

Annex 18A. Indigenous Peoples Plan (Based on OP.4.10)**1. Background****1.1 Project Description**

The proposed project's central development objective is "The enabling framework for collaborative management of protected areas in Indonesia is strengthened through promotion and replication of the Aketajawe-Lolobata project approach" and the global biodiversity goal that will be achieved during the 5 years of the project is "Globally significant biodiversity of Aketajawe Lolobata NP is conserved through an effective conservation management regime which has the active support of local stakeholders".

The project's primary aim is to secure the forests inside the National Park by stopping incursions from neighboring logging concessions and finding solutions to specific local management problems which are acceptable to the stakeholders involved. The project will facilitate agreements on National Park boundaries, access to resources and other issues, and co-operation between the national park management and other stakeholders (communities, private sector, local government). Endorsement and oversight of these agreements will come from a multi-stakeholder forum where all stakeholders are represented. At the same time the project will increase the capacity of the National Park management team to manage the Park successfully using this collaborative and consultative approach. The project will work with local government on spatial planning issues at district level to minimize forest loss and other threats which occur outside the Park and threaten the Parks long term conservation value. Finally, the project will work to raise public awareness and support for the park amongst decision makers and opinion leaders in North Maluku Province, and to disseminate the lessons from this project to other protected areas in Indonesia.

The project will achieve the following outcomes: (a) establish an adequate basis of biological and social information for the management of the National Park; (b) develop an effective management regime for ALNP including facilitating bi-lateral agreements between the National Park and neighboring communities and industries, rationalizing and re-marking the boundaries of the National Park, establishing a multistakeholder forum to provide oversight, and working with District Government to integrate spatial planning and National Park management; (c) ensure that the National Park management and other stakeholders have adequate capacity (resources, skills, information) to play an effective role; (d) a monitoring system supports effective lesson learning and evaluation; (e) information and lessons from the project shared with other relevant institutions Indonesia; (f) high levels of awareness and support amongst the public and decision makers in the three affected Districts and the main towns in North Maluku.

1.2 Purpose of the Indigenous People's Plan

This plan is prepared to ensure that the development process fully respects the dignity, human rights, economies and cultures of Indigenous Peoples. The policy requires the project executors to engage in a process of free, prior and informed consultation, resulting in broad community support to the project by the affected Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous Peoples should receive benefits that are culturally appropriate and gender and intergenerationally inclusive; potentially adverse effects on the communities should be avoided.

1.3 Indigenous Peoples involved with, or affected by this project

Communities living in settlements outside the Aketajawe – Lolobata National Park, and in semi-nomadic groups within the park, were considered for inclusion in the indigenous peoples safeguard work by the project, and thus for inclusion in this annex as Indigenous Peoples under OP 4.10. This policy defines "Indigenous Peoples" in a generic sense to refer to a distinct, vulnerable, social and cultural group possessing the following characteristics in varying degrees:

- (a) self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;

- (b) collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories
- (c) customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society and culture; and
- (d) an indigenous language, often different from the official language of the country or region.

A group that has lost "collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area"; (see above) because of forced severance remains eligible for coverage under this policy.

In the case of this project, no permanent settlements are located inside the national park. Three villages (comprising 9 sub-villages) and 3 transmigration settlements are close to the boundary of the National Park, however only a small proportion of the people in these settlements are indigenous in the sense of the criteria above. The settlements are:

- 2 villages on the western side of the Aketajawe Block of the National Park, Hijrah and Akekolano, each consisting of 4 sub-villages.
- 1 village south-east of the Lolobata Block of the National Park, Miaf, which is an access point for illegal artisanal mining of gold along the course of rivers within the Park.

The majority of the people in these villages are from ethnic groups who are traditionally farmers and fishermen living in coastal settlements (the Tobelo, Maba and Bicoli) or originate from outside Halmahera, particularly from Sangihe Island in North Sulawesi, and other islands in Maluku. The livelihoods of these villagers are based on small farming, trading, and sea fishing. None of these groups qualifies as people indigenous to the area within the National Park.

The 3 transmigration settlements which are within the project area do not have any Forest Tobelo inhabitants, and are occupied largely by small farmers from Lombok, Java and Madura, but also with people from Sangihe-Talaud and other islands in North Maluku. The main source of income in these settlements is wet rice cultivation and intensive market cropping. They do not meet the criteria for indigenous people (the interests of these transmigrants, and the non-indigenous villages, are considered in the involuntary resettlement annex 18).

- 2 transmigration settlements bordering on Aketajawe Block, Kobe Kulo, to the south-east, have a population of over 1000 people originating from West Java and Lombok. Pintatu, on the north east border of the same block, has a population of over 700 people from Java.
- 1 transmigration settlement south of Lolobata Block, Maratana Jaya, was developed in conjunction with an industrial timber plantation in conversion forest. Other transmigration settlements exist in the area but are not considered to have any interaction with the forests protected by the National Park.

Within some villages there is also a minority (exact numbers are not yet known) of people who identify themselves as members of the Forest Tobelo ethnic group (Tugutil, the official Government term for this group, is offensive and its meaning unclear, and so this document uses the term used by Chris Duncan, the author of the majority of studies on this group, based on their own terminology of *fongana ma nyawa*). They have a distinct language, culture and attachment to particular areas of forest within the project area and thus clearly qualify as indigenous people under OP 4.10. There are several small hamlets, such as Totodoku described below, where the residents appear to be virtually all Forest Tobelo, and are in varying stages of adopting a sedentary lifestyle. There is also a small population of Forest Tobelo people still living semi-nomadic lives within the forests covered by the National Park and surrounding logging concessions. These people clearly qualify as indigenous peoples and are the focus of the projects safeguards work, described below.

1.4 Legal and institutional framework applicable to Indigenous Peoples in Indonesia

There is no specific recognition of Indigenous Peoples within Indonesian Law, and the project's social safeguards work therefore addresses the requirements and standards established by the World Bank.

Social groups considered under the Bank's Indigenous Peoples policy are covered by the broader Indonesian legislation concerning *Masyarakat adat* communities ("customary law communities" or "legal communities," which refer to communities that establish their own regulations and social control). This legislation recognizes the status of adat communities and includes some provisions for their protection and rights, including over ulayat (communal) land; examples include both the Human Rights Act (Act No. 36 of 1999), the Local Government Act (Act No. 22 of 1999), and agrarian legislation (Regulation No. 5 of 1999: Guidance for Resolution of Problems of Ulayat Right of Adat Law Communities, and the Forestry law Act No. 41 of 1999). However, Indonesian government policy continues to focus on attempts to resettle nomadic and semi-nomadic people living in the forested interior into permanent villages, and the discouragement of swidden agriculture. These policies are described as integrating 'isolated' peoples (*terasing* in Indonesian) into the mainstream of economic development. Social scientists and civil society organisations have charged that the motivation for these policies is more strongly driven by the perceived need to protect the state's control over forest resources or fear of successionists politics than by a genuine concern for the welfare of the people involved (see for example the attached independent consultants report). Government programs have met with varying levels of success, and have existed under several different names; the program is currently known as the Program for the Development of Social Prosperity of Geographically Isolated Customary Law Communities (PKAT).

The majority of traditional communities in Indonesia are forest dwellers, and since state forest land covers some 70% of the country, the legal framework which most impacts on indigenous peoples in Indonesia is the basic Forestry Law (Law 41/1999). Law 41 states that the rights of traditional peoples can be recognised, as long as there is a regulation at District or Provincial level which defines the community and territory concerned. In practice this has not happened and recognition of the rights of traditional communities remains the political aspiration of civil society groups such as AMAN, the Indigenous Peoples Alliance.

There has been some progress in practical adaptation of forestry policy to accommodate local needs, though this stops short of acknowledging rights. The Bukit Duabelas National park in Sumatra was created to protect environmental services and 'to protect the source of livelihoods of Orang Rimba', a semi-nomadic indigenous group. This is the first (and so far only) example of the creation of a protected area specifically to ensure the continuation of traditional livelihoods. At national policy level, the Ministerial Decision on Collaborative Management of Protected Areas, which forms a basis for the implementation of this project also lays down a framework for consultation and collaboration between multiple stakeholders in the management of a national park. It thus creates the possibility of incorporating and protecting the resources used by indigenous peoples, though this is not an explicit aim of the Decision.

2. Social assessment and consultations

2.1 Distribution and definition of Forest Tobelo people

The Forest Tobelo are an ethnic group who traditionally follow a semi-nomadic lifestyle in the forests of Halmahera island, hunting, gathering, processing sago, farming on a small scale, and occasionally trading forest products with outsiders.

The Forest Tobelo share a common language with the coastal village communities of the Tobelo people, but define themselves (and are defined by others) as a separate group with distinct livelihood strategies, traditional land ownership and their own social and belief systems. The distinctions have broken down to some extent since the 1980s, when missionaries and Government development projects succeeded in encouraging a proportion of Forest Tobelo to live and farm in sedentary settlements, but even though this process is continuing, Forest Tobelo still have strong cultural and livelihoods links with forest resources. Some remain truly semi-nomadic, and many combine settled and semi-nomadic strategies, dividing time between settlements and in the forest or with some family members following each alternative.

Within this broad self-defined identity as Forest Tobelo, groups recognise affiliations with particular watersheds within the forest, and family sub-groups lay claim to specific areas of cultivated and uncultivated land within the territory of their group.

The Forest Tobelo live throughout the island of Halmahera. On the northern peninsula most of the groups have been settled and there are several villages in the sub-districts of Kao, and Tobelo Selatan, including Telaga Paca, Waingongira and Kukumutuk. In east Halmahera, within and around the Lolobata section of the National Park, there are numerous groups living along various rivers. In the Wasile sub-district the majority remain nomadic, including groups living along the Dodaga and Tutuling Rivers, as well as behind the village of Loleba. However some 25 families have settled in Totoduku village approximately 10 kilometers from the Subaim transmigration. Detailed information on the territory, history and current situation of these groups is not available.

On the other side of the East Halmahera peninsula, in the northern half of the Maba district there are several groups of Forest Tobelo, each corresponding to a different river valley. Starting from the northern tip of the peninsula these include the Dowong, the Akelamo, the Ategou, the Ai-ai, the Mabulan, the Iva, the Afu, the Lili, the Waisango, the Onata and the Gaifoli. Each of these is the name of a river and of the people in that river's watershed. A summary of their current location and situation is given in table 1.

Table 1: Forest Tobelo Groups in Maba Sub-district (in and around the Lolobata section of the National Park)

Name of river valley/group:	Current location/situation:
Dowong	The people from these five river valleys in the north part of Maba sub-district have retained a close connection with the forest, though several started to plant swiddens in 1990s. A few families from Ai-ai settled on the coast at Dororam in the 1990s as part of Evangelical Church of Halmahera program (which eventually failed). Subsequently, Forest Tobelo missionaries (from Tanjung Lili) influenced the majority of the people in this area to settle several km inland from the coastal village of Pumalanga. This settlement is often referred to as Akelamo. Many built houses at Akelamo but continue to return to the forest /gardens for weeks at a time.
Akelamo	
Ategou	
Ai-ai	
Mabulan	
Iva	Moved to form a settlement at Dorosago (influenced by Evangelical Church of Halmahera) but most returned to the forest during communal violence of 98 – 2000. Current location not known.
Afu	Majority converted to christianity and settled near Lili River at Tanjung Lili, the site of a New Tribes Mission base (1982 – 1999) and a logging company 'assisted village'. Tanjung Lili has become the source of 'Forest Tobelo Missionaries' who work to convert their fellow Forest Tobelo to christianity.
Lili	
Waisango	
Onata	Most were killed during fighting with people from Lili river in the 1970s. The remainder integrated with the communities of Miaf and Tatangapu near the mouth of the Onata River. In 1995 5 families returned to work on the timber plantations behind Miaf and to attend teaching by Forest People missionaries from Tanjung Lili.
Gaifoli	Have settled in two villages, Bebseli and Marasibno, near the larger town of Wayamli.
Dodoga	Some Dodoga people have migrated and formed settlements south of Gaifoli, e.g. Gau

Data from Duncan (2005) Preliminary Social Assessment of communities living around the Aketajawe-Lolobata National Park, North Maluku Province

Away from the project area, in Maba Selatan sub-district, there are groups living along the Sangaji River, as well as throughout the interior of the southwestern peninsula. Exact populations and distributions of these groups remain undocumented. Elsewhere in Central Halmahera there are Forest Tobelo in the sub-districts of Oba and Weda. These groups may be inside or close to the Aketajawe section of the National Park, but so far nothing is known about their history or territorial claims. None of the groups in Maba Selatan, Oba or Weda have been the focus of any development efforts and many still follow their shifting settlement pattern in the interior although all have established relations with coastal communities. None of the groups have been the focus of organized missionary efforts and would most likely still retain their indigenous belief systems.

2.2 Forest Tobelo Population and social structures

No reliable survey of Forest Tobelo population has ever been carried out. The only anthropological work carried out (by C Duncan) focused on the Northern part of Maba sub-district, and the Dodaga region in Wasile sub-District. The population estimates resulting from that work are summarised in table 2.

Table 2: Population estimates for Forest Tobelo communities

Area	Population estimate (1990 – 96)	Notes
Northern Maba Sub-district: - Tanjung Lili - Dororam - Iva - forest areas Northern Maba	58 settled households 5 settled households 5 settled households 82 semi-nomadic households	Assuming 5 people per households, these figures equate to approx 300 - 400 settled and 300 – 400 nomadic Forest Tobelo in north Maba. Most of the nomadic people are along the Akelamo and Ategou rivers
Southern Maba sub-district - 'a number' of Forest Tobelo households in Bebseli, Marasibno and Gau villages	- no further information	
Wasile sub-district - Dodaga and Tutuling River valleys - behind Loleba Aketajawe Section	- estimate of 227 people (1990) - no information - no information	

Data from Duncan (2005) Preliminary Social Assessment of communities living around the AketajaweLolobata National Park, North Maluku Province

Based on this scant data, Duncan makes an informed guess at a Forest Tobelo population of 1500 – 2000 people in Maba, Wasile, Oba and Weda, the four sub-districts where the National Park is. Whilst these people will have a varying degree of interaction with the forests within the National Park, they all have a high degree of dependence on forest resources for their livelihoods.

According to Duncan, Forest Tobelo communities do not have formal political leaders. Some men are able to wield influence due to their kinship ties, charisma, or their esoteric knowledge, but their decisions are not formal or binding. Forest Tobelo who have settled into larger sedentary communities, such as the community at Tanjung Lili remain egalitarian. Although local government officials might recognize particular individuals as “tribal heads” (Indonesian, *kepala suku*) or “hamlet heads” (Indonesian, *kepala dusun*), these individuals have limited power to enforce their decisions if community members choose to disregard them. This has consequences for the disclosure and grievance procedures as well as for the consultative and participatory aspects of the project itself, since people claiming to ‘represent’ Forest Tobelo at any level higher than family are unlikely to have any authority to make decisions on behalf of others.

2.3 Forest Tobelo and Natural Resource Use

Forest People have always relied on agriculture to a certain extent. In the past they planted small swiddens in the interior or along the coast with coconuts, bananas, cassava and other crops which they would then utilize in passing. They also planted rice for use in yearly rituals honoring their ancestors. These plots were not intensively cultivated and often returned to forest after a few years. In recent years, due to large-scale logging, an increase in interactions with coastal communities, as well as western missionary efforts, many Forest People in central Halmahera have begun planting coconut palms, chocolate and other tree crops, in addition to creating larger swiddens for food crops. However, forest resources still play an important role in providing subsistence, materials for household needs, construction, as well as NTFPs gathered for sale to villagers and merchants. Whilst the importance of forest resources to Forest Tobelo livelihoods has declined, use patterns remain the same except for the switch from processing of sago (a wild forest product) to cultivating cassava as the staple source of carbohydrate. Hunting still provides the bulk of the protein needs for the Forest Tobelo, and focuses on the only two large mammals on the island, both of which are long-term introductions: wild pig (*Sus scrofa*) and deer (*Cervus timorensis*), although other mammals including cuscus (*Phalanger orientalis*), palm civet (*Paradoxurus tangalunga*), and a few species of fruit bat are hunted. As well as a subsistence activity, hunting remains one of the primary means through which men are able to establish social status.

All types of birds except owls are considered potential food sources, though in practice the most commonly caught are ground birds which are caught in snares, and small passerines which are hunted with slings and spear guns. Very few Forest Tobelo have air guns. Insects, and freshwater fish and invertebrates are also an important source of food. Forest Tobelo who have settled near the coast have also turned to exploitation of turtle eggs, shellfish and marine fish. A wide range of plants are gathered for food and medicines, though settled Forest Tobelo are increasingly turning to purchasing modern medicines.

A few forest products have become commercialised and are sold to coastal communities for cash. Originally the major crop was canari nuts, but the canari trees (over which individual ownership rights were recognised by the Forest Tobelo) were also a target of logging companies. The decline of the canari harvest is reported to be coincident with an increase in the capture and sale of parrots for the caged bird trade, and this is now a major source of income for Forest People who still live in the interior and have not planted extensive coconut groves. The trade in caged birds focuses on four parrot species: Chattering Lory (*Lorius garrulus garrulus*), White Cockatoo (*Cacatua alba*), Violet-necked Lory (*Eos squamata riciniata*), and Eclectus Parrot (*Eclectus roratus vosmaeri*). The birds are sold to coastal villagers, who sell them on to traders in Ternate and Tobelo.

The major change in the Forest Tobelo livelihoods since the late 1980s has been an increasing dependence on intensive cultivation of crops for cash. This change is the result of negative factors such as the loss of forest to logging companies, but also the need for cash to buy rice (imported rice is preferred over local varieties), salt, tobacco, medicines and other commodities. Thus, whilst the traditional agriculture still practiced by Forest Tobelo in the interior is swidden fallow, allowing forest regrowth, the establishment of coconut plantations is increasing as contact with Government and coastal communities increases and sedentarisation progresses. The main cash crop is coconut (processed for copra), which is interplanted with a wide variety of subsistence crops. When the coconut matures (after 5-7 years) and fruits the food and other crops are moved to a new site. This process results in the permanent replacement of forest with coconut plantations.

2.4 Relationships between Forest Tobelo and formal land use patterns

According to Duncan, drawing on examples from Maba and Wasile District, there are two main patterns of interaction between government and private sector interests, and the Forest Tobelo, both of them damaging to Forest Tobelo interests. The first is the use of resettlement schemes, both government and private sector funded, as a mechanism to move people out of forests and thus ensure uncontested access for logging and transmigration development. The second involves simply ignoring the presence and rights of Forest Tobelo, backed up if necessary by force.

The Government is currently planning 2 transmigration schemes behind the villages of villages of Tatam and Labi-Labi in the sub-district of Wasile, and there is another one already underway behind the village of Pumalanga in the Maba District. There have been plans to add additional transmigration sites behind Dorosago and Miaf in the Maba district, though these have not yet been realised.

3. Project Implementer Actions to ensure adequate consultation and safeguards

3.1 Social Assessment Process

The information contained in this annex is based on a preliminary social assessment conducted by BirdLife Indonesia field staff and partners in 2005, who visited Totodoku, a sedentary Forest Tobelo settlement close to the trans-peninsula Subaim-Buli road in East Halmahera, and carried out a rapid assessment of the state of forest management in East Halmahera, and a review by Chris Duncan, the leading academic authority on the Forest Tobelo, who compiled a separate report based on his original research updated and expanded during his visit to the area in 2005.

Key findings and conclusions from Chris Duncan's report are as follows:

- there are two broad groups of people native to the central Halmahera peninsula: the coastal dwelling, settled, Tobelo, Maba and Bicoli ethnic groups, and the forest-dwelling, Tobelo speaking inhabitants of the interior. Only the latter group qualifies as a vulnerable indigenous group under the criteria of the OP 4.10. These groups are referred to as Forest Tobelo in this proposal and annexes.
- Forest Tobelo who have adopted a sedentary lifestyle have settled in a number of coastal communities in eastern Halmahera. They retain strong cultural and livelihoods ties with forest resources
- Forest Tobelo still leading a semi-nomadic life are believed to be present in both blocks of the national park of the national park. They recognise claims to water catchments and individual family group land.
- Estimates of numbers of Forest Tobelo are based on very incomplete knowledge, but a figure of 1500 – 2000 is proposed for the 4 sub-districts covering the 2 blocks of the national park. Perhaps half of these are sedentary.
- logging and conversion for transmigration causes the loss of tree species and other forest resources important for the Forest Tobelo, as well as physical destruction of gardens and shelters.
- important trends in Forest Tobelo livelihoods are increased sedentarisation, increased need for cash to by imported products, a shift from canari nut trading to bird trading, a shift from collecting to intensive cultivation, increasing conversion to Christianity
- Government bureaucrats have a culture of categorising Forest Tobelo as backwards, uncivilized, and thus legitimate targets for sedentarisation and other interventions in their management of resources. The challenge for the project will be to ensure that these attitudes change within local Government staff, and that newly posted National Park staff have a more informed and balanced attitude and understanding of the issue.
- if the National Park is managed taking into consideration the resource use needs and patterns of the Forest Tobelo, the National Park has the potential to protect their livelihoods from further destruction within logging and transmigration developments. Conversely, if small scale shifting agriculture, bird trapping and hunting are banned and enforcement is effective, there is the potential for conflict and further weakening of Forest Tobelo livelihoods as a result of the National Park.
- The groups most likely to be impacted by the park are those living along the Akelamo and Ategou Rivers, in Lolobata section, which are included in or surrounded by the National Park. Any groups living in Aketajawe section would also be affected.
- the non-hierarchical nature of Forest Tobelo society, low literacy levels, and semi-nomadic lifestyle, make consultation and participation complex and time consuming. Although there are opinion leaders and people who are trusted and consulted because of their skills and powers, there are no leaders who can legitimately claim to represent or decide on behalf of the Forest Tobelo people at higher than the family level.

3.2 Prior Consultations

The lack of knowledge of distribution and population of Forest Tobelo, difficulty of contact, and lack of a leadership structure through which to engage with this community, make consultation with the Forest Tobelo difficult and time consuming. Consultation with affected groups prior to the development of this project is not considered appropriate in the majority of cases because:

- many communities are inaccessible without a good deal of time and funding available, and cannot be reached until staff are established in the field;
- the project intends to ensure that the National Park permits the current resource use by indigenous communities living within the National Park and protects them from the impact of logging concessions;
- no land will be acquired under this project, there will be no relocation and no involuntary restriction of access to resources for the Forest Tobelo.
- the project will implement a process of field studies and adaptive management which will be specifically focused on understanding the needs of Forest Tobelo and ensuring that they are safeguarded. These activities include a dedicated anthropological study during the first year, identification of key indicators to monitor the impact of the project and National Park on Forest Tobelo livelihoods. Forest Tobelo who have settled in villages will also be involved in participatory processes leading to the definition of community – national park agreements on resources and access. Consultations will take place throughout this process, with the necessary time and funding provided to handle the process in a culturally sensitive manner.

Some initial consultations have taken place, including a meeting held in the hamlet of Totodoku in February 2006, which was attended by approximately 15 Forest Tobelo people from this community, and an Indonesian-speaking relative from a second, more permanent village named Tokur-Tokur. At this meeting, facilitated by a Tobelo speaking Government employee, the aims of the project were introduced, including what was meant by a National Park, and feedback requested. The members of the community were receptive to the aims of the project and willing to be involved in the process - they saw forest protection as very important, and wished to be involved as guardians of the forest in some way. A meeting was also held in May 2006 in Tokur-Tokur as part of the community consultation and disclosure process, and copies of a summary of the project in Tobelo language were given for further distribution to members of this group.

For further details of public consultations taken in preparation for this project, see report by BirdLife Indonesia on the disclosure / consultation process, and also Annex 18, Involuntary Resettlement Process Framework.

3.3 Framework for free and informed consultations during implementation

During the first year of the project an independent and experienced consultant will be commissioned to undertake consultation and problem identification with the settled and semi-nomadic Forest Tobelo communities. This study will include an assessment of Forest Tobelo in Aketajawe section, until now entirely unknown, and mapping of areas of the National Park of importance for Forest Tobelo livelihoods. The consultant will develop guidelines for the most appropriate methods of consultation and consensus building with regards to the National Park, given the lack of leadership structure in Forest Tobelo communities. The consultant will be expected to develop insight into the perceptions and needs of the Forest Tobelo which will then allow him/her to represent these needs in discussion on national park management policies, zonation, and interventions in local Government land use planning.

Another outcome of the first year study will be capacity building and a system for monitoring the impact of the project and the National Park on the Forest Tobelo. This will include identification of key resources and livelihood issues which can be monitored independently by the project, and a protocol for routine meetings and consultation with Forest Tobelo groups which will allow the project, and ultimately the National Park, to gather information and measure reactions to its programs.

Practical issues where there is potential for conflict between norms of National Park management in Indonesia and Forest Tobelo practice (such as swidden agriculture, hunting, bird catching) will be the subject of detailed information, consultation and planning by the project and National park management team before any action is taken. Particular efforts will be made to prevent repressive law enforcement unless there has already been agreement with Forest Tobelo communities on what rules will be enforced, how and where.

The project will work to develop appropriate attitudes among national Park staff and all other staff who work on project activities. Using the simple knowledge – attitudes – practice framework, the project will provide complete and up-to-date information in appropriate language and format for Government staff, and create opportunities to discuss attitudes and perceptions towards the Forest Tobelo. Perhaps most importantly, the project will create opportunities for staff to interact with Forest Tobelo through surveys and research, facilitating greater understanding on both sides.

Finally, the project will exchange information and experience with other national parks where there are indigenous people. BirdLife Indonesia already works with WARSI, the NGO which succeeded in getting the last forest territory of the nomadic Orang Rimba in Sumatra protected, and who continue to work on empowerment and protection for these people. If necessary, an appropriate amount of project budget will be made available for a relevant NGO such as WARSI to provide support for the involvement of indigenous people within the project. Other relevant examples are from Siberut in Sumatra and Manusela in Maluku.

3.4 Action plan/Measures to ensure that benefits are culturally appropriate

The project aims to:

- ensure that the project's benefits to indigenous peoples are culturally sensitive and are seen as being both appropriate and acceptable to the communities who are identified as key stakeholders in the management of forests;
- ensure full consultation with, and the informed participation of, local people, identified as being most relevant to the management of local forest;
- To avoid, minimize or mitigate potentially adverse effects of new restrictions and increased enforcement of access to natural resources upon indigenous peoples known to depend upon these resources.

The long term benefits to the Forest Tobelo are improved management of the forests of Central Halmahera to prevent increasing degradation and fragmentation. This will allow the continuation of their traditional lifestyle in the interior, where this is their desire, and ensure that resources from the forest continue to be available.

Involvement for the sedentary communities in National Park co-management through the development and annual review of management agreements will enhance their resource use rights over forest resources from the National Park, and will enable their needs to be taken into account in the management plan. Being involved in this process should also have the effect of building capacity within the community, as community members become more able to articulate their needs and have a better understanding of the processes involved in government.

There is evidence that members of the Forest Tobelo group are involved in trade in endemic Parrot species, and it has been suggested that this has increased as a result of the loss of forests and forest resources in logging concessions. The project will assess the extent of this trade and consider options for reducing its damaging effects or developing alternative forest products trade with the assistance of the sociologist. Funding for these interventions would come from the budget for pilot interventions to stabilize resource extraction for local communities (see Annex 18).

4 Budget for the IPP

The following items in the project budget are specifically allocated to support the projects work with the Forest Tobelo:

Budget line	Description	Budget allocation (USD)
Anthropology consultant	6 person-months throughout the project	17,100
NGO to handle grievance procedure	annual retainer	5000
M&E consultants	(part of overall allocation for project)	27,500
field costs for map and study resource use by the Forest Tobelo	5 months of preparation and field study in Y1	9,150
field costs monitor project impact on Forest Tobelo	annual monitoring following protocol developed in Y1	3,100

Activities to engage the Forest Tobelo, such as in the consultations, and to build capacity among them and among relevant government staff will be funded from within the project budget. Any specific interventions to improve resource use or to introduce any alternative resource use for the Forest Tobelo would be covered separately if necessary as per para. 3.4.

5 Grievance Mechanism

The project's complaints handling process would be through an independent NGO, local to the project site, selected following advertisement and following the issuing of 'no objection' by the World Bank.

The details of the independent NGO and the mechanism for making a complaint will be promoted through project literature and during research and monitoring during the course of the project.

If a grievance is received the NGO will make an independent investigation into the grievance if deemed necessary. In the case of complaints related to the strategy being used to implement particular aspects of the project, these would be passed (without mentioning the name of those making the complaint) to project management for response. To ensure that complaints are processed properly they will be handled by a specified member of staff within the project management unit in Bogor, who will be responsible for complaint handling and tracking. This arrangement is in fact already in place within BirdLife Indonesia; the Director of Conservation Programs is responsible for handling complaints arising from BirdLife Indonesia projects, including receiving, registering, referring, tracking and reporting upon all complaints received, copying all such documents to the National Park authorities.

6 Participatory monitoring and evaluation

One of the outputs of the participatory research into resource use by the Forest Tobelo will be the development of criteria and indicators to monitor Forest Tobelo livelihoods. These will include expected positive and potential negative impacts of the project, as well as other key factors. The criteria and indicators will be developed independently by the consultant anthropologist. Using this monitoring protocol as a basis, project staff and National Park staff will undertake routine monitoring on an annual cycle. Where appropriate this will include participatory monitoring of resources and resource use patterns.

As well as structured monitoring of pre-defined indicators, the project will ensure there are regular meetings with Forest Tobelo at places where the semi-nomadic Forest Tobelo interact with settled Forest Tobelo and other groups (the Akelamo settlements in Maba District for example). This will enable the project to update its understanding of resource and livelihoods issues for the Forest Tobelo in a qualitative way.

7 Disclosure

For a GEF Medium Sized Project, the World Bank requires that the Indigenous Peoples Plan be publicly available at least 21 days before Bank approval of such project, at a place accessible to, and

in a form, manner and language understandable to the displaced or affected people and local NGOs. The project has complied with this requirement by providing a summary translation of the Indigenous Peoples Plan in Bahasa Indonesia for distribution to relevant government agencies, NGOs and civil organisations. In addition, a short introduction to the project (approx 2 pages) with reference to the measures that will be taken to accommodate traditional livelihoods based upon natural resources was made available in Bahasa Indonesia and Tobelo, and distributed during a community meeting in Tokur-Tokur - although by no means all Forest Tobelo people are literate, some are and will be able to convey this information to others. Communication of the project aims to the wider Forest Tobelo population including semi-nomadic communities requires face to face meetings with each of the widely dispersed groups using local (Tobelo) language speakers. This will be one of the project's aims during the first year, but is not feasible at the disclosure stage. By definition, the communities which are hard to contact and communicate with are those who will feel least impact from the activities of management of the National Park.

Bibliography

A detailed reference list is included in the attached consultant's report.