life. Well-being means being able to meet the basic needs to survive, like food (rice, sugar, salt) and clothing. At the same time, perspectives also vary with ethnic and socioeconomic status (perhaps even gender).
For some Ibaloi respondents of this study, Tuba Benguet, good life means the state of being able to buy other amenities in life such as gas for cooking, a mechanized tractor to lighten the burden of farm work, and a vehicle to transport their goods and products.

Well-being means good health. Among the Ayangan of Ifugao, good life is synonymous with a healthy life, *ap-apa-hochan*, which means that a person or a community is able to maintain a harmonious relationship with the environment and supernatural world. To attain good life, one should not ravage the forest and spoil the land, especially the ricefields. One should nurture them and not leave them idle or unproductive; otherwise, one will get ill and suffer misfortune (Interview with Prof. Leah Enkiwe, 2001).

For the Iffialig of Barlig, Mountain Province, notions of well-being are linked to notions of health. The generic term for health is *apu-apuor*, which means absence of illness or sickness. It can be noted that women and men in Barlig have a positive definition of health. Health is not simply the absence of illnesses but a condition of well-being or being strong in order to face the day-to-day challenges of life in a cheerful way.

The indigenous description of a healthy person is *amma ammay chi achor*, which means good condition of the whole body. “When one is conditioned, one is healthy and strong.” Note that there is the implicit assertion here that one is able to work or function because the body is fully developed in relation to one’s need to work. Health is then considered to be an integrated aspect of life of the people. For many men and women in Barlig, there is emphasis on the idea that “life is work,” if one is *apu-apuor, nakursi* or *amma ammay chi achor*, then he or she is capable of doing things.

Although indigenous worldviews persist, these do not constrain people in the villages of the Cordillera. Their values and ideas of good life are increasingly influenced by what they read, see, and hear outside their villages. Increasingly, people believe that education is a key to a better life, especially for the younger generation. A college degree is a passport out of the drudgeries of a farming life. This is why they work hard to be able to send their children to college. Some dream of sending one or two of their children to work overseas.

**Mindanao**

Indigenous perceptions of poverty are first considered among two separate ethnic groups of Mindanao, the Higaonon community of Bukidnon Province and the Ata-Manobo community of Davao Province. A more general analysis is then made concerning poverty perceptions of the indigenous peoples of the island of Mindanao as a whole.

When asked for local terms for poor, Higaonon respondents refer to such Visayan terms as *kabos* and *makaluluy* (the latter referring more specifically to a “pitiful condition.” Two youth leaders noted that the term is equated with the absence or lack of money while its opposite, *sapian* (Visayan for rich) connotes the ability to purchase material things such as houses, farm animals, and vehicles. Traditionally, these were not within their consciousness until the entry of the dumagats or outsiders. Thus, the Higaonon appear to perceive themselves to be poor only to the extent that others say they are. One woman informant refused to be referred to as “pitiful,” observing that she still had food on the table and did not have to resort to begging.

The nearest terminologies akin to poverty are *agkapulog, tingauhol* and *kalugan*. Residents experience the first only because they do not have money to buy certain things they need, but this condition does not necessarily indicate that food is scarce. The second term refers to seasonal hunger. Although food is limited during this period, they can still eat because the situation is temporary and can be mitigated. The third term indicates that a person is in a state of difficulty: while walking through a steep and narrow terrain, when food is scarce, a conflict is unresolved, or violence is experienced.

The Higaonon perceive themselves to be in difficult circumstances brought about mainly by outside factors. According to ethnographic literature, they were traditionally coastal dwellers enjoying the resources both of the sea and the forests. However, they were subsequently pushed into the interior areas, where they had to depend solely on the forest for their subsistence, household, health, and ceremonial needs. These interior areas were in turn encroached upon by migrants in the 1970s. A number of Higaonon lost tracts of land to outsiders for cash or for goods such as cloth, sardines, and alcoholic beverages.
The situation was further aggravated by government policies on land tenure and resource use, greatly limiting access to forest zones. Then logging activities by the Nasipit and Agusan logging companies from 1980 to the early 1990s affected the economic, social, and political condition of the community. With the depletion of forests, the more immediate impact was the decrease of meat supply (deer, wild pig, monkey, chicken, frogs, birds, and fish). In addition, sources of honey became difficult to find. Wild chickens for traditional healing practices became scarce. Logging also greatly altered the cycle of traditional farming systems. Due to more intensive use of the land, farm productivity lessened. The problem was aggravated by changes in the local climate and build up of pests and disease. As a result, harvests have not been sufficient to sustain Higaonon communities until their next cropping season. As the supply of traditional food dwindled over the years, seasonal hunger became more prolonged. Nutrition patterns also changed, with an adverse impact on health and consumption patterns—community residents learned to eat canned foods and instant noodles. These are nutritionally inferior to their traditional diet of vegetation and animals from rivers and forests.

When asked about their needs and aspirations, the Higaonon tend to refer to such issues as infrastructure, production, social services, conservation, and promotion of indigenous systems and governance.

Among Ata Manobo communities, the concept of poverty is best encapsulated by the term *kaayo-ayo*, referring to an individual who possesses only a set of clothes and has to depend on others for subsistence. In a worse condition would be the *kaubong-ubong*, referring to a person who is practically homeless and does not attend to physical appearance or hygiene. Reasons suggested for individuals in this state are that they reside in interior areas and they do not participate in community activities. The comfortable ones by contrast are the *maupiyak*. They have sufficient food and domesticated animals. This perception of a level of comfort as stated by the Ata Manobo, however, contrasts with the outsiders’ view of the wealthy (*adunahan*) as possessing much money, concentrating on business activity, and pursuing only personal interest.

Principal factors promoting poverty, according to Ata Manobo perceptions, can be summarized as follows. As recently as 1983, the area’s forests were still intact. The leaders interviewed said they were living in harmony with the forests that produced all they needed. Then business people entered into a 25-year logging concession, remaining in the area for 15 years. There was a slow but steady depletion of forest areas and subsequent loss of biodiversity. Wild animals vanished and farmlands were torn down by the logging operations. Now there is insufficient organic matter due to lack of forest litter. The cultivation of upland rice has become difficult because of the limited amount of planting materials and the excessively compact soil, making even sweet potato cultivation difficult. “At first logging companies cut the trees, then they reforested the area with fast-growing trees and prohibited the Lumads from farming within these reforested areas.” All of this has made food shortages the principal problem in the area, despite the existence of official “food for work” programs.

Corresponding changes in cultural practices have been observed by Ata Manobo informants. Previously, they would work together on an unpaid basis. Now wage labor has been introduced. In addition, they now fail to initiate rituals before clearing the land. Conditions are aggravated by the presence of outsiders who have oppressed them by buying products at a very low rate and selling at exorbitant prices. In addition, they have also brought in vices such as drunkenness and gambling.

Ata Manobo informants believe that restoration of the forest is basic for the development of the community. Only when the vegetation has been restored can the wild pigs, birds, and the other requirements for the survival of the Ata Manobo be provided. Other identified needs include infrastructure, education, local governance measures such as the creation of tribal village councils, cultural integrity through ongoing study of traditions, and livelihood projects.

More generally, perceptions of poverty among the indigenous peoples of Mindanao, and also the remedies advocated to address poverty, display certain similarities. Many indigenous languages have generic terms that approximate the word poor. Generally, the term is not to be considered an indigenous one. Indigenous communities generally assert that they are not poor, but are instead living “in difficult circumstances” brought about specifically by the loss
of their lands and territories. There are various terms that link the concept of poverty to powerlessness and dependency, including slavery. Poverty can also be manifest in the loss of belief in, or practice of, the indigenous culture. In terms of access to resources, the poor are referred to as those who are unable to purchase necessary goods and have no education or money. The term can also refer to an outsider or to a person who has been banished from the group for unacceptable behavior.

Indigenous peoples often emphasize that they have resources coveted by outsiders. Thus, poverty can be defined as the deprivation of resources that they already have, rather than the absence of additional resources that might add to their well-being. According to the Lumads of northwestern Mindanao, they cannot be poor in areas where they have the forest resources for their food and health needs, where there is peace, and where there is an indigenous system of mutual support.

Several development needs and aspirations can be discerned. A main demand is full implementation of the IPRA in order to develop their land and regain territories lost through cheap sales or acquisition. A second is education. Indigenous peoples see the importance of sending their children to school, even at high cost, often seeing good education as a passport out of farming. Some Higaonon, for example, have abandoned traditional practices of arranged child marriages to enable their children to complete high school or university education. Third, there are demands for livelihood programs and financial assistance, as indigenous communities clearly aspire to higher incomes to meet their household needs. Fourth, they demand a measure of self-governance and respect for their cultures. Fifth, they demand the means to protect themselves and their resources. Sixth, they demand improved infrastructure as a means for increased productivity. Finally, they are requesting more meaningful participation in the development process. In consequence, the living space of groups that formerly depended on shifting cultivation has now been limited to the few hectares of land allocated to them.

VIET NAM

Consultants visited several villages of the Northern and Central Highlands in Viet Nam, conducting focus-group meetings and household visits to both the poorest families and individuals, and also those considered to be better off. The main perceptions of poverty by the ethnic minority communities can be grouped under five main headings, covering respectively: food security, basic conditions for production and livelihood, economic activities, health and education, and family networks and cultural changes.

Food Security

The lack of food security appears to be the primary concern of poor ethnic minorities. Food production deficits average between 3 and 6 months for most villages. Food for ethnic minorities is defined generally as rice and other resources such as tubers, leaves, vegetables, and other forest and aquatic products. Low cash income is not cited as a difficulty. Rather than wage labor, ethnic minorities still prefer working on their own rice fields to ensure the harvest for the next season: “You never know how much money is enough to buy rice to feed the family.”

Many people nevertheless also seek off-farm employment. They receive Vietnamese dong (D)10,000–15,000 (about US$0.66–1.00) per day, equivalent to 6 kilograms of rice and enough food for a household of 5 people for one day. Thus, most of this income is absorbed by the expenditures for household goods and supplementary foods. The need for new products, which were not used for their livelihood previously, contributes to further expenditure. For cooking, ethnic minorities used rice and other forest products. They previously burnt a special type of plant and used the ash for salt. Nowadays, due to forest degradation, these resources are not as plentiful. The people are buying oil, sea salt, and other additives for cooking.
Basic Conditions for Production and Livelihood

Land shortage is perceived as one of the causes of poverty. In one village surveyed, three quarters of the agricultural land is under rubber trees. According to commune leaders, the process to secure land for rubber farms was quite straightforward. Farm representatives proposed the plan for a rubber plantation to the Commune People's Committee, which allocated the land accordingly. This process was done without consultation with local people. They were then forced to move further into the forest to look for new patches of land for cultivation. In Kong Plong district, only one fourth of the communes have land for wet rice. The rest continue to practice upland rice in infertile areas of young regeneration forest due to increasing demands and the ban on shifting cultivation of the Government. This leads to unprecedented reduction in upland rice production.

If you go to visit a household and cannot meet them for 2 weeks or a month, you can be sure that they are poor people. Only poor people cannot afford to work near the village, as there is no fertile land left. They often stay in the forest for weeks with their children.—A district indigenous officer.

According to traditional beliefs, agricultural land and forests were communal property. Households and family clans were entitled to exploit and use land on the basis of their strict observance of the customary laws. There was no purchase of land or other assets.

In Dak Xu, the commune moved to the roadside in 1987 due to the resettlement program. Not only has their lifestyle changed, but the land has also assumed a monetary value. Land disputes between the indigenous people and migrants have become intense in the communes where the research took place.

Land-grabbing incidents and land disputes happen so often in our village. Before we were not aware of the value of land. Now we have to compete with outsiders who are a lot faster than us.

Before ethnic minorities can secure enough land for their households, all the more fertile land has gone either to outsiders or to people who have access to cash. The transition from a subsistence to a cash economy has caused a number of difficulties for ethnic minority groups, who are ill-prepared to face a new social structure with more market-oriented values.

They now even charge for domestic animals such as cats or dogs, which they used to give away for good luck.—A woman interviewed.

Since the early 1990s, when the market economy took off in lowland areas, migrants have arrived in the Central Highlands from the deltas. They rent or buy land from the indigenous peoples. At the same time, they also secure land by hiring indigenous persons or northern upland migrants to clear forests for arable land. This cash flow has changed the land-clearing pattern of the indigenous communities. Instead of clearing enough land for cultivation, they clear to make money. Other minority groups, who come almost empty-handed, also create heavy pressure on land clearing for cultivation. Under these circumstances, large-scale land trading and clearing have influenced land use and cultivation patterns of the indigenous people in several ways.

First, income from land selling or renting has motivated indigenous peoples to clear more land and move further inside the forest. The open market has exposed both the indigenous peoples and the migrants to perennial and fruit crops in the area. However, success in growing these crops depends a great deal on familiarity with complicated techniques and market price fluctuations. Having better access to information and being cash holders, Kinh people tend to be more successful than the ethnic minorities. Ethnic minorities often find it difficult to adapt to the changes. Therefore, they tend to sell or rent land and move away to continue their traditional agricultural practices. The more adventurous indigenous households decide to keep up with the change. However, when problems (e.g., drop in pricing or natural disasters) occur, they tend to sell land and move away instead of continuing to grow other crops.

The lack of land and inability to expand into forest areas have drastically stopped land trading in many villages. In the surveyed sites, ownership of land for ethnic minorities nowadays has become, more than ever, crucial for their survival.

Once you sell land, it means hunger for your family. There is nowhere to go to clear land anymore.
Most poor people interviewed either have no idea of the land-use rights certificate referred to as the “red card” or have not yet been granted one. Allocating land-use rights requires measuring, mapping, and determination of “origins,” and other steps. These steps are extremely time-consuming. In addition, red cards are granted only for agricultural land. In Chu Pah district, only 21% of the total agricultural land has been mapped and allocated red cards. The cost for measuring was abolished in 2001. According to district officers, indigenous peoples do not appreciate the significance and security over land provided by the red cards. Their concept of customary rights over land remains intact. The allocation process frequently becomes locked in dispute when land allocation rights are sought over an area that is claimed by others under customary systems.

Apart from the ignorance regarding new developments such as the cash value for land, poor indigenous peoples are often uneducated and are marginalized from village meetings—the only source of information on the Government’s new laws and directives. Even if they attend such meetings, they find it difficult to understand fully what is most essential to them.

Lack of good shelter also presents problems. Poor people in surveyed areas live in small temporary shelters made from leaves, bamboo, and mud. These shelters are not stable and are often located near upland rice fields, which are far from villages. Such distance prevents them from adapting quickly to a new lifestyle and concepts.

She has always lived in her rice field since she does not have a house in the village. She cannot attend the activities and events. She does not know the value of land now and, therefore, she does not feel the necessity to obtain a red card.

Economic Activities

In Chu Pah, the rice fields of ethnic minorities are mostly located near streams to take advantage of the natural water flows for irrigation. They have only one harvest of wet rice a year. An increase to two harvests annually to this community requires intensification techniques, which are not adequately provided by extension workers. Before 1985, villagers in Dak Lung worked in a collective farm subsidized by the Government for seedlings, fertilizer, and provision of technical assistance. During this period, ethnic minority households received their shares of rice at the end of the harvest. Since the 1990s, after the breakdown of this collective system, ethnic minorities have been left with no knowledge of how to start generating sufficient foods and incomes. Now, land is allocated to individual households. This change from subsistence economy to semi-subsidized and finally to an open-market economy has confused a large proportion of ethnic minorities.

Ethnic minorities are not familiar with cash-oriented economy. Thus, most women in Dak Xu, for example, are not capable of paying back loans from credit programs. According to them, after the provision of credits ends, poor people become poorer. The loan and the interest are beyond their capacity to return.

We do not know what to do with the money given as a loan. We do not know how to plan and moderate our income-generating activities and expenditure. And how can we pay back the loan with such interest?

Price fluctuations are a further problem. Coffee has been the most popular and lucrative cash crop in the Central Highlands. The severe drop in its price over the last 2 years has caused some serious dilemmas for the inhabitants, especially the indigenous peoples. Most of the cash available in the households was invested in fertilizer and irrigation for this demanding crop. Nowadays, in many villages, people cut down coffee trees to grow new crops. The majority of the population nevertheless continues to wait for the price to recover. In almost every village, ethnic minorities complained about this sudden change and blamed the Government for not keeping their promise in buying the products. Many are confused as to what to grow to generate cash incomes after chopping down these trees.

Health and Education

Most of the poorest households are either female-headed or headed by people with disability or poor health. Disability and poor health are always cited as the first signs of poverty. In all surveyed communes, there is at least one health center with between three
and four staff. However, these health centers are either too far away or not well equipped and without necessary medicines to deal with conventional diseases. Further, ethnic minorities have almost stopped using traditional herbal medicines due to the depletion of these herbs and restricted access to them. Most forest areas are managed by either state farms or state forest enterprises.

In many places, the Government subsidizes medicine for common diseases, but in some surveyed communes, people have to pay for medicine, which is not available at health posts and only sold at local pharmacies. Most of the time, poor people cannot afford to pay for medicine. For instance, medicine for headaches costs them 2 days of labor. Furthermore, only sick persons themselves can buy or be given medicine. Most poor people live alone, or are disabled, weak, or too far away from health posts.

There are only a few primary schools in the research villages. Most are built by villagers and have only one or two rooms. There are no boarding schools at the commune level. Sending children to the only boarding school in a district is beyond the financial capacity of villagers. The district selects two students from each village and pays for their education at this school.

**Family Networks and Cultural Change**

Poverty is often explained by family breakdown, including divorce, widowhood, and domestic violence.

*My husband left me when I was struck with illness and became paralyzed. For a long time, I could not work to support my son and myself. I do not have any relatives in this village, as my husband is a Kinh man. My son has now grown up. He is the only source of income for my household.*

Most indigenous groups living in the surveyed areas are matriarchal. Different generations used to share the same house called the “long house”. The oldest woman in a long house is the owner of the house, and is the one with all the knowledge and experience of household management, agriculture, and other business. Nowadays, this tradition is disintegrating and is being replaced by nuclear families. Nuclear families live in separate houses and have their own piece of land. Inheritance was mentioned as a cause for poverty by young ethnic minorities. Young girls get married and leave home without properly learning cultivation techniques and experiences from their parents.

*It is difficult to start everything now. Luckily, my mother and I still live near each other. I can learn slowly from her things that I do not know.*

Some women interviewed said their husbands now engage in activities and distractions, particularly related to alcohol, which did not exist previously in their villages. The women pointed out this phenomenon as a cause of poverty.

Ethnic minorities used to live in such remote areas that communication with the outside world was almost nonexistent. The village was the basic social unit. In the Central Highlands, it is also the highest level of social organization. The villagers do not know any other social structure beyond it. Their lives have been regulated by customary laws. *Gia lang*—the most respected person—or the *gia lang* council manages all issues related to administration. The impact of the development process has been drastic changes to the traditional institutions of the indigenous people. In the past, the villagers went to *gia lang* to seek advice on issues related to nature, climate, and forest to make decisions on farming and livelihood. Drastic changes in the living environment, technologies, farming organization, lifestyle, and state interventions and laws have limited the role of *gia lang*. Nowadays, the village chief, who is elected by the villagers and approved by the commune leaders, manages administrative issues. Also, there are new mass organizations and higher administrative levels beyond the village. However, in the project survey, the indigenous peoples were found to still highly appreciate their traditional institutions for management of village issues. All informants expressed the need to have customary laws and *gia lang* in the village.

The poor speak about their inability to fully participate in festivals and rituals. In the past, when wood was used for household construction purposes, rituals were required before cutting down a tree because, according to indigenous religious belief, trees have souls like human beings. Nowadays, wood is harvested on an industrial scale and traded for cash by outsiders. The forests close to villages have been rapidly disappearing. Access to wood and other forest resources is very limited.
Nha rong (the communal house) is the cultural center for ethnic minorities. Ethnic minorities used to gather in the nha rong every night talking, drinking, dancing, and exchanging experiences regarding their livelihood practices. In all surveyed villages, people are now settling in flat areas along the roads. The nha rong has disappeared with all its rituals or been transformed into a place called a cultural hall of different design and with a tin roof. This new nha rong is not acknowledged or accepted by the communities as a part of their cultural life. According to ethnic minorities, nha rong is also the place where poor people can learn from those better off. There is no longer a mechanism for sharing and exchanging knowledge and experiences as in the past.
INTRODUCTION

This section examines the role of international assistance in providing support for poverty reduction policies and programs as they affect indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. Clearly, the scope of such interventions can be very considerable. They can range from overall support for policy formulation and its implementation, to large-scale loan support for infrastructure or investment projects as they affect these vulnerable groups, technical assistance of various kinds, and “safeguard” approaches, which (as reflected in ADB’s Policy on Indigenous Peoples) can be designed to protect these groups from the potentially adverse effects of development interventions. Projects and programs, as noted earlier, may or may not be targeted specifically at indigenous peoples and ethnic minority groups.

It is also important to distinguish between the role of multilateral financial institutions, other international organizations such as UNDP and other agencies of the UN system, bilateral donor agencies, and the various NGOs active in this area, including those of the indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities themselves.

Here, we identify the main objectives and approaches of international assistance and how the various actors involved can complement each other, using their own particular “niche” in accordance with their mandates and expertise. This is an issue of much importance for the proposed regional action plan on capacity building and poverty reduction of indigenous peoples.

Specific attention is given to the activities and approaches of ADB for two reasons. First, one of the principal objectives of the present regional technical assistance is to improve the implementation quality of ADB-financed loans. The terms of reference provided that ADB’s interventions through projects and programs should be evaluated, mainly but not only through selecting up to two projects in each country to assess the nature and effectiveness of implementation procedures.

Second, as became clear throughout the project’s implementation, it is not only through its loan interventions that an organization like ADB is well equipped to deal with indigenous and ethnic minority poverty concerns. The ADB Policy on Indigenous Peoples emphasizes very strongly the need for a policy framework, objective knowledge and information, and accurate and effective representation of indigenous peoples, among other things. To date, ADB’s main operational instrument for addressing these concerns has been the Indigenous Peoples’ Development Plan, which is applied essentially at the individual loan and project level. However, as ADB staff, government officials, and other informed stakeholders regularly commented in the course of this project, a project-based approach is often not the most suitable one for addressing very complex concerns of ethnicity and poverty reduction. An equally important question is how to incorporate these concerns within the overall policy dialogue, support for strategic law and policy reforms, country sector programming, overall participatory poverty assessments, poverty partnerships between ADB and the country concerned, medium-term planning, and much else. Thus, this review of ADB experience adopts a broader perspective in the interests of finding the most comprehensive approach possible in formulating a regional action plan.
REGIONAL SUPPORT FOR POLICY AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: THE UNITED NATIONS EXPERIENCE

International Labour Organization

The ILO derives its mandate on this issue from its standard-setting initiatives on indigenous and tribal peoples, in particular its Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, No. 169 of 1989. Although not as yet ratified by any country in Southeast Asia (India, Bangladesh, and Pakistan have ratified an earlier ILO instrument on the same subject), Convention No. 169 has had a strong influence on the indigenous peoples policies of other international organizations including ADB and the World Bank. It has also been a strong point of reference for the 1997 IPRA in the Philippines, which repeats several of its provisions and is clearly influenced by the Convention. The spirit of the Convention, as most relevant to poverty reduction programs, is that indigenous peoples should exercise as much control as possible over their own development and institutions, and participate in the formulation and implementation of plans and programs for national and regional development that may affect them directly. The Convention also has strong provisions on land, requiring governments to take the necessary steps to identify the lands that indigenous and tribal peoples traditionally occupy, and to guarantee effective protection of their rights of ownership and possession. Governments have responsibility for developing, with the participation of the peoples concerned, coordinated action to protect their rights; the responsible government authority shall ensure that agencies or other appropriate mechanisms exist to administer programs.

With this mandate, ILO has provided policy advice to a number of Southeast Asian countries, including Cambodia, Lao PDR, Philippines, and Viet Nam. In Viet Nam, it has developed programs with the state agency CEMMA, including pilot projects on natural resource management and women’s workload in ethnic communities. In Cambodia, it has provided technical assistance to the IMC, mainly in the form of technical advice and capacity building relating to the government’s draft policy. A series of workshops was organized in 1997. Important policy advice has also been provided to Lao PDR.

More directly related to poverty reduction at grassroots level has been ILO’s Inter-Regional Programme to Support Self-Reliance of Indigenous and Tribal Communities Through Cooperatives and Self-Help Organizations (INDISCO). Originally launched in 1993 with support from the Danish Government, it has projects in Southeastern Asian countries including Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, and Viet Nam. The focus has been on pilot projects, demonstrating viable models of participatory indigenous peoples’ development through a number of country-specific initiatives. INDISCO claims that in some pilot areas the living standards of indigenous peoples have been raised considerably. In Viet Nam, the program has concentrated its activities in Yen Bai Province, establishing some 40 self-managing groups among ethnic minorities; and supporting income-generating activities through technical training on business development and revolving loan-fund credit. In the Philippines, it has managed pilot projects in both the Cordillera region and Mindanao and Sulu, handing these over to partner organizations in 1999. It has recently promoted the establishment of two indigenous knowledge resource centers, enabling indigenous peoples to take over project management from INDISCO and continue on their own. The strategy for 2000–2003 aims to disseminate best practices and to combine field activities with policy interventions.

The approach can be illustrated from the INDISCO experience in the Philippines. One prerequisite for its assistance is that land tenure of the community must be secured. Even in the absence of a formal land or ancestral domain title, the community must be aware of their land rights and ready to defend them. A second criterion has been to work with existing indigenous institutions. INDISCO has respected traditional indigenous methods of electing their leaders, encouraging the strengthening and consolidation of tribal councils and formation of broader federations. Building on its practical experience in different regions, INDISCO has recently undertaken a 3-month “scoping project” with UNDP support, to provide guidance for the new NCIP.

Highland Peoples’ Programme

The Highland Peoples Programme (HPP) for Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand, and Viet Nam began in...
1995, following initiatives taken in connection with UNDP’s Year of Indigenous Peoples in 1993. It has been a joint initiative of UNDP and the United Nations Volunteer program, using volunteers for many of its country programs. The declared objectives were first, to increase organizational capacities and opportunities in selected highland communities in participatory planning, and to increase the support capacities of the responsible governments; and second, to establish mechanisms and procedures for dialogue and exchange of experiences and information on highland peoples’ development at regional, national, and local levels. As with ILO’s INDISCO approach, it first undertook pilot projects in a limited number of villages in Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Viet Nam. Its second objective was implemented through various regional workshops and study tours. It had a limited budget of US$1.1 million for its first period (1995–1998), the assumption being that it would have a catalytic role on highland peoples’ development in the subregion.

In both Cambodia and Viet Nam, the government focal agencies for the HPP were the same as for the present project, namely IMC in Cambodia and CEMMA in Viet Nam. CEMMA carried out pilot projects in four provinces of the North and Central Highlands and, in early 1998, a workshop was held for all organizations working in highlands peoples’ development. In Cambodia, the main contribution was to help the IMC develop its policy guidelines for highland peoples’ development through a participatory process. No pilot projects as such were implemented by the IMC. Instead, the HPP’s pilot activities were integrated within a large UNDP project in the northeastern province of Ratanakiri. A mid-1998 evaluation considered that the HPP has been successful in its first phase. It had “made substantial achievement in terms of capacity building in select highland communities and the government support structure,” and had had a catalytic effect. However, it was found that there had been limited cooperation with other projects (including those of NGOs) working on highland peoples development, and also limited learning from traditional culture and knowledge in the pilot projects. It was recommended that the HPP’s own pilot projects should be limited in size and number; that the HPP should focus on building networks for exchange of experiences and information; and that it would continue to support the development of policy guidelines when opportunities arose.40

A second phase of HPP commenced in November 1999, but by early 2001 no additional activities had been undertaken except in Viet Nam. Activities in Viet Nam included training programs for CEMMA officials on participatory development for ethnic minorities, dissemination of lessons learned, and networking. A mid term evaluation conducted early in 2001 contained certain criticisms of the program and its approach. These confirm some opinions encountered during the present project. In Cambodia, for example, the creation of IMC appears to have been instigated by the HPP, and its profile has been greatly diminished since the HPP effectively ceased its activities in that country. There appears to have been no sense of national ownership and the IMC has in recent times been operating on a shoestring budget. In Viet Nam, the capacity of CEMMA to implement activities at the local level has often been called into question. It has proved difficult to find a suitable mix between its advisory, security, and operational roles. A possible lesson to be learned from the HPP experience in the Mekong subregion is that it is very difficult to contribute effectively to policy and its implementation in indigenous and ethnic minority areas without a presence on the ground through concrete activities.

OTHER UNITED NATIONS ACTIVITIES: CAMBODIA, PHILIPPINES, AND VIET NAM

In Cambodia, an important focus of UN activities has been in Ratanakiri, which together with Mondulkiri has the highest proportion of highland indigenous peoples. UNDP’s CARERE program in Ratanakiri between 1996 and 2000, as an experiment in decentralized planning and participatory development, has given much attention to indigenous concerns. In particular, its community-based natural resource management project has demonstrated the close linkages between indigenous livelihoods and surrounding natural resources. Several training workshops were organized on land and forest use by indigenous communities of the region in conjunction with the wide network of NGOs active in this region.41

In the Philippines, UNDP entered into an agreement with the Government in 1997 to undertake
a preparatory assistance project relating to indigenous management of their ancestral domains. At that time, before the adoption of the IPRA, the designated executing agency of Government was the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). Five areas were identified for capacity building, including support for policy reform; development and advocacy aimed at the protection of indigenous rights; strengthening of national and community-based capacities to accelerate ancestral domain delineation and mapping, and issuance of certificates of ancestral domain; support to the management of ancestral domains by indigenous peoples; capacity building for indigenous knowledge systems and practices; and strengthening indigenous peoples organizations. Workshops and consultations were held. A revised capacity-building program was prepared in mid-2001. Its components include strengthening NCIP in such crucial issues as mapping, which has hitherto been conducted mainly through the assistance of NGOs.

In Viet Nam, UNDP has played an active role in the Poverty Task Force. Recently it coordinated a special study on poverty reduction for ethnic minorities, proposing a set of socioeconomic development targets specifically for these groups.

NONGOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION INITIATIVES

There have been numerous NGO initiatives related in at least some way to poverty reduction for indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. Following is a broad overview.

In Cambodia, mention has already been made of the important NGO initiatives in Ratanakiri. Several international and national NGOs have worked in close collaboration with international organizations and local government. They have combined technical work, for example on resource management and community mapping, with advocacy on law and policy reforms. Others have focused on health and education policies and programs. An interesting recent initiative is support by some international NGOs for the creation of a highland peoples’ organization.

In the Philippines, the number of NGOs working with or on behalf of indigenous peoples is extremely large. Advocacy NGOs played a key role with regard to the IPRA. Others, such as Philippine Action for Intercultural Development, have taken a lead with regard to community mapping. An important feature of the Philippines is the existence of indigenous peoples’ organizations at either national or regional levels, as well as the local level. For example, a National Confederation of Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines was formally created in 1998, aiming to unify all indigenous federations, to formulate action plans, and to help strengthen local organizations. Other objectives include consolidating the development of ancestral domains; and further institutionalizing the beliefs, traditions, cultures, and institutions of indigenous peoples throughout the Philippines. A Tribal Communities Association of the Philippine is active nationwide except in Muslim areas. It is strong on advocacy and also provides legal assistance to indigenous peoples charged with such offences as illegal logging, and in researching conflicts arising from claims to ancestral domains. An example of a more regional organization is the Cordillera Peoples Alliance.

In Indonesia, an NGO movement has grown in recent years. An initial lead on indigenous concerns was taken by the environmental NGO WALHI in the early 1990s, taking an advocacy position on indigenous land and other rights. Many NGOs are now addressing land and resource rights, both in Jakarta and at regional and provincial levels. Some of these, as in West Kalimantan, are advocating indigenous rights by reference to such international instruments as ILO’s Convention No. 169. As in the Philippines, NGOs have taken a strong lead on participatory community mapping. In West Kalimantan, for example, the NGO Pancur Kasih created a community mapping facilitation unit, through which some 150 communities had mapped their lands and forests by 2000. Pancur Kasih also developed a credit union, blending microfinance with awareness-building activities. The scheme was originally developed in 1997 to meet the ordinary credit needs of the organization’s activists. The credit union came to be seen as an effort to develop the economy of adat communities, particularly for the Dayak peoples of Kalimantan. Activities spread to East and South Kalimantan and Siberut, and the union evolved from being a simple credit cooperative to a holding company with diverse business assets.

In Viet Nam, international NGOs have been most active in programs and projects on behalf of ethnic
minorities. An ethnic minority working group was formed under the leadership of Oxfam Hong Kong, China. A fairly recent development is the formation of national Vietnamese NGOs working with ethnic minorities. The NGO Toward Ethnic Women has worked with poor highland minority communities since 1994. It has focused on increasing the confidence of marginalized farmers and knowledge of their fundamental rights, providing them with opportunities to improve skills in natural resource management, savings and credit, and in public health and hygiene among other areas. The Centre for Indigenous Knowledge Research and Development works with ethnic minority farmers to reach development targets by developing pilot models based on indigenous knowledge and traditional culture. Both these NGOs work in close collaboration with the Centre for Human Ecology Studies of the Highlands, a research and networking organization that aims to improve the quality of life of highland ethnic minority communities in the Mekong subregion and Yunnan Province of the People’s Republic of China.

**EXPERIENCE OF THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK**

**Identification of Relevant Projects**

In principle, several projects in the participating countries were considered potentially relevant for review. In the Philippines, at least 10 ADB-sponsored projects are either targeted at indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities or considered to affect them significantly. In Indonesia, there are at least 9 such projects. In Viet Nam there are at least 5 and (in view of a decision to focus on poverty reduction in the central region) this number is expected to increase in the near future. In Cambodia, many of the relevant interventions have been through technical assistance, although it is considered that ADB-sponsored projects earmarked for indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities may also expand in the near future.

Choosing specific projects was nevertheless not an easy task. Should the emphasis be on past, ongoing, or pipeline projects? Should it be on loan projects, or on other forms of intervention such as technical assistance? Should the exercise cover similar sectoral projects in the different countries, or attempt the maximum diversity? Should the emphasis be on projects that are designed very largely to benefit indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities? Or should it also address “safeguard” concerns, when the projects are of more general coverage but may also have an impact on indigenous peoples?

The aim was to derive the maximum number of lessons, as varied as possible, in order to guide future ADB activities and interaction with the governments concerned over what are sometimes quite sensitive issues; and to identify issues and problems in such a way that they can be incorporated within a future action plan.

In Cambodia, significant loan projects have not affected indigenous areas. However, the ADB program in Cambodia is now expanding quite rapidly, also covering overall poverty reduction and key policy concerns. In this context, it was considered most useful to concentrate on relevant technical assistance projects, and to examine the extent to which these have been implemented in accordance with the ADB Policy on Indigenous Peoples and in collaboration with Cambodian indigenous peoples and relevant state entities.

In Indonesia, attention was given both to ongoing projects and to a pipeline project shortly to be implemented. The focus was on the outer islands of Kalimantan and Sulawesi, where there are substantial adat or indigenous communities. A key issue is how adat or indigenous concerns are being addressed in the context of regional autonomy and decentralization programs.

The Philippines provided an opportunity for a dual approach. In the Cordillera, there has for several years been implementation of an ADB poverty project affecting predominantly indigenous peoples. This provided the opportunity to examine consultative procedures, assessing the extent to which the project interacted with indigenous institutions and knowledge systems. In Mindanao, where the bulk of future ADB assistance may now be directed, it was more difficult to identify specific projects. A more general approach has been taken, examining the extent to which indigenous concerns have been incorporated in project preparation.

In Viet Nam most attention was given to the new central region livelihood project that will have a significant impact on ethnic minorities in Kontum and other provinces of the Central Highlands. Some attention
was also given to the Northern Highlands, comparing ADB experience with World Bank projects, and with overall concerns in the policy dialogue.

**Poverty Partnerships and Analysis**

Of the participating project countries, formal partnership agreements on poverty reduction have now been signed between ADB and the governments of the Philippines and Indonesia.

The Philippines agreement makes a number of commitments directly concerned with indigenous peoples and their rights. Other commitments, such as those for Mindanao, imply respect for indigenous cultural demands. A program of asset reform to address problems of income and wealth inequality will include the distribution of ancestral domain claims to indigenous people. Commitments regarding agricultural modernization with social equity will address security of land tenure, indigenous peoples’ rights, and land reform and redistribution. In the context of special attention to ensuring peace and development in Mindanao, special interventions for development will include the implementation of culturally sensitive programs in health and education, and institutional reforms to improve the voice of Mindanaoans in government agencies and institutions. The agreement does not enter into detail on the above issues, establishing only general principles.

In the agreement with Indonesia, there is certainly an allusion to ethnicity concerns insofar as they affect poverty. It is observed that “New forms of poverty are emerging as a result of social tensions and outbreaks of sectarian or political violence. A further complication arises when the victims of unrest attempt to relocate themselves elsewhere. This is a disruptive influence in the receiving area regardless of the goodwill or lack thereof of the inhabitants. Displaced persons and refugees are a new problem in Indonesia and there are many challenges to developing appropriate approaches to deal with this issue.” Beyond that, the Government of Indonesia and ADB have agreed that poverty reduction is the government’s highest priority, and will be addressed inter alia through implementation of decentralization and development of good governance; enhancing local government transparency and accountability to reflect local needs and aspirations; strengthening community organizations; and accelerating development in remote areas. For implementing the agreement, good governance would be achieved by creating transparent and accountable decentralized institutions responsive to the needs of the poor. Such commitments provide ample scope for considering the role of adat institutions in local governance and community empowerment, particularly in remote areas.

In Cambodia, a draft participatory poverty assessment, prepared by the Government and ADB, contains a chapter on poverty among ethnic minorities. It covers inter alia the social exclusion of ethnic minorities, food insecurity and diminishing natural resources, and disenfranchisement of land-use rights and access to natural resources, physical infrastructure, and health and education. The assessment was made as a contribution to the draft Second Five-Year Socioeconomic Development Plan, 2001–2005, prepared with ADB technical assistance. The draft Plan contains certain commitments toward ethnic minorities. For example, ethnic minority groups, which subsist on what they gather or hunt from common property resources, will be given security of tenure over the use of these resources. The most acceptable means to safeguard the rights of traditional users is to give them long-term stewardship contracts with concerned government agencies. A partnership agreement on poverty reduction between ADB and the Government of Cambodia is currently being finalized.

In Viet Nam, a similar partnership agreement is also in draft form. The draft gives considerable attention to ethnic minorities and their social development. Ethnic minorities are considered together with the poor and with women in poor households as especially vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. The needs of ethnic minorities should be integrated into relevant ADB-assisted interventions. Examples in proposed areas of ADB support include the following: (i) while strengthening the institutional framework for agriculture, efforts will be made to improve the productivity of ethnic minorities; (ii) within secondary education, special attention will be paid to increasing access of ethnic minorities, and to involving communities in all phases of education delivery; and (iii) the health care system will be made more accessible to the poor and responsive to the needs of ethnic minorities. Immediate indicators in each of these areas
will be selected to measure the extent to which ethnic differences, as well as income and gender differences, are being addressed.

While in certain cases there is reference to specific poverty concerns of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, either directly or indirectly, there is little indication as to how the representatives of these groups have been involved in identifying their needs, or in formulating recommendations for suitable responses. An exception is perhaps Cambodia, where the participatory poverty appraisal involved a series of focus-group discussions within ethnic minority communities. Thus, thought needs to be given as to how indigenous peoples and their representative organizations can henceforth be involved more directly in exercises of this kind. The issue is discussed further in the final chapter.

**Country Strategies and Programs**

How have these ethnicity concerns or general commitments of partnership agreements on poverty reduction been translated into proposed activities within ADB country strategies and programs (CSPs)? A review was made of the CSP updates, 2002–2004, for Cambodia, Indonesia, and Philippines, and of a draft document for Viet Nam. Incorporation of ethnicity concerns within country strategies was also discussed on a regular basis throughout the project with ADB staff both at headquarters and at the Cambodian, Indonesian, and Viet Nam resident missions.

In most cases, there is very limited if any reference to indigenous and ethnic minority concerns. In the case of Cambodia, they do not figure at all. This is mainly because of the geographical location of most proposed new loan interventions, in the Khmer-populated lowlands.

More surprisingly, there is no direct reference to indigenous issues in the Philippines. These are not mentioned specifically in the substantive sections on such issues as human development, good governance, or environmental protection. There is nevertheless reference to pipeline projects, which would clearly have an impact on indigenous communities and their claims to ancestral domain. An example is a planned Community-Based Forest Resources Management project in Mindanao, with a tentative loan amount of US$40 million, for which the proposed executing agency is DENR. It is envisaged that a combination of short- and long-term forestry strategies could help increase self-reliance of upland communities, stimulating income and employment opportunities. A planned Mindanao Basic Education project, with a tentative loan amount of US$50 million, aims to achieve universal participation in education for students representing different sociocultural backgrounds. Children from cultural minorities, together with poor families, are identified as the main beneficiaries. In a planned US$75 million Rural Roads Development project, with a focus on Mindanao and the southern Philippines and the social issues to be addressed include indigenous peoples and land acquisition.

In Indonesia, the CSP provides ample scope for addressing ethnic concerns in different dimensions of development. Consistent with the Indonesian Government position, indigenous peoples and communities are not identified as such. But a number of planned projects provide opportunities for incorporating adat concerns. A planned US$150 million Poverty Reduction through the Land Rehabilitation and Management project aims to reduce poverty among people living on degraded forestlands in the outer islands. This should facilitate community-led integrated spatial planning and management of degraded forests and critical ecosystems. A second planned Community Empowerment for Rural Development project, with a projected US$150 million budget, aims to empower rural communities by strengthening their capacity to plan and manage their own activities. A planned Rural Poverty Reduction project, also with a projected budget of US$150 million, aims to help poor farmers increase agricultural productivity in areas including Central Kalimantan, Central Sulawesi, and East Nusa Tenggara. These are all areas where significant adat communities can be identified.

The draft CSP for Viet Nam stands out from the others. Ethnic minority issues figure very prominently. This may be explained by two factors. First, the Government has identified in its 2001–2010 socioeconomic strategy the need for special policies to support ethnic minorities. Second, the CSP has a geographical focus on the Central Region of Viet Nam where over 2 million ethnic minority people from 30 different ethnic groups, accounting for more than a quarter of Viet Nam’s ethnic minority population, reside. And within this geographical focus there is a strong
emphasis on the Central Highlands, where the poverty indicators for ethnic minorities are particularly acute. The proposed CSP, stressing the need to preserve the culture and diversity of ethnic minorities, observes that the development impact of past policies and programs for the development of ethnic minorities and remote areas should be carefully reviewed and assessed.

Project Assessment

Cambodia

In Cambodia, there is very little of relevance in specific loan projects to assess. Considerable attention was given to indigenous concerns in the context of an US$28.5 million Agricultural Sector Program approved in 1996, one component of which has been the drafting of the new Land Law. As noted earlier, advocacy groups lobbied strongly—and eventually with success—to have a special chapter on indigenous lands included in this law. The Land Titles Department initiated revision of the law in 1998. An ADB loan review mission in December 1998 then urged that a government draft be widely discussed with stakeholders before submission to the National Assembly. An ADB project manager and senior counsel participated in several meetings with international organizations and NGOs, at which the indigenous peoples’ section in particular was discussed. Technical assistance was also provided for the wording of this section. Further ADB technical assistance has since been provided on the implementation of land legislation. This covers the drafting of implementing regulations, public dissemination, and training of the judiciary.

An Education Sector Program was under preparation during the project. Social assessment was conducted of indigenous peoples targeted under the program. It identified difficulties in recruiting and retaining teachers in northeastern provinces, and difficulties for children to conform to the national education schedule because of the agricultural calendar (with the continuing use of swidden techniques). It formulated a number of recommendations including quotas for indigenous peoples, especially young women, to enter special training programs to become teachers; and sensitization programs (including the collection and publication of stories and myths from ethnic minorities) in order to promote a sense of indigenous cultural legitimacy within mainstream Cambodian society.

A study on the health and education needs of ethnic minorities was conducted by ADB consultants in 1999 as part of a regional technical assistance project in the Greater Mekong Subregion. It is a well-informed publication, but essentially comprises description and analysis without formulating operational recommendations.

A Cambodia country report was prepared by ADB consultants as part of a regional technical assistance project on Poverty Reduction and Environmental Management in Remote Greater Mekong Subregion Watersheds. The aim was to prepare a prefeasibility proposal for a possible Cambodian-ADB program on Poverty Reduction and Environmental Management in the Se San Watershed. The consultancy proposed a range of project interventions, covering institutional strengthening and capacity building, community development, livelihood systems development, infrastructure development, and environmental management. The intended target beneficiaries were rural communities of five districts in Ratanakiri and Stung Treng provinces, the main emphasis being on greater food security and development of income-generating activities. This report and its proposals were subsequently criticized by a network of NGOs in Ratanakiri, concerned at the absence of input by local communities into the project design. They argued that the procedures were inconsistent with the requirements of ADB’s Policy on Indigenous Peoples.

Indonesia

While no projects have been concerned specifically with adat communities, several have been implemented in locations where such communities are found. In such outer islands as Kalimantan and Sulawesi, a number of indigenous peoples’ development plans have been prepared. An example is the recently approved Community Empowerment for Rural Development project. This aims to revitalize poverty reduction efforts in the rural sector by supporting the government’s program to devolve development resources to local governments; and by strengthening the institutional and human resource capacity necessary to enable rural communities to plan and manage local development initiatives. It aims to move some 74,000 poor families
above the poverty line in 11 districts of 6 provinces of Kalimantan and Sulawesi islands. A further 40 districts from 20 new provinces are expected to benefit from the institutional and capacity-building program.

The indigenous peoples’ development plan prepared for this project follows the government definition of “isolated communities” under the then Ministry of Social Affairs Ministerial Decree, No. 5 of 1994. On this basis, it identifies indigenous people from 19 different ethnic groups in the project area. A project implementation unit at the district level is responsible for identifying subdistricts containing indigenous people within its jurisdiction, in consultation with relevant government departments and missionary groups, and those working in environmental conservation projects. Participating districts are encouraged to include those with concentrations of indigenous people.

The basic philosophy of this project’s indigenous component is mainstreaming. It is expected to bring positive benefits to indigenous peoples through access to mainstream services and improved governance. Participation is voluntary and indigenous communities must approve all works. In areas with large indigenous populations, it is assumed that the improvement in capability for local planning will permit more participation by otherwise marginalized groups and will legitimize social and ethnic diversity by strengthening local institutions.

The Sulawesi Rainfed Agriculture Development project, while not specifically targeting adat communities, has inevitably had an impact on these communities because of its geographical location. Located in different catchment areas of four Sulawesi provinces, the project has been funded by an ADB loan of US$30.36 million, with counterpart funding from the Government of Indonesia. It commenced in 1995 and was scheduled to be completed in 2002. The project aims generally to increase the productivity, incomes, and overall prosperity of farmers in the four catchment areas. Some specific objectives are to increase the farm incomes of rainfed farmers, to protect and improve the fragile upland environment, to reduce poverty, and to improve the socioeconomic conditions of women beneficiaries.

The project has undergone significant changes in its overall approach. As freely recognized by ADB staff and consultants, it began with a very top-down and target-driven approach, with inadequate consultation with local communities. More recently, it has shifted toward a more participatory and bottom-up approach, making community development its core component, and involving local NGOs in the identification of needs. The NGO members tend not to be from the target villages, although community development workers have been recruited from these villages, in the expectation that they will eventually assume the major responsibility for community assistance programs. Moreover, one task of the NGOs has been to facilitate the establishment of farmers’ entrepreneurship groups (Kelompok Usaha Bersama or KUBs), which are based on the existing natural groups in the village. Thus, the bottom-up and participatory approach of the revised project has naturally led to some identification and strengthening of local adat institutions in those parts of Sulawesi where these enjoy some legitimacy.

The pattern appears to have been repeated in other Indonesian projects during the 1990s. There was apparently no deliberate attempt to identify adat institutions as such in the outer islands for example, where, consistent with government philosophy, no real distinctions were drawn between adat communities and transmigrants. Such was the case of a community-based rubber plantation project in Sekolaq Darat, East Kalimantan, implemented between 1992 and 1998. The project aimed generally to provide assistance to small farmers in planting good quality rubber trees on their land. The project had no specific provisions for dealing with adat communities and institutions, apart from informing adat leaders of the existence of the project in the villages covered by it. Only in cases of land conflict might adat leaders be more directly involved. As the project would only deal with lands free of conflict, parties to land conflict were required by the implementing agency to settle such conflicts through either adat or formal law institutions as a prerequisite for involvement in the project.

More recently, in preparing a new generation of projects for governance and poverty reduction, ADB has been more concerned to understand and build on adat institutions. This is evident in a number of pipeline projects for the outer islands, in which these issues are to be covered in project preparatory technical assistance.

**Philippines**

In the Philippines, considerable attention was given to the ADB-financed Cordillera Highland...
Agricultural Resource Management (CHARM) project being implemented in three provinces of the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR), where indigenous peoples predominate. Although the loan project is not officially targeted at indigenous peoples and communities, they are likely to comprise at least 90% of the intended beneficiaries.

The project aims to reduce poverty in the CAR by increasing annual household incomes of smallholder farm families in the target area from US$820 in 1994 to US$2,170 by 2006. In 1991, 70% of the population had incomes below the poverty threshold of pesos (P)40,000 (approximately US$1,540) per annum for a family of six. The project aims to reduce the number of poor families to not more than 25%. Project implementation started in 1997 and was scheduled to end in March 2003. The project cost is US$41.4 million, funded by loans from ADB and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The lead implementing agency is the Department of Agriculture. Other government agencies have been involved in aspects of implementation, including DENR, Department of Agrarian Reform, National Irrigation Authority, and local government units.

Project components were based on participatory rural appraisals undertaken in 47 villages in 12 municipalities initially identified as within the project area. Priority needs were identified as access infrastructure—roads, vehicles, footbridges, and tramlines; water for irrigation and domestic use; and village market facilities.

The CHARM project was designed before the adoption of ADB’s Policy on Indigenous Peoples. A development strategy was nevertheless prepared for indigenous cultural communities, aiming to ensure their informed participation and to use their traditional processes for community action. Overall, the project appears to have responded to expressed needs of indigenous communities. Community participation has been accomplished successfully through active involvement in a village-level natural resource management plan. Conducted on an annual basis, this plan identifies priority needs and specific activities to be implemented over the next year. This participatory approach has been the project’s main strength, building the capacity and confidence of indigenous peoples to plan, implement, and evaluate activities. Another strength is efforts to secure the appropriate tenure instruments for ancestral lands and domains. It has also responded to the needs of indigenous peoples for greater market access and food self-sufficiency.

A perceived weakness, discussed at some length during the present project’s provincial workshop in Baguio, has been the absence of systematic attempts to work through, and to strengthen, viable indigenous institutions. Such a component or methodology was not included in the original CHARM project document. The project has actually initiated some activities to enhance such institutions, as in the case of Abra Province where the traditional system is now being improved. But there are several traditional institutions for forest management and protection, of which the project might have been able to avail. There have also been concerns that insufficient use was made of local expertise for project implementation. An example was a case in Benguet Province, where a road construction project was awarded to a private contractor rather than to a community-based group.

In Mindanao, a new generation of projects is now being prepared, likely to have at least some impact on indigenous peoples. A Mindanao Basic Education Development project has been under preparation for some time, aiming to expand educational projects for poor and vulnerable groups. Among the target groups are indigenous communities seeking access to mainstream public education and alternative forms of education, including nonformal, and livelihood education. An indigenous peoples’ development plan was prepared for this project in 1998, outlining a tentative basic education strategy for indigenous communities. The project also aims to focus on Muslim schools in order to establish a culturally relevant and appropriate curriculum for Muslim and nonMuslim populations.

Indigenous concerns have been addressed quite systematically in the context of a Rural Livelihoods in Mindanao Forestlands project currently under preparation. This project aims to address the needs of the rural poor located in forestlands through an increase in land productivity in areas not suitable for agriculture, as well as the provision of alternative sources of livelihood. It aims to involve the direct participation of some 15,000 households, of which approximately 60% are identified as indigenous peoples. Several certificates of ancestral domain have already been issued within the proposed project area by DENR.
An initial social assessment for this project provided an overview of the indigenous peoples in the project area and their sociocultural features; of land tenure and indigenous production systems; and of the poverty level and economic indicators. It found that average annual incomes per family are well below the annual poverty threshold, and that subsistence farming fills the void for food requirements. Poverty of an indigenous group like the Ata-Manobo is attributed to geographical location, which impedes the provision of basic social services. A contributory factor is the peace and order situation, sufficiently volatile to warrant fear in the delivery of social services. The initial assessment identifies a number of potentially negative impacts of the project. These include the rising value of real estate adjacent to project sites, which may cause the Ata-Manobo to sell their lands; a distortion of social relations through more intensified involvement with the market economy; and the possible emergence of a local elite. Proposals are put forward for measures including legal assistance to protect territory and resources, and livelihood assistance for enterprise development. All project initiatives should be directed through an organized council of elders for approval.

**Viet Nam**

In Viet Nam, the most important experience has been with new poverty reduction projects in the Central Highlands. A Central Region Livelihood Improvement project was approved by the ADB Board of Directors in April 2001. It aims to ensure that the poor in upland communes of several provinces, including Kon Tum in the Central Highlands, achieve sustainable livelihoods through a reduction in the incidence of poverty in the project area. The project includes five components: household food security, income generation, community development, institutional strengthening, and project management support.

Considerable attention was paid to ethnic minority issues in project preparation. Technical assistance to this effect, financed from the Japan Special Fund, included the services of a rural sociologist to develop a project-specific minority peoples' development plan. This was to articulate the framework for the participation of minority peoples in project planning and implementation, based upon consultations with minority peoples and their representatives in the project area; and to assess poverty levels and other vulnerable groups' development opportunities and constraints, including consideration of cultural and linguistic aspects vis-à-vis ethnic minorities. On the basis of assessment, some important provisions have been included in the final project document. On land, for example, the project will seek to negotiate for land-use rights of one form or another for ethnic minority communities, in return for agreed management plans. The project document also raises certain concerns with regard to sedentarization and its compatibility with indigenous peoples' culture and institutions. The social development plans will examine existing plans for sedentarization and the communities' ideas on these will be submitted to district and provincial authorities for further review and discussion. Assurances are to be sought that the Provincial Peoples' Committees will support arrangements to extend community access to land rights on a sustainable basis.

The indigenous peoples' development plan for the project also aims to facilitate empowerment of ethnic minority communities by strengthening their participation in local development activities. The Plan's objectives are to be addressed through comprehensive consultations with the individual communities and villages as a precursor to social development plans for each commune. Assurances are that in all communes and villages, and particularly those where indigenous peoples are a minority, all indigenous groups are represented in the participatory community development process and priority is given to their concerns.

Similar plans—usually termed ethnic minority development plans in the Vietnamese context—have been prepared for other new and pipeline projects. For a rural health project, the plan supports the ongoing government strategy for ethnic minorities through project-specific components and a mainstreaming strategy. The former components include the production of ethnic minority handbooks for commune and village health workers, and where possible the translation of materials into ethnic minority languages.

Most recently, ethnic minority concerns have been addressed during the preparation of a Second Red River Basin Water Resources Sector project. This project aims to improve agricultural performance and incomes of poorer communities through sustainable improvements in irrigation, drainage, watersheds, and flood protection,
within a framework of integrated water resource management in the Red River Basin. All components are to be supported by rural development measures, or by special poverty reduction measures based on community demands. For the purposes of this project, it was decided after negotiation with the Government to incorporate, instead of ethnic minority development as such, guidelines on participation of ethnic minorities in the project. The emphasis is on mainstreaming and positive measures to improve incomes and livelihood. This includes greater incomes from upland farming activities through raising of crop yields and quality; maintaining ethnic identity through such traditional handicrafts as weaving and embroidery; and introducing improved but culturally appropriate farming technologies that will not alter traditional lifestyles and farming practices. Emphasis is given to safeguards in flood protection. For all activities, efforts are to be made to reach out to ethnic minority groups in their own language, using culturally appropriate techniques.
This chapter presents some of the main findings of the project and discusses their implications for future poverty reduction strategies, policies, and programs as they may affect indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. It prepares the ground for the presentation of a proposed action plan in the final chapter.

ETHNICITY AND POVERTY REDUCTION: THE CASE FOR DIFFERENTIATED TREATMENT

Fundamental questions are when and under what circumstances indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities should receive differentiated treatment in poverty reduction programs, and also what this differentiated treatment should include. Should it have different goals, responding to the different perceptions of these peoples? Should a program, project, or any of its components be “ethnically targeted”? Should there be very distinct procedures, to permit the effective participation of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in the design, implementation, and monitoring of programs?

The present project dealt with these questions from different angles, as presented in different chapters above. First, it discussed the complex issue of definition, among other things assessing how easy it is in practice to distinguish between indigenous and nonindigenous peoples in each of the countries. Second, it reviewed the law and policy framework, examining the extent to which there may be special provisions for these groups in national development and poverty reduction policies and programs. Third, a limited quantitative assessment (based on admittedly weak data) examined the possible correlation between ethnicity and poverty, and the case for ethnic targeting. Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, the study focused on the perceptions of these groups with regard to poverty and well-being. Finally, it examined the international experience, in particular ADB experience to date, assessing how these ethnicity concerns were dealt with in policies, programs, and projects.

One point stands out. There cannot be differentiated treatment unless there is a clear understanding of the target groups. This is what currently sets Indonesia (and to a lesser extent Cambodia) apart from the Philippines and Viet Nam. In Indonesia, there is a strong undercurrent of adat identity, manifest in new networks and community-based organizations throughout the archipelago. They are mobilized under a roughly similar banner of traditional land rights, recognition of customary law, and self-governance through customary institutions. But it is virtually impossible to estimate the numbers of such adat groups, first because of the absence of an official national definition and policy, and second because the criteria for inclusion depend as much on lifestyles and aspirations as on strictly ethnic factors. Certain ethnic groups may nevertheless be more likely than others to pursue or aspire toward an adat communal lifestyle. A great deal of anthropological work and participatory baseline studies would be necessary before serious consideration could be given to ethnically differentiated policies and programs.

The Philippines and Viet Nam present rather different, distinct, pictures. The Philippines has a legal definition of indigenous, which is potentially far reaching. It also has an elaborate law and policy framework, which allows for differentiated treatment. The main issues are ancestral domain and traditional land rights, together with local self-governance and respect for traditional institutions. There remain ambiguities over definition, for example, whether certain Islamized communities of Mindanao and Sulu would be candidates for inclusion under the “indigenous umbrella” if they so chose. The fieldwork under this project has pointed to indigenous
perceptions of poverty and well-being that provide very strong arguments for ethnically differentiated treatment. The concept of impoverishment can be strongly linked to dispossession from traditional land areas, and to the breakdown of communal structures and institutions. At the same time, indigenous respondents in the Philippines emphasized the need to have access to more income and education, and to have greater insertion within the market economy on their own terms. This seems to point to the need for a “development with identity” approach, which does not aim to insulate indigenous peoples from market forces, but rather seeks to adapt market structures to indigenous values and institutions. Yet, if this approach is to be pursued further, there is a need for far more systematic data collection and analysis to assess poverty trends for indigenous peoples in different parts of the country.

In Viet Nam, the arguments for ethnic targeting of policies and programs have been quite intensively discussed. There is a relatively clear understanding as to who comprise the ethnic minority groups, although proposals have been made in this project for refining the classifications. The existing classifications have nevertheless permitted some analysis of poverty trends for ethnic minorities in different geographical regions over time. Evidence of a growing poverty gap between ethnic minority and Kinh populations has led to some reconsideration of earlier policies and a growing acceptance that some targeting of resources may be necessary at least for the smaller ethnic minority groups. There is a broader policy debate concerning the purposes of such targeted policies. Past policies have tended to promote economic and social integration, but have not always been successful in reducing poverty among vulnerable groups. More attention is now being given to the scope for differentiated poverty reduction interventions, adapted to the particular situation and aspirations of different ethnic minority groups.

THE LAW AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

The present project has identified diverse law and policy frameworks in the participating countries. The concerns of this project have been not so much with indigenous identity and rights in general, as with their implications for poverty reduction strategies. It is necessary to review the fundamental principles on which a policy toward these vulnerable groups might be based.

At one end of the spectrum, policies can be based on the concept of special protection from outside forces or, at the other, on accelerated integration within mainstream society. Policies can be based on other principles, such as recognition of prior rights of “aboriginal” peoples over their lands and resources.

Policies in the project countries, albeit evolving in recent years, have shown a mix of these principles. Indonesia is understandably nervous of the concepts of indigenous peoples and indigenous rights, given the complex claims and even conflicts to which these concepts could give rise in such a culturally diverse country with a recent history of transmigration and other demographic movement. Cambodia has so far found it easier than neighboring Viet Nam to incorporate indigenous rights provisions in its new land law, perhaps because the issues and claims are more localized. Viet Nam has been able to direct resources at poor ethnic minority communities without having a formal policy on the subject. The emphasis has so far been mainly on integration, with uniform land and resource management policies, for example. There are signs that the Government may consider certain policy reforms, such as with regard to land adjudication.

The Philippines is the country with policies most anchored on the principles of special and ancestral rights, permitting differentiated treatment with regard to land rights and other concerns. The signs are that these ancestral domains and self-management policies will not be sufficient in themselves to achieve economic upliftment in those areas where poverty of indigenous communities is most serious. There is a need to combine these approaches with further policies and programs to ensure improved access to basic services and income-earning opportunities. One of the tasks of the NCIP is to achieve this, ensuring that all government departments and agencies give due attention to indigenous concerns.

POVERTY INDICATORS AND MEASUREMENT

The data needed for a rigorous quantitative assessment of poverty trends in indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities are unavailable in most countries. The
emphasis of the project was mainly on qualitative assessments in order to gain some idea of indigenous perceptions of poverty, its causes, recent trends, and possible remedies. The very preliminary findings are that poverty and wealth do have a very particular meaning for cohesive indigenous and ethnic minority communities, which seek to maintain their cultural integrity and which can equate the concept of poverty with loss of traditional values. At the same time, it should come as no surprise that indigenous peoples share the same aspirations as other population groups with regard to educational achievement, productivity, and income-earning opportunities. It should always be remembered that these peoples, while they wish to maintain the integrity of their community, may actually wish their children to earn a livelihood outside the community. They are not locked into a purely subsistence economy, but tend to have a foot in different economic environments.

Baseline studies of poverty in indigenous and ethnic minority communities need to examine these factors, if they are to be of real use for poverty reduction strategies. There is a need to examine the extent to which remittances are being sent from outside the communities, how much participation there is in external labor markets, and other aspects of integration within the wider national economy. Income inequalities within the community, including gender inequalities, also need to be assessed.

**LAND TENURE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Land tenure and rights were the most sensitive issues. In each country there has been either a reality or a threat of dispossession from traditional lands and forests. This has often been put forward as the principal cause of impoverishment, or intensification of poverty, in recent times. In some cases, serious land shortages are emerging. This problem has been identified in parts of Indonesia and Viet Nam, and in those parts of northeastern Cambodia close to urban centers. Reasons can include extensive settlement by nonindigenous peoples, sometimes spontaneous and sometimes officially sponsored by governments. In the Philippines, where the present Government has pledged to accelerate its program of titling ancestral domains, there are likely to be complex problems of overlapping claims between indigenous communities, mining and other concessionaires, and other external interests.

The appropriate policy response should vary with the individual situation and the nature of indigenous and ethnic minority demands. Where very significant areas of lands and environmental resources have been lost to outsiders, as in the case of certain Indonesian islands, there can be strong demands for restitution as well as regeneration of depleted environmental resources. In cases where indigenous lands are only now coming under serious threat from outside interests, the need can be for a very rapid program of identification, community mapping, demarcation, and titling. This will need some legal framework, as well as some mechanism for resolving conflicts between indigenous and outside land claimants. Where lands are to be titled communally, there is need for clarity as to the legal entity in which landownership is vested.

**CONSULTATIVE MECHANISMS AND TRADITIONAL INSTITUTIONS**

The project aimed to examine consultative mechanisms carefully. There is correctly a growing interest by ADB and others in the role of institutions in poverty reduction and development. Traditional indigenous and ethnic minority institutions can be very important agents of governance, enjoying strong legitimacy within the communities, with an important role in conflict mediation and resolution. But traditional institutions also change and may have been undermined by centralizing policies or by conflicts.

Indeed, with the possible exception of the Philippines, the role of traditional institutions in poverty reduction and development does not appear to be strong in the project countries. There are ongoing attempts to revitalize customary law institutions in Indonesia, to create new highland peoples organizations in Cambodia, and to recognize new ethnic minority consultative councils outside the official state structure in Viet Nam.

In establishing consultative mechanisms, it is also important to look beyond the merely local and community level. It has to be remembered that indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities are a very considerable proportion of national populations, at least...
in Indonesia, Philippines, and Viet Nam. Their interests, and the extent of their poverty reduction, will be affected by decisions at the national as well as local level. There is a corresponding need for consultative mechanisms that permit indigenous and ethnic minority representatives to be involved in policy formulation at different levels of society. Lessons may be learned from such bodies as the NCIP in the Philippines and Viet Nam's CEMMA.

INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

For international development assistance, the concern with indigenous peoples is quite recent but decidedly growing. Policy and program interventions by international agencies in the project countries have had mixed success. The mere drafting of a policy may not lead to effective results. However, as organizations like ADB give more emphasis to poverty reduction including targeting of the poorest geographical areas in developing member countries, there is likely to be ever more contact with indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities.

This has been the case in the project countries, with the exception of Cambodia where indigenous peoples are located mainly in one geographic region that has not been considered a priority for ADB assistance. This means that more poverty reduction projects have contained specific components for indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, and a number of indigenous peoples' development plans or ethnic minority development plans have been prepared for specific projects. There have also been cases where the bulk of intended beneficiaries of ADB projects, particularly poverty reduction projects in rural areas, have been indigenous peoples or ethnic minorities.

Nevertheless, adequate attention to the poverty concerns of these peoples can require policy dialogue with the governments to seek consensus on key policy reforms and promote meaningful consultation with the representatives of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities on national policy decisions that can affect them. There is scope for addressing these issues more comprehensively in partnership agreements on poverty reduction with the countries concerned and in CSPs.

In this regard, the experience with the project countries has been mixed. In Viet Nam there has been considerable attention to ethnic minority concerns in the CSP, and also in preparing the partnership agreement. In the Philippines, a very recent partnership agreement on poverty reduction makes reference to indigenous rights and to support for the government's issuance of ancestral domain titles for indigenous communities. It would be useful to find mechanisms through which representatives of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities could be consulted directly during the preparation of CSPs and partnership agreements on poverty reduction. This would be one more means of mainstreaming their concerns in national planning processes and in the programs and policies of government agencies concerned with different aspects of poverty reduction.
INTRODUCTION

A key objective of the project has been to propose a regional plan of action to address the poverty concerns of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. In presenting this action plan, some clarification is needed. For a project that has been financed and implemented by ADB, and which has reviewed ADB’s past activities in the participating countries, it is inevitable that some of the emphasis should be on the future activities and programs that can be undertaken by ADB itself. Components of the plan can guide the future approach and activities of ADB, and result in specific programs of technical assistance, research and analysis, and other interventions.

However, the action plan needs also to be of more general application, identifying policy concerns that can be addressed at the national level, and activities and programs that can be undertaken by national and international agencies, either governmental, intergovernmental, or nongovernmental. Some comparative advantages of the different actors will be identified in the next section.

Furthermore, the plan has to address procedural issues as well as specific activities and programs. A key concern of indigenous peoples throughout the world is that they should be consulted adequately, if possible through their own representative institutions, with regard to any development or investment projects that are likely to have an impact on their lands or livelihood. Getting the procedures right in order to secure the involvement of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in the process of their own development, can be as important as planning specific or targeted activities on their behalf.

A regional action plan also has to take due account of national differences. The context is very different, for example, in the Philippines, where the legal framework for recognizing indigenous rights and land security is firmly in place; and Indonesia, where these concerns are only now beginning to be placed on national policy agendas. Throughout the region there remain some concerns about definition (i.e., the population groups to be covered by the terms *indigenous peoples* and *ethnic minorities*) and the implications of the terms used for practical policies and programs.

Despite some underlying differences between the participating countries, this project has also identified some common challenges and opportunities. Some of these challenges are quite immense for national governments and civil society, and also for the international assistance and development community. Land adjudication policies and natural resource rights and management stand out as the most significant concerns around the Southeast Asian region, sometimes gathering in intensity in recent years. Community empowerment, the role of traditional institutions in governance and decentralization, consultative mechanisms, health, education, social services, language, and cultural recognition are some other common issues and challenges.

As pointed out earlier, the issues of ethnic or indigenous identity can be highly complex. Some governments may be reluctant to recognize the concept of indigenous peoples, fearing that this may lead to differentiated claims that can undermine national unity. However, as ADB President Tadao Chino emphasized during the regional workshop, failure to address the poverty concerns of vulnerable ethnic minorities can undermine national harmony and spill over into serious interethnic tensions.
Even so, the purpose of identifying a population group as indigenous or ethnic minority needs to be clearly understood. To cite President Chino again, “How can the balance be struck between respect for indigenous cultures and mainstreaming processes that combat social exclusion, break down the barriers of discrimination, and seek improved access for marginalized groups to national economic benefits?” The point is that indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities can be singled out for distinct treatment, either on the grounds of their vulnerability and poverty in the context of modernization and development, or because of cultural differences. In neither case are these groups likely to wish to be protected from development. Like any other peoples and communities, they will almost certainly wish to benefit from material progress. Indeed, as the participatory poverty assessments demonstrated in each of the four countries, indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities express needs largely similar to those of other groups of society. They want more and better education, jobs, and incomes; improved health and health services; greater access to credit and financial services; higher quality roads and infrastructure; and many of the other material benefits that make up a decent human existence.

At the same time, some indigenous and ethnic minority groups can display strong resistance to assimilation by the dominant society. Retaining their distinct social, cultural, and economic institutions—whether of language, governance, land and resource management, or traditional health care—can be an integral part of their existence. But this can also be a matter of choice. Self-identification as indigenous can be bound up with lifestyle choices as much as with ethnic origin. Further, external characteristics, such as language or dress, may not identify persons or groups with a strongly felt indigenous identity.

ISSUES OF DEFINITION AND IDENTITY

National Action

Each of the participating countries has had potential difficulties in identifying the persons or communities considered to be indigenous peoples or ethnic minorities for the purpose of targeted poverty reduction programs or any other form of intervention that might require differentiated approaches. The problems of identification clearly vary from country to country, as has been seen in the earlier analysis.

In Cambodia, where adequate census data are available, the important thing is to determine which ethnic minority groups should be covered by the special provisions of the new Land Law, or by the policies and programs of the IMC.

In Indonesia, participants at the national workshop recommended a major participatory process, involving universities and research institutions as well as organizations of adat communities, to identify adat communities and institutions. Such a process is clearly necessary, if the Government is to fulfil its commitment to strengthen adat institutions within the framework of regional autonomy and decentralization programs.

In the Philippines, despite a fairly strong legal and institutional framework, there is still insufficient clarity as to which ethnic groups will be covered by the provisions of the IPRA. Full clarity will be needed if the Government carries out its pledge to accelerate the issuance of ancestral domain titles between 2002 and 2004. The issues are particularly complex in Mindanao, where the distinction between indigenous and Muslim identity is not always clear. Muslim groups might henceforth choose to identify themselves as indigenous in order to pursue ancestral domain claims. A series of participatory consultations at different levels will also be advisable in this country, to examine the implications of self-identification as indigenous. The scope for disaggregation by ethnicity should also be examined in population census and household surveys.

Of the four countries, ethnic classifications are most advanced in Viet Nam. This has permitted some comprehensive analysis of poverty trends in ethnic minorities. It provides a useful basis for poverty targeting. However, the project’s national workshop in Hanoi recognized deficiencies in the existing classifications. It has pointed to a more exact identification of Viet Nam’s ethnic composition as an important priority in the immediate future, and as an urgent need for policymakers and development practitioners. The country study has recommended conducting this study not only at the national level, but also in provinces and communes at the local level.

In each country, therefore, there is a need for major initiatives to identify indigenous peoples and ethnic
minority populations. Each government could designate a research institute to assume principal responsibility for these studies and set time-bound targets for carrying out these activities.

**International Action**

These national efforts will require international support. A bilateral donor may wish to support the research activities. Moreover, technical support would be useful to assist governments of the region to capture indigenous and ethnic minority characteristics in their census, household surveys, and other statistical data gathering. Such assistance could be provided either by one of the United Nations agencies, or by ADB.

ADB has been required under its Policy on Indigenous Peoples to address issues of indigenous identity in its country operations. So far this has been done mainly at the project level, in the context of social assessment and the preparation of indigenous peoples’ development plans (IPDPs). The experience has sometimes presented difficulties, both because of possible ambiguities over the criteria for definition, and also because of uncertainty over the practical implications of such definition for project operations.

ADB would benefit from a clear understanding with the governments of the region, concerning the ethnic groups to be covered by its Policy on Indigenous Peoples. The issues are best addressed in country strategies and programs and in overall policy dialogue. Moreover, profiles of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities need to cover not only their numbers, geographical location, and ethnic grouping. They should also cover their patterns of land use and forms of representation, among other things.

**OVERALL LAW AND POLICY FRAMEWORK**

**Challenges**

The overall policy framework is of obvious importance, in promoting and safeguarding the rights of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in the development process. As the Policy on Indigenous Peoples stresses, ADB supports government efforts through assistance in formulating policies, strategies, laws, regulations, and other specific actions responsible for indigenous peoples.

In the project countries, the law and policy framework is still evolving, with the possible exception of the Philippines where the main challenges are those of policy implementation. The national workshops generally emphasized the need for more coherent policies and for participation by indigenous peoples and ethnic minority representatives in policy formulation. In Indonesia, for example, the national action plan calls for review of policies in participation with adat communities; for a revision of laws and other implementing regulations (including local and regional regulations) that can have a negative impact on adat communities; for ratification of international law instruments related to adat communities; and for public consultation in the process of revising laws and policies. In Viet Nam, the national workshop recommended the adoption of a comprehensive policy, with a common understanding of guiding principles for development work, based on scientific research as well as knowledge of real situations.

At the regional workshop, some participants stressed the need to harmonize policy approaches of different government agencies. There might be an excellent overall policy concerning indigenous peoples or ethnic minorities, but this might not be applied by different government line agencies. Examples were policies concerning shifting cultivation.

**National Action**

Each country can set itself the goal of adopting an integrated policy concerning poverty reduction and development for indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. The policy can be informed by international standards. Governments should make efforts to disseminate these standards—including the ILO’s Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, No. 169 and other pertinent instruments of the UN system—among key policymakers and the legislature. However, it is equally important that policies be influenced by national realities and by the perceptions and aspirations of the indigenous and ethnic minority groups themselves.

Moreover, governments could establish policy review commissions, to review other sectoral policies.
and guidelines (including overall socioeconomic planning, land and forestry, health and education, credit and financial services, marketing and infrastructure, local government, and regional autonomy or decentralization) by reference to the concerns of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. Consistent with the recommendations of this project and its regional workshop, such an approach would serve to mainstream these concerns and ensure that there is some understanding of indigenous/ethnic minority aspirations in all poverty-oriented policies and programs. Moreover, adequate involvement of indigenous and ethnic minority representatives in such an exercise would provide important capacity building for them, as well as building awareness of their needs in the rest of society.

To prevent such a policy review exercise from being too ambitious, it is recommended that each country commence with a small number of important issues. They could be selected by the pertinent government agency in consultation with indigenous and ethnic minority representatives. A particular focus might be given, for example, to regional autonomy and decentralization policies in Indonesia; or to land and resource management policies in the Philippines.

To ensure adequate follow-up to the project, some policy reviews should be commenced by the end of 2002. An initial regional consultation could then be organized early in 2003, to compare findings and learn lessons for future policy formulation.

**International Action**

International agencies could support such a policy review exercise in accordance with their mandates and expertise. Of the UN specialized agencies, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, IFAD, ILO, the United Nations Children’s Fund, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and WHO might all support certain aspects and host national or international meetings as relevant.

As suggested at the regional workshop, UNDP might play a particular role in this area. In accordance with its new policy paper on indigenous peoples’ issues, UNDP aims to focus on effective participation in policymaking. Indigenous peoples have been identified as one of the areas for future collaboration between ADB and UNDP. UNDP might usefully sponsor the above-mentioned consultation in early 2003, to learn the appropriate lessons.

ADB could provide financial or technical support for such a comparative policy review. Alternatively, it might provide technical support to governments and indigenous organizations. The regional workshop specifically recommended that ADB should invest in programs for indigenous peoples’ capacity building, enabling them to participate in the process of law and policy reform, sponsoring seminars or workshops for this purpose. To follow up this recommendation, ADB resident missions could sponsor at least one such workshop in each participating country by mid-2003 at the latest.

**POLICY COORDINATION AND CONSULTATIVE MECHANISMS**

**Challenges**

For policies to be effective, they need to be coordinated carefully among the various agencies of government, and consultative mechanisms need to be established at different levels. During the project, the regional workshop and some of the national workshops detected some failures to translate broad policy principles into effective action at the local level. This point was emphasized for the Philippines and Viet Nam, the two countries that have the strongest policy framework at the national level. The Viet Nam country study, for example, pointed to inadequate linkages and consistency between policies, basic laws, programs, and projects, leading to some overlap and confusion between programs and projects.

Key issues include determining which agency of government should have the principal responsibility for policy coordination; how policy should best be coordinated between national, provincial, and local levels; and how the representatives of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities can be represented most effectively at all levels on consultative and policy bodies.

The regional workshop made a number of important recommendations, some directed at national governments, others at international actors including ADB. The following elements of the action plan are based largely on these recommendations.
National Action

Each country should identify a lead agency of government, with responsibility for coordinating policies for indigenous and ethnic minority development, in consultation with representatives of these peoples. This agency may have some role in implementing projects and programs. Policy coordination should nevertheless be its main function, together with the monitoring and evaluation of projects and programs that affect these peoples and their livelihood.

Consultation mechanisms need to be adapted to the national context. Different approaches have been suggested in the national action plans. The Philippines proposed convening a national consultative body on an annual basis, to facilitate identification of leaders. Indonesia proposed increasing the representation of adat communities in peoples’ representative bodies, as well as strengthening the role of adat institutions in policymaking by regional governments. Viet Nam stressed the need to increase the number of ethnic minority personnel involved in development programs. Cambodia proposed the establishment of local councils of ethnic minorities, to advise on development and investment policies and programs. An important condition is that governments should establish time-bound targets for establishing consultative mechanisms at different levels, ensuring wherever possible that these build on existing organizational structures and are not artificially imposed on the peoples concerned. Extensive capacity building will then be required to enable indigenous peoples and ethnic minority representatives to participate effectively in decision taking.

International Action

International agencies including ADB have the opportunity to improve policy coordination and to strengthen mechanisms for the improved participation by indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in poverty reduction policies and programs. For ADB, the structural mechanisms are already in place, such as the partnership agreements on poverty reduction at the country level and the IPDPs at the project level. A challenge is to move beyond purely project-based or local approaches, toward one that can first assess the impact of general antipoverty policies and programs on indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, and second permit these peoples greater participation in development planning and processes at the national level.

As recommended at the regional workshop, international support could consist of the following activities.

- A review of policies in all areas to identify gaps or conflicts on indigenous peoples’ issues.
- Assistance in preparing national action plans on indigenous peoples.
- Funding of pilot projects for capacity building for indigenous peoples and government officials from the provincial to the national level. When a new department has been created to address the development and poverty concerns of indigenous peoples, as in the case of Cambodia, assistance could seek to strengthen its capacity.
- Organization and facilitation of national and regional discussions on poverty reduction and indigenous peoples, with the participation of all stakeholders including governments, indigenous peoples, NGOs, and, where relevant, private enterprise.

Monitoring Poverty Trends and Characteristics

Challenges

Poverty monitoring for indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities is required for two major purposes: first, using the more conventional poverty indicators, to assess whether or not these peoples are disproportionately affected by material poverty, and also whether or not these trends have been worsening; and second, through careful fieldwork, to help policymakers understand better the meaning of poverty and wealth for these peoples, and their own priorities. The project aimed to do both of these things. Because of the general lack of data disaggregated by ethnicity, with the exception of Viet Nam, it could only shed limited light on the first issue. On the second issue, the findings were
very mixed. Indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities may have particular perceptions of poverty and wealth. But in other aspects, their concerns and aspirations are very similar to those of other population groups.

National Action

In household survey and other baseline data used for poverty indicators and measurement, particular attention could be paid to indigenous, ethnic minority, and adat communities. Other countries might follow the example of Viet Nam, whose national action plan proposes official regulations on compulsory use of indicators and data from ethnic minority areas in official statistical publications, both central and local. Where possible, statistical surveys should be combined with qualitative sample assessments that pay attention to indigenous perceptions of wealth and poverty. Representatives of these groups need to be trained in survey techniques and indicators in order to participate effectively in poverty monitoring and poverty trend analysis.

International Action

Initiatives such as that led by UNDP in Viet Nam’s Poverty Task Force, identifying mechanisms for monitoring poverty targets for ethnic minorities, could usefully be replicated in other countries of the region. This study proposed longitudinal studies in sample provinces and for select ethnic groups until 2010. UNDP might promote similar approaches elsewhere in collaboration with ADB and other international agencies.

ADB could address these concerns in the framework of its partnership agreements on poverty reduction with the governments of the region. This could also provide the appropriate mechanism for devising projects or programs in accordance with the aspirations voiced by indigenous communities. In the early stages of drafting such an agreement, a consultative meeting could be held with representative organizations of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, identifying their own concerns and priorities, and the means by which performance in this regard could be monitored. A start could be made immediately, identifying the appropriate procedures for such an exercise.

LAND RIGHTS AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Challenges

The project’s national workshops and regional workshop placed major emphasis on lands and natural resources. The nature of the challenges and the appropriate policy and program response clearly vary by country. In Indonesia, some adat communities are making demands for the restitution of lands previously occupied by them. In the Philippines, indigenous peoples and their support groups now seek to register their claims to ancestral domain. Similarly, in Cambodia, the emphasis is on demarcating and titling traditional indigenous land areas. In Viet Nam, there is need for significant law and policy reform before ethnic minorities can make any legal claim to traditional land areas.

Policy approaches on key aspects of land use and ownership remain diverse. There are differing views as to whether or how much indigenous land should be protected from market forces, with restrictions on mortgaging and alienation to outsiders. And there are mixed approaches to indigenous patterns of land use, including the longstanding debates over traditional forms of shifting cultivation. There is a particularly difficult balance between the promotion of efficient and environmentally sound agricultural practices and respect for indigenous culture. However, indigenous cultures are not static, and it would appear that most indigenous and ethnic minority communities wish to modernize their land tenure to make their agricultural practices more sustainable and to benefit from market opportunities without excessively prejudicing their traditional land security. And most importantly, loss of their land security is widely perceived by indigenous peoples as the main cause of their material poverty or impoverishment.

When special land rights for indigenous peoples are recognized, there can be considerable complexities in their implementation, in reconciling these special rights with other aspects of the national legal system, and in solving potential conflicts between indigenous peoples and outsiders. These issues have become most problematic in the Philippines, which has the most ambitious legislation on ancestral land rights and domain. However, the same challenges may in future
be replicated in other Southeast Asian countries. As stressed by a legal expert from the Philippines during the regional workshop, a number of questions arise. Who will benefit from these special tenurial instruments? Can tribal councils, councils of elders, clans, or tribes be proper beneficiaries of such tenurial instruments? What will be the permissible extent of resource use, for example, over waters, minerals, and other subsurface resources within ancestral domain areas? And how can conflicting claims between mining, forestry, public land, ownership, and other various forms of claims be resolved?

National Action

Different strategies need to be pursued, depending on whether or not a law and policy framework for adjudicating indigenous land rights are in place.

Where they are in place, as in the Philippines and to a lesser extent in Cambodia, practical and rapid measures are required in order to avert further land dispossession, demonstrating progress each year in improving land security. A useful model is the commitment by President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo of the Philippines to award ancestral domain titles to 100 indigenous peoples’ communities every year during 2002–2004. Such time-bound targets are important, measured both as the number of titles to be awarded each year and as the physical land area to be regularized.

In all cases, indigenous communities need to be involved in the mapping of the lands traditionally used by them. These communities have the best knowledge of their own patterns of land use and of their boundaries. Land specialists from government organizations need to work in close collaboration with local communities, providing training in the necessary mapping and surveying techniques.

Once the land areas have been demarcated and titled in the appropriate legal entity, it is important to assist indigenous communities in land use and management. This may be a longer-term objective, given that the titling process is only now commencing. But it is important to demonstrate that indigenous communities can manage their land in an economically effective and environmentally sound manner, given an appropriate policy environment and technical support. Some pilot programs could be usefully developed during 2004–2005.

International Action

The process of land regularization will require much international support, both technical and financial. Southeast Asian countries could learn useful lessons of best practice from other countries that have carried out extensive land titling and regularization programs for indigenous peoples, for example, in Latin America. Bilateral donor agencies such as the Danish International Development Agency, which has considerable experience supporting such programs in Latin America, might consider the extension of such a program to Southeast Asia. An important role can also be played by such international NGOs as the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, which has experience of participatory land mapping and titling that could usefully be adapted to the Asian region. An organization like the ILO, which has already addressed sustainable development plans for ancestral domain in the Philippines, might usefully extend the scope of this work to other countries of the region. Or UNDP, with its new emphasis on indigenous peoples’ issues, might usefully develop a regional program for the sustainable development of indigenous and ethnic minority lands.

Some ADB projects already have components for the titling of indigenous lands. Examples are its agricultural development and poverty reduction projects in the Philippine Cordillera region (CHARM) and a rainfed agriculture development project in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Implementation of these components has not been strong and has possibly been hampered by lack of technical competence concerning these vital issues within ADB itself.

A follow-up ADB program of activities on indigenous land policy and management is clearly warranted by the circumstances. The project's national and regional workshops drew attention to the need for different forms of policy advice, for law reform, for regulating existing laws, for technical aspects of surveying and titling, and for conflict resolution. Land issues are likely to surface frequently in the context of ADB's own poverty reduction projects in indigenous and ethnic minority areas. This suggests a need to increase comprehension among ADB technical staff of land rights concerns and of the appropriate policy response.

These concerns would be best addressed through a new 2-year (2003–2004) regional technical assistance
with two sets of objectives. The first is to assist participating governments to refine their law and policy framework and implementing mechanisms; to establish particular targets for issuing land titles; to strengthen government machinery responsible for coordinating land adjudication; and to strengthen consultative mechanisms with indigenous peoples’ organizations. The second is to strengthen ADB’s internal capacity for addressing indigenous and ethnic minority land concerns in future project interventions; and develop a database and training manuals for ADB staff.

**INDIGENOUS AND ETHNIC MINORITY CONCERNS IN BASIC SOCIAL SERVICES**

**Challenges**

A major concern is the inadequate delivery of basic social services to often remote areas where these groups are located. Another is that health and education services are ill adapted to indigenous cultures, and take no account of their traditional knowledge and practices. This is linked to the wider issues of discrimination that can pervade relations between indigenous and mainstream ethnic groups. A third concern is that credit and financial services cannot adopt to the many indigenous land and resource management systems based on communal tenure. There are many other aspects. Language barriers can prevent ethnic and linguistic minorities from access to all kinds of services, judicial or administrative. This can add to a spiral of discrimination and enduring poverty.

**National Action**

A key issue is to mainstream indigenous and ethnic minority concerns in all government programs for the delivery of social services. The issue was addressed in the Philippine national workshop, in which a series of different line agencies were invited to explain their programs on behalf of indigenous peoples. This exercise could usefully be repeated in all countries. It requires adequate policy coordination and consultative mechanisms.

**International Action**

Many international organizations, both government and nongovernment, are now concerned with indigenous knowledge systems and practices. The World Bank and ILO, among others, have addressed this area. One task is to disseminate the information and lessons learned, seeking to incorporate it within the programs of government line agencies.

The role of ADB will be enhanced considerably, if it can find the means to enhance expertise on indigenous and ethnic minority concerns in its operational work. Mainstreaming ethnic concerns in sectoral programs requires paying attention to them at an early stage of project formulation. This is the opposite of the “safeguard” approach, which tends to examine the potentially adverse impact of an intervention, rather than to examine ways in which indigenous groups can participate in, and hopefully benefit from, sectoral programs of national application. As the findings of this project indicate, an effective strategy for reducing the poverty of these vulnerable groups tends often to require the latter approach.
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