Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

Project Information Document/ Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (PID/ISDS)

Concept Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 29-Dec-2016 | Report No: PIDISDSC20139

Public Disclosure Authorized

BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country	Project ID	Parent Project ID (if any)	Project Name
Indonesia	P160661		Acceleration Program of One Map Policy Implementation (P160661)
Region	**Estimated Appraisal Date**	**Estimated Board Date**	**Practice Area (Lead)**
EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC	May 01, 2017	Sep 28, 2017	Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice
Lending Instrument	**Borrower(s)**	**Implementing Agency**	
Investment Project Financing	Ministry of Finance	Badan Informasi Geospasial (BIG),Gedung Kementerian Agraria dan Tata Ruang/Badan Pertanahan Nasional (BPN)	

Proposed Development Objective(s)

The proposed Project Development Objective of the Project would be to support implementation of the OMP, and strengthen the NSDI and social forestry for establishing clarity on actual land use at the village level in target areas.

Financing (in USD Million)

Financing Source	Amount
Global Environment Facility (GEF)	18.23
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	200.00
Total Project Cost	**220.00**

Environmental Assessment Category	Concept Review Decision
B-Partial Assessment	Track II-The review did authorize the preparation to continue

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here.

Other Decision (as needed)

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Indonesia's territory covers more than 6,000 inhabited islands, including the world's third-largest tropical forest, which is globally significant due to its extent, biodiversity and carbon storage capacity.[1] Indonesia is the world's fourth largest country by population, with 2,300 ethnic communities scattered across 208 districts, 642 sub-districts, and 71,771 villages. Its 250 million people come from 300 native groups and speak more than 700 languages and dialects. In 2010, roughly 54% of Indonesians lived in urban areas; by 2050 this number is expected to increase to 67%, making Indonesia one of the fastest urbanizing countries in the world. Arable land represents 14% of land use, forests 52%, and meadows and pastures 10%.[2] Farm productivity is very low by regional standards and is limited by considerable land degradation, deforestation, erratic access to water, as well as dated methodologies and equipment.

The Indonesian gross domestic product (GDP) in 2015 was $1.3 trillion, positioning Indonesia as the largest economy in Southeast Asia. It is the world's tenth largest economy in terms of purchasing power parity and the only Southeast Asian member of the G-20. The Indonesian economy is based largely on extraction of non-renewal resources (16% of GDP, 40% of exports[3]), as well as agriculture and forestry (together 34% of GDP)[4]. Thirty-three percent of the labor force depends predominantly or exclusively on agriculture, forestry, hunting or fishing, and many others in downstream activities[5] and 1% on the extractives.[6] The people depending on forests and rural lands for livelihoods are disproportionally poorer than the national average and include also many *adat*[7] communities. The commodity boom of the last decade halved the Indonesian poverty rate to 11.2%[8], but the economic growth slowed and by 2014 34 million (14% of the population) lived below the poverty line of $21 per month, and another 65 million people (27%) lived just above it.

Pressures on Indonesia's land and natural resources have led to the world's highest rate of deforestation and wide-spread land degradation, negatively affecting Indonesia's globally significant biodiversity and placing Indonesia among the world's ten worst emitters of greenhouse gases (GHG). Indeed land use change is responsible for two-thirds of Indonesia's emissions. Agriculture, logging, mineral extraction, rapid urbanization, and housing development together with weak land governance and administration have increased speculative encroachment and forest conversion, diminishing and degrading forests and the environmental services they

1 The tropical forest covers an estimated 94 million hectares of natural and planted forests representing 52% of Indonesia's total land area and containing 17% of the world's bird species, 16% of reptiles and amphibians, 12% of mammals, and 10 percent of plants. Indonesia's forest also serves as one of the world's most important carbon sinks, sequestering and storing significant quantities of carbon in both above-ground forest biomass and below-ground peatlands.
2 Indonesia Agricultural Census, 2013. Arable land (hectares) in Indonesia was last measured at 23.5 million in 2011, according to the World Bank. Arable land (in hectares) includes land defined by the FAO as land under temporary crops (double-cropped areas are counted once), temporary meadows for mowing or for pasture, land under market or kitchen gardens, and land temporarily fallow. Land abandoned as a result of shifting cultivation is excluded.
3 "Bringing revenue transparency to Indonesia's extractive industries"; The Hub: International Perspectives, Erry Riyana Hardjapamekas, Strategic Review, August 2, 2013.
4 GDP breakdown by sector is as follows: agriculture represents 34%; forestry and logging 0.19%; and mining and quarrying 9.8%.
5 Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS).
6 Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS).
7 Local customary law of Islamic-Malay tradition in Indonesia. For the purposes of the project preparation, the term *adat*-communities is used non-academically to describe indigenous and other groups practicing communal or customary tenure.
8 The gross national income per capita developed from $2,200 in 2000 to $3,475 in 2013.

provide, and disrupting traditional forest/rural livelihoods and settlements, further enhancing the potential for poverty. Notably, unsustainable natural resource use and poor environmental management disproportionately affects the livelihoods of forest-dependent communities. Economic loss and damage as a result of poor forest management and environmental degradation are substantial[9] impacting hard local livelihoods and poverty.

The special nature of poverty in forests– remoteness, low population density and dispersed community locations – requires a response that recognizes the linkages between the fate of people living in these areas and the country's management of its natural resources. Lifting the extremely poor out of poverty permanently requires sustainable management of these resources and improving the rural economy broadly. Clarity on land-use, access rights and licenses are emerging as key to improving the management and protection of natural resources, and reduction of poverty.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

An unclear policy and regulatory framework, coupled with a fragmented and incomplete land administration system, hinder the management and governance of land and natural resources in Indonesia. Land administration in Indonesia is divided between forest lands[10] administered by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) and non-forest lands administered by the Ministry for Agrarian and Spatial Planning (BPN). While global experience and best practices encourage a unified registry and cadastre system for all properties and tenure types, the dual system maintains two parallel systems to register, designate and manage state lands. This results in duplication in policy, legal and institutional frameworks, unclear tenure arrangements and legal recognition. The dualism also contributes to the slow recognition of *adat* communities' rights on land and hinders the government's ability to optimize land use and protect resources.

As an additional dimension, licensing for use of natural resources (extractives, timber and forest products, oil palm) takes place across different ministries and at different levels of government, and there are issues of transparency, boundary demarcation and mapping of issued licenses, further complicated by the absence of a common base map and data platform. In addition, this overall lack of clarity makes it difficult to enforce laws and regulations designed to manage land use, such as the ban on using fire to clear land. The situation encourages agricultural expansion onto forest lands under the assumption that cultivation will provide direct returns to the community and lead to permanent property and resource rights. Land disputes between communities and large-scale land users (such as plantation forests) are common. Protected areas are poorly demarcated, and regularly encroached. Lack of clarity in land relations also inhibits investment, particularly for industry where upfront costs are high, such as geothermal energy.

In response, in 2011 the GoI introduced the Geospatial Information Law and the Open Map Policy (OMP) aiming to establish a unified, agreed-upon base set of geospatial data (i.e., topography, land use, and tenure) that informs decision-making at the national and sub-national levels as the base of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI). Since 2011, the GoI has prioritized OMP as an effort to establish a unified, agreed-upon base set of geospatial data (i.e., land use, tenure and topography) that informs decision making at the national and sub-national levels. President Joko Widodo has acknowledged that without better landscape management

[9] Recent the World Bank analysis shows $16.1 billion (1.9% of national GDP) losses by the 2015 forest fires in Indonesia. Earlier, the World Bank's Country Environment Assessment estimated annual economic losses from environmental degradation to be as high as 7.4% of GDP.
[10] 64.5% of Indonesia's territory (125.9 million hectares) is classified as Forest Estate (Kawasan Hutan) and designated for conservation and forestry-related purposes.

and improved geospatial data, the country will be unable to sustainably manage its natural resources. The Medium Term Development Plan (RPJM) for 2015-2019 reflects OMP with the aim to complete 100% of forest demarcation, establish and make operational 629 Forest Management Units (KPH), and foster community forestry partnerships across 12.7 million hectares (including customary holdings) . The RPJM also targets 60% coverage of non-forest land maps and 70% coverage of land certificates, 89,000 kilometers of forest boundary demarcation and mapping at 1:5,000 scale, and the integration of the forest land registration into a national land registry. Already established, NSDI builds on a new geodetic reference system (SRGI 2013), a publicly available portal (Ina-Geoportal by BIG), and OMP coordination mechanism (led by Coordinating Minister for Economic Affairs (CMEA)). The government also has invested in a new topographic base map, at a scale of 1:50,000, that is close to covering the entire country. As the first results of collaboration under OMP, the GoI publishes a jointly compiled Forest Moratorium Map and BIG invites civil society groups to contribute to One Map through community land mapping. However, both the NSDI data content, OMP compilation rate and crowdsourced maps' integration all remain limited, impeded by incoherent and overlapping data, and incomplete processes and standardization.

However, the current OMP methodology confirmed by Presidential Regulation (9/2016) aims to produce 1:50,000 scale maps based on over 80 thematic datasets and with limited or no ground verification. It is becoming apparent that this approach and scale will not be sufficiently detailed to reliably identify the land use and occupancy at the district and village levels. Indeed, as line ministries have difficulties producing coherent data internally and with all datasets significantly overlapping, locational and size discrepancies and inaccuracies are expected.

Responding to these challenges, there is consensus in the GoI that OMP needs to progress systematically across the territory, include all state, communal and private stakeholders in each territory, and engage directly with land users in verifying/demarcating their land use and occupancy. Apart from the GoI, landholders and civil society will expect a process that is capable of locating and delineating communities and land use. There is also a common understanding on the urgency for a vast territorial impact, and an acceleration of OMP progress will require streamlining the NSDI framework and regulations, investing in NSDI infrastructure and ensuring NSDI's (true) access to all target datasets. Further, a field verification process is needed that incorporates lessons learned from numerous existing communal mapping approaches used in Indonesia and applies a mass-scale process capable of delivering a cheap and efficient, yet inclusive and transparent, process and results.

Further, the GoI has introduced a Social Forestry program to reduce poverty among the forest dependent people, reduce deforestation and forest degradation, improve land management and conserve forests and valuable ecosystem functions. The target of the Social Forestry program is to identify eligible communities and forest lands, and adjudicate, demarcate and transfer 12.7 million hectares of degraded forest land to community ownership for forest management purposes by 2019. The program will also support restoration of these lands to boost economic welfare, promote community engagement and community ownership in managing lands and forests, and to reduce the pressure to convert old-growth forest for agriculture. The program also aims to address the systemic poverty in forested areas and generate global environment benefits in the buffer zones of critical protected areas.

Extending community management of degraded forest lands through social forestry is a core goal of forestry development in Indonesia for environment, economic and social outcomes. Participation of local communities in forest resource management has become a major priority of the government and is a pillar for both

sustainable forest management and local community welfare. Since 2007, the government has issued policies and regulations to improve community access rights to the forest estate. When fully implemented, the Social Forestry program is expected to result to at least 9.2% GHG emission reduction at the national level. To date, the Government has demarcated 957,049 ha of which 779,454.46 ha have been transferred to communities. However, achievement of the program's ambitious targets have been impeded due to challenges in identifying and transferring appropriate lands. With GEF financing, the proposed project aims to support the GoI's efforts to scale up the social forestry impacts through linking the program with the broader One Map efforts, which would provide an agreed and updated basemap for all land-related decisions by all agencies. Such an effort would significantly improve MoEF's identification and demarcation of degraded lands for Social Forestry. With GEF resources, the project would target the transfer and improved management of 500,000 ha of degraded lands and improve the protocols and information base for scaling up Social Forestry. MoEF aims to achieve the project targets through social forestry schemes, including *hutan kemasyarakatan* (community forestry), *hutan desa* (village forests), *hutan tanaman rakyat* (community plantation forests) and *hutan adat* (customary forests). With these schemes, the social forestry program also contributes to the conservation of biodiversity especially through the protection of corridors and improved management of buffer zones to important habitats.

Based on a preliminary assessment, the stated MoEF targets are unlikely to be achieved due to a number of challenges including in identifying and transferring appropriate degraded lands, weak capacity at the community level to improve access to information, markets, decision-making, and technical assistance, and in limited institutional capacity and incentives at the national and local government level. Indeed, with GEF financing the proposed project would aim to improve the information base to improve decision-making, methodologies to facilitate transfer of appropriate degraded lands, and build capacity of local government and communities to execute such transfers. Furthermore, it will provide technical assistance for forest management and related livelihood activities so as to promote poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation. As such, the project will contribute to the government's commitment to international conventions such as climate change (e.g., nationally determined contributions - NDCs) and biodiversity as well as to the government's development-related policies and programs.

Relationship to CPF

The Indonesia-World Bank Group Country Partnership Framework 2016-19 (CPF) is guided by the twin goals of eliminating poverty and enhancing shared prosperity. Among other objectives toward these goals, it calls for forward-looking management of Indonesia's natural resources. Specifically, it aims to support sustainable landscape management through improved Land Management and Spatial Planning by (i) building capacity for spatial planning and land administration; (ii) enhancing transparency on forest asset boundaries; and (iii) improving security of land tenure and use. Further, the CPF calls for support to a policy reform agenda including land and forest governance and administration. Among the more concrete initiatives, the CPF calls for a geo-referenced national inventory of land parcels covering all public and private lands as necessary to support harmonization of spatial plans at provincial, district and village levels, strengthening the capacity of subnational entities to allocate, manage and monitor land and support the rights of indigenous communities within the forests. Public availability of One Map in the context of NSDI is a development outcome of this engagement area and a new land project was included among the planned World Bank Group investments under the CPF.

Further, the proposed project would be part of the Sustainable Landscapes Management program of the World Bank Group (WBG) with GoI that supports the government to a) sustainably manage lowlands through

conservation, restoration and sustainable development of peatlands; b) improve land information system by completing the One Map; and c) reform the National Fire Management System by introducing risk based and prevention-focused approaches. As the first stage, a program of World Bank-supported technical assistance (PASA) has been launched, a Multi Donor Trust Fund has been established with the initial support of Norway and Australia, and the preparation of investment projects has started, including the proposed One Map program with GoI, World Bank and GEF financing.

The proposed project would contribute to the objectives and strategies of GEF-6. The project would enhance the forest cover by converting degraded forest land into well managed forest. The selection of forest lands would be based among others on their potential to generate other benefits including biodiversity conservation (e.g., buffer zones and corridors which provide dispersion benefit to critically endangered wildlife such as orangutan and Sumatra tigers) and reversing land degradation. Therefore, it would contribute to the GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal area objective 4 (mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes), especially program 9 (Managing Human-Biodiversity Interface). In addition, the project would contribute to the objectives of GEF-6 LD focal area objectives through increased forest area coverage and improving management of forest lands. The project would specifically contribute to the GEF-6 SFM objectives especially toward enhancing forest management and restoring forest ecosystems. In addition, the project is consistent with the Indonesia's Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of 2015-2020 and contributes to its objectives especially through the restoration of degraded forest land and conservation of important forest areas critical for biodiversity such as habitats for iconic Indonesian wildlife. Furthermore, the project will contribute to Aichi Biodiversity Targets 1, 7, 15 and 18.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Note to Task Teams: The PDO has been pre-populated from the datasheet for the first time for your convenience. Please keep it up to date whenever it is changed in the datasheet.

The proposed Project Development Objective of the Project would be to support implementation of the OMP, and strengthen the NSDI and social forestry for establishing clarity on actual land use at the village level in target areas. The objective would be achieved by improving infrastructure, capacity, procedures and guidelines for the implementation of the OMP, enhancing public access to geospatial data and services, compiling and verifying concessions data and other data on state lands, confirming state lands' integration into the overall land administration system, providing accurate geospatial base data, and producing local level One Maps through participatory communal methodologies.

Key Results (From PCN)

The tentative list of key development performance indicators:

a. Administrative villages with clarity on actual land use and land disputes in Indonesia (number/%);
b. Direct project beneficiaries (landholders, concessionaires, government agencies, community members) with delineated land use in One Map, of whom x percentage are female (number/%);
c. Public access to local geospatial data online (%);
d. Methodology for identifying and transferring degraded lands to communities developed and piloted (yes/no); and

e. Area under Social Forestry management scheme including formalized use rights to communities (ha).

Project beneficiaries would include all land users whose security of tenure would improve, and central and local government that would have improved capacity for decision-making through NSDI and local One Maps. The data would provide basis for spatial planning, land and natural resources management, including for agriculture, forestry, mining and extractives, and conservation. The project would encourage sustainable land and resources use and provide up-to-date geospatial data for tenure regularization and allocation. This would expose, and reduce incentives for, unsustainable land use practices and increase local capacity to manage resources. Related to latter, the project would contribute to improved governance through reducing the risk of issuing overlapping forest, extractive and agricultural concessions/licenses. Together, the project would positively contribute to poverty reduction and climate change mitigation.

As per the GEF data sheet, further GEF indicators will be developed and included into the results framework.

D. Concept Description

The project would have four components and tentatively USD 200 million IBRD cost and USD 18.227 million GEF financing:

Component 1: One Map Policy Framework, Technical Assistance, Capacity Building and Project Management (US$12.5 million, IBRD). The objective of this component would be to ensure feasible framework, process, methodology, capacity and quality for NSDI and OMP implementation. The component would provide technical assistance to improve NSDI and OMP regulations, processes and methodologies to allow feasible implementation and quality assurance. The component would also provide project management support for implementing agencies countrywide. The component would maintain a needs-based capacity building program to the NSDI and OMP implementing personnel and key stakeholders throughout the project period. The component would also support analysis, consultation and development of policy and regulatory framework for the One Map and on land and natural resources more broadly.

Component 2: One Map Data Compilation to NSDI (US$55 million, IBRD). The objective of the component would be to improve the Indonesian NSDI infrastructure, solutions, data content and accessibility. The component would upgrade hardware, software, hosting facilities and communication lines for NSDI applications and identify, digitize/convert, georeference and connect (OMP) datasets to NSDI. The component would also facilitate further Geospatial sector standardization and NSDI coordination, and facilitate data sharing agreements for data population to the NSDI. Finally, the component would support the GoI to develop electronic geospatial services available to the public.

Component 3: One Map Verification; Fit-for-Purpose Participatory Village Land Use Mapping and Land Administration (US$112 million, IBRD). The objective of this component would be to produce local level One Maps (delineating land use and occupation in a field/block level – not on an individual parcel level) to cover target rural and peri-urban areas. Initially, the component would finance high or medium resolution base maps, photomaps or orthorectified images to all target areas against a fit-for-purpose and cost-efficiency criteria. Also, the component would support general and location-specific public awareness and community sensitization programs that would ensure full inclusiveness and participation in participatory land use and occupancy demarcation and mapping, which would constitute the field verification of the OMP. The field campaign would aim to record the actual land use and occupancy, and identify disputes. Subsequently, public

display would be arranged for rectifying errors and facilitating dispute resolution between state, communal, public, private and private sector land users. Where possible, the registration of delineated and undisputed state lands in the Land Registry would be facilitated. For the latter purpose, the component would support the creation/upgrading of an integrated Cadastre and Land Registry system, or a joint information system that would integrate all state and private lands into one registry/record. Finally, the component would support fit-for-purpose titling pilots that would test low-cost processes for completing parcel level titling and cadastral mapping in areas with completed local One Maps.

Component 4: Strengthening Social Forestry (US$18.227 million, GEF financing). The objective of this component would be to improve forest management and conservation of biodiversity of global significance through the restoration of degraded lands and protection of forests in social and environmental priority areas using best available data[11]. The activity will help to mitigate emissions from degraded lands through reforestation and from further land use change. The component would use incremental GEF resources to support the GoI's Social Forestry program in the MoEF by i) policy and institutional strengthening of social forestry; ii) selecting, demarcating (as part of the Component 3 local One Map production), regulating and registering groups' access to forests through various community, village and customary and partnership tenure arrangements; iii) development and implementation of community investments; iv) support to small and micro community enterprise development; and iv) capacity building. The details of each of this activities will be further elaborated during project preparation. For example, development and implementation of community investments requires among others (a) organization of community groups; (b) improving capacity of these groups including knowledge generation and sharing; (c) transferring land use rights of agreed area based on initial roadmap; and (d) development of detailed management plan for the area including detailed mapping, demarcation and zoning. Such investments would be done under the sustainable forest management principle/models. This activity will also support Indonesia in its effort to reduce its forest fire and haze issues and loss of critical habitats for biological diversity.

Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

[11] This includes use of national data, Key Biodiversity Areas data and Digital Observatory for Protected Areas etc

SAFEGUARDS

A. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The program is expected to generate positive overall outcomes by enhancing land management systems, inter-ministerial and agency coordination, institutional capacity building as well as promoting tenure security and social welfare particularly amongst forest-dependent communities through the Social Forestry Program. The locations of specific interventions are not yet known, but are likely to include substantial parts of the Landscape program's target provinces and possibly other priority areas identified for social forestry and titling. The BIG, serving as the PMU for Components 1 and 2 and the BPN, as the PIU for Component 3, and MoEF's PIU for the Component 4 will select sites and project targets during project preparation. There is a possibility that Under Component 2, financing will be made available for secondary infrastructure investments related to the Information and Communication Technology (ICT). These investments will most likely be used to renovate and improve existing facilities such as data centers, disaster recovery facilities and server rooms and therefore does not envision the need for new lands or new infrastructure building and/or AMDAL (Environmental Impact Assessments) as per-GoI's regulations. Codes of Practice for safe infrastructure and construction and HSE will be considered adequate for Component 2 since risks are expected to be minor. Additional safeguard measures are applicable to Components 3 and 4, where local-level land use mapping and support for social forestry are provided.

Specifically, for Component 3, community-driven land use mapping exercises aim to create a level playing field by bringing key stakeholders, particularly communities, to collaboratively identify and record actual land use and claims and assess where existing and potential disputes are located. Component 4 activities will take place in degraded forest lands within areas identified as important for biodiversity conservation. Since the Social Forestry program is be national in scope, potential safeguard issues may stem from lack of community participation due to limited access to information.

An Integrated Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for specific safeguard aspects under each component will be jointly developed by respective PMUs/PIUs including BIG, BPN and MoEF during project preparation. Safeguard implementation and oversight will be embedded in the project institutional structures under each component.

B. Borrower's Institutional Capacity for Safeguard Policies

The coordination of the program will spearheaded by BIG (PMU for Component 1 and 2) and BPN (PIU for Component 3). More clarity on the capability of the Government unit to implement WB's Safeguard Policies will available after a capacity assessment is completed. Although the main safeguard risks are related to Components 3 and 4 where implementation would likely be led by BPN and MOEF respectively, the role of BIG as leading agency is key to ensuring coordinated approach to safeguard management.

BPN has previous experience with the WB in land administration projects , has implemented the WB's Safeguard Policies, and therefore has some capacity to manage social and environmental risks However, since this program will be implemented nationally, local BPN offices' capacity to manage social and environmental risks may vary across districts and provinces, such that further capacity assessments will be necessary. BIG (PMU for Components 1 and 2), established in 2011 following the Geospatial Information Act , has limited experience working directly for WB's financed projects and therefore capacity strengthening in the area of safeguards is an essential component being envisioned under the TA component during the Investment Project Financing (IPF) preparation. MoEF (PMU for Component 4) has previously worked with the WB mainly on REDD+ related analytical activities and has limited experience in implementing WB supported projects . Currently, the MoEF is implementing the newly launched (2016) Forest Investment Program (FIP) 2

with focus on capacity strengthening for Forest Management Units (FMU) but through a different directorate. The understanding of safeguards within MoEF requires further assessment.

Further assessments on the capacity of implementing agencies at both the national and sub-national levels will be conducted throughout project preparation and information generated from these activities will feed into the design of technical support and capacity building strategies under the program.

C. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Thomas E. Walton, Lucy Madeline Mitchell, Fajar Argo Djati, AMY CHUA FANG LIM

D. Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The project is classified as Category B. Because the locations of project activities will not be known at the time of appraisal, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) will be prepared. The project is expected to have impacts that are positive overall. Potential adverse impacts will not be large-scale and can be avoided or minimized through mitigation measures that have been applied in similar Bank-supported land projects. The positive impacts from the project will include: (a) documenting changing patterns of land use and deforestation; (b) providing accurate physical demarcation of boundaries for protection and conservation forest, thereby enhancing the government's capacity to provide the necessary protection; (c) reducing the probability of issuance of conflicting or inappropriate land use licenses; (d) providing incentives for improved land management; and (e) improved community livelihoods based on sustainable natural resource management. The only direct potential environmental impacts from the project are associated with renovation/improvement of existing buildings/infrastructure under Component 2. Most of those impacts can and will be addressed by Codes of Practice for HSE (Health, Safety and Environment) that will be formulated during project preparation and embedded in renovation contracts. If asbestos-containing materials are encountered during renovation work, handling and disposal will be in accordance with standard asbestos management measures that will be included in the ESMF. For component 4, under the Social Forest program and as

		mentioned in OP4.09, there will be risk usage of pesticides/fertilizers on degraded forest land that will be tenured to the community or villagers. These and other potential impacts of the component will be addressed through the management plans that will be prepared by the communities under MoEF guidance.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The project as planned does not involve conversion or degradation of natural or critical natural habitat.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The project will not finance commercial logging or activities that would convert or degrade critical forest areas or other natural habitats. However the project activities under the Component 4 are intended to trigger improvements in management, protection and land use patterns in forest areas.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project will neither involve procurement nor application of pesticides. However it could conceivably trigger an increase in pesticide use under the Social Forestry program supported through Component 4 where degraded forest land will be transferred to the community and villagers for management.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	TBD	The project will not have direct impacts on physical cultural resources (PRC). However, since project activities will be implemented in areas controlled or claimed by indigenous peoples (see comments on OP 4.10 below), there is the possibility of induced adverse impacts on resources important to IPs, such as sacred groves. The policy is therefore considered for triggering, and its management requirements will be incorporated in the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF). In addition the ESMF will incorporate chance-find procedures for PCR.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	Activities under C.3 will be implemented in territories/areas controlled or claimed by IPs or where there is co-existence between IPs and other local communities (e.g. in-migrants, forest dwellers, etc.). This program, particularly Components 3 and 4 are expected to benefit IPs communities . Through land use mapping and boundary demarcations, this program will support current initiatives to strengthen tenurial security for IPs. The maps produced can be used for further legal processing. Being a GoI's led initiative, this program aims to bring together all key government and non-government stakeholders and is therefore expected to improve coordination and

		collaboration in current efforts to settle land conflicts and recognition of land rights for IPs communities. Under social forestry schemes, Component 4 will provide alternative tenurial arrangements for IPs and is expected to provide a faster pathway to address some pertinent issues such as: lack of transparency in land use allocation and decisions; lack of tenurial security; criminalization of IPs in relation to land and resource use; and limited access to lands and natural resources. Various secondary data indicates that IPs groups in Indonesia are considered some of the most marginalized and vulnerable groups, with high concentration in areas with low HDIs and poor infrastructure. IPs groups are most vulnerable: • Those living in forest areas, parks and reserves, as traditional owners/custodians, positioned as encroachers or squatters; • In villages or hamlets where they are minorities; • In urban fringes, as migrants usually living on other tribes' land and; • In islands and border areas, may be militarized or lowest services. Social inclusion strategies for mapping activities should take these constraints into consideration, by tailoring the approaches to the extent possible to meet the needs of IPs and vulnerable groups. These measures will be accommodated in the ESMF and POM. The activities will also be implemented based on free, prior and informed consultations to obtain broad community support and to ensure that communities have an adequate and accurate understanding of the initiatives proposed. An Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) will be developed and integrated into the ESMF to ensure that project implementation is culturally and socially appropriate and is based on broad community support. The guidelines for such consultations, tailored to the program's context, will be integrated in the IPPF and POM.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	TBD	No project activities are expected to result in Involuntary Resettlement and/or the exercise of

		eminent domain. The project will fund mapping of land use and occupancy and will support land conflict resolution through identification of land claims in a participatory manner. Since the participatory mapping will record state and public lands, the impact to informal land users will need particular attention, which is intended to be covered in the ESMF. The approach will be subject to confirmation at the project appraisal. Component 4 aims to enhance access to lands and natural resources for forest dependent communities through social forestry schemes and is therefore expected to address access restriction issues that exist due to unclear land boundaries and identification of ownership. The ESMF will establish a community participation framework, strategies to improve access and livelihoods related to social forestry, and grievance redress mechanism (GRM) protocols to ensure that the implementation of Components 3 and 4 is participatory, inclusive, transparent, and responsive to potential grievances that may arise.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project does not involve dependence on or construction of dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project will not have any effects on international waterways.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project is not being implemented in disputed areas.

E. Safeguard Preparation Plan

Tentative target date for preparing the Appraisal Stage PID/ISDS

May 12, 2017

Time frame for launching and completing the safeguard-related studies that may be needed. The specific studies and their timing should be specified in the Appraisal Stage PID/ISDS

ESMF and IPPF: TBA

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Mika-Petteri Torhonen, Iwan Gunawan
Lead Land Administration Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Ministry of Finance

Implementing Agencies

Badan Informasi Geospasial (BIG)
Priyadi Kardono
Head
info@big.go.id

Gedung Kementerian Agraria dan Tata Ruang/Badan Pertanahan Nasional (BPN)
Sofyan Djalil
Minister
humas@bpn.go.id

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

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

APPROVAL

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

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Surhid P. Gautam	30-Dec-2016

Practice Manager/Manager:	Kevin A. Milroy	30-Dec-2016
Country Director:	Rodrigo A. Chaves	03-Jan-2017

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here.

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

The program is expected to generate positive overall outcomes by enhancing land management systems, inter-ministerial and agency coordination, institutional capacity building as well as promoting tenure security and social welfare particularly amongst forest-dependent communities through the Social Forestry Program. The locations of specific interventions are not yet known, but are likely to include substantial parts of the Landscape program's target[12] provinces and possibly other priority areas identified for social forestry and titling. The BIG, serving as the PMU for Components 1 and 2 and the BPN, as the PIU for Component 3, and MoEF's PIU for the Component 4 will select sites and project targets during project preparation. There is a possibility that Under Component 2, financing will be made available for secondary infrastructure investments related to the Information and Communication Technology (ICT). These investments will most likely be used to renovate and improve existing facilities such as data centers, disaster recovery facilities and server rooms and therefore does not envision the need for new lands or new infrastructure building and/or AMDAL (Environmental Impact Assessments) as per-GoI's regulations. Codes of Practice for safe infrastructure and construction and HSE will be considered adequate for Component 2 since risks are expected to be minor. Additional safeguard measures are applicable to Components 3 and 4, where local-level land use mapping and support for social forestry are provided.

Specifically, for Component 3, community-driven land use mapping exercises aim to create a level playing field by bringing key stakeholders, particularly communities, to collaboratively identify and record actual land use and claims and assess where existing and potential disputes are located. When such information is generated to inform policy processes and practical actions, activities under this component could potentially serve as proactive and protective measures by which land management, conflict resolution strategies, monitoring, as well as conservation efforts could be further harnessed in a more cost-efficient and effective manner.

Land use mapping strategies, designed to be scalable nationwide, will be developed during project preparation under the TA component. The design of community participation approaches for the mapping process will take stock of the previous experiences of the WB supported Community Driven Development (CDD) programs such as PNPM Rural where village-level mapping activities were supported.

The implementation of Component 3 will seek broad participation of relevant stakeholders including Indigenous Peoples (IPs), vulnerable community groups (landless farmers, settlers in state forests, forest-dependent communities, nomadic groups, etc. among others) as well as other parties with vested interest in lands in question. Access to information and outreach might be limited for some of these community groups due to remote geographic locations, language barriers, and seasonal mobility patterns. Under these circumstances, careful attention will be paid to the development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and allocation of specific resources to ensure that flexibility and tailored treatment are possible particularly for areas with existing and/potential conflicts. Preliminary identification of high-risk areas will be carried out by BPN Offices in participating districts/provinces in collaboration with consultancy teams for mapping activities prior and during project implementation. Tailored approaches to consultation and mapping activities the high-

[12] Riau, Jambi, South Sumatra, Bengkulu, Lampung, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, South Kalimantan, East Kalimantan, North Kalimantan, Papua and West Papua.

risk areas will be developed during project preparation.

Specifically for Component 4, the Social Forestry program under the MOEF (DG Social Forestry) aims to strengthen the institutional capacity and methods for transferring and managing degraded lands to villages and local communities through various tenure arrangements. Through collaboration with BIG and BPN on land use mapping, this program aims to redistribute 12.7 million hectares of degraded forest land. Doing so requires better clarity on the boundary demarcations between forest lands and private concessions. Through the social forestry support, community access to land and resources is expected to strengthen livelihoods and improve natural resource management via restoration and conservation of high biodiversity areas.

Component 4 activities will take place in degraded forest lands within areas identified as important for biodiversity conservation. Since the Social Forestry program is be national in scope, potential safeguard issues may stem from lack of community participation due to limited access to information. Unclear legal requirements of communities may also disadvantage some groups of IPs and other forest dwelling peoples. In light of these concerns, boundary demarcations and land claim settlements need to be participatory and inclusive to avoid conflicts and create legitimacy amongst all claimants of lands in question (e.g. open access lands). Access to socially and culturally appropriate services related to natural resource management and livelihoods will affect the achievement of the social forestry program objectives.

An Integrated Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for specific safeguard aspects under each component will be jointly developed by respective PMUs/PIUs including BIG, BPN and MoEF during project preparation. The development of the ESMF will tap into the wealth of previous experiences and literature under this sector in Indonesia. To complement available data, thematic environmental and social assessments may be carried out particularly in selected areas where information is not readily available, particularly to help identify or better understand high-risk locations. Prior to implementation, Project Operational Manuals (POMs) will be developed to further translate key measures outlined in the ESMF and institutional arrangements across PIUs and PMU.

Safeguard implementation and oversight will be embedded in the project institutional structures under each component. A complimentary Recipient-Executed Technical Assistance (TA) package (INIS Grant, 0.65 million USD) will be strategically used to assist BIG, BPN and MOEF during project preparation to carry out an environmental and social assessment and develop safeguards instruments as well as capacity building for implementers, particularly in the areas of community engagement, outreach and mobilization. Relevant safeguard instruments will be prepared before project effectiveness under the RETF TA component, as necessary.

The development of safeguard instruments will take stock of the previous WB and other partners' experiences in land administration and social forestry. A Review of the Land Sector (Forest and Non-forest) in Indonesia and previous WB supported initiatives[13] offer a number of key lessons-learnt:

- Community mapping serves as a platform to establish checks and balances in actual land use and access to resources. Such exercises need to begin with careful review of a range of different rights and interests in the land being mapped, to serve as an early analysis of claims and conflicts.
- While community land use mapping does not readily respond to immediate needs of communities, such exercises are an attempt to protect access to land and resources and limit the intrusion of others who benefit from exploitation of natural resources.

[13] References cited include: (1) World Bank 2014, Towards Indonesian Land Reforms: Challenges and Opportunities A Review of the Land Sector (Forest and Non-forest) in Indonesia, (2) PROFOR 2014: Mapping Indigenous Land and Resources: Stock taking of Experiences, Looking Back, Lessons Learned and Moving Forward and (3) 2015 AMAN, Implementation Completion Report – Improving Governance for Sustainable Indigenous Community Livelihoods in Forest Areas (SICoLIFe).

- To improve legitimacy and avoid conflict over land mapping processes, broad consultation and consensus mechanisms must be embedded in the process.
- Understanding actual land use and occupancy can help improve land management and conservation of resources only if accompanied by strengthening institutional capacity of relevant agencies and law enforcement.
- Appropriate procedures for participatory mapping need to be in place and conveyed at community level, with accessible advice on follow-on steps that communities could opt for in regularizing their land rights.
- The role of civil society is important to strengthen the voices of marginalized populations through their networks and has historically played a strong role in advocating reforms to land laws and regulations.
- Community mapping often takes place outside the government's system[14] and therefore not optimally useful in processes related to formal tenure such as concessions, titling and conflict resolution. Support to One Map should therefore enhance integration of community mapping exercises with the government-led processes.
- Previous work (such as WB's JSDF[15]) has also shown that youth generally are active and integral in the mapping activities, with guidance from the elders/seniors, provided that they are equipped with knowledge about mapping technology. Similarly, when space and capacity building opportunities are created for women, they have been active and comfortable participating in the mapping work.

Safeguard measures need to take account the lessons outlined above and acknowledge the complexity and risks of land projects, particularly in areas with history of land conflicts. Efforts are needed to develop fit-for-purpose preventive measures for anticipated risks.

[14] Since 1999, Participatory Mapping Network (JKPP), Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago (AMAN) has taken the initiative to map out indigenous territories and customary use of land and forest by local communities to support their claims for recognition of indigenous territories. In 2011, AMAN, JKPP, Forest-Watch Indonesia (FWI), Consortium for Supporting Community-Based Forest System Management (KpSHK) established the Ancestral Domain Registration Agency / BRWA) as a one-stop gate for registration of ancestral domains and verification. The agency also acts as an administrator of community maps before being handed over to the government as a trustee.

[15] Implementation Completion Report – Improving Governance for Sustainable Indigenous Community Livelihoods in Forest Areas (SICoLIFe) September 2015