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Executive Summary

The Joint Learning Process of MISEREOR and Partner Organizations Working on Natural Resources included seven civil society organizations (PO1, PO2, PO3, PO4, PO5, PO6 and PO7) in Indonesia, which are committed to the protection of indigenous land and forestry rights in the face of progressive land grabbing practices through palm oil, timber and mining industries. The efforts of the CSOs are focused on protecting the sovereignty of smallholder farmers in line with their customary practices and livelihood needs. Since the late 1960s, the allocation of deforestation concessions in Sumatra and Kalimantan had been used to cement the power of the authoritarian Suharto regime. In the late 1980s and 1990s, the deforestation rate in Indonesia took on a dramatic scale, primarily driven by industrial pulp and paper production - often accompanied by massive human rights violations. It is only in the last 20 years that the exponentially growing palm oil industry has become one of the central causes of deforestation, conversion of natural forest into plantation areas and recurrent massive forest fires that in recent year regularly during the dry season engulfed Sumatra, Kalimantan and neighboring parts of Malaysia and Singapore in a thick haze. In the lowlands of Kalimantan, it is especially coal mining that contributes to the displacement of local residents and the degradation of natural resources. However, even efforts by the international community to mitigate the effects of climate change through programs such as REDD + and to denote degraded forest zones as conservation areas have led to the deprivation of indigenous and local communities of their rights to continue using traditionally used forest areas as main sources of their livelihoods.

MISEREOR has supported parts of their partner organizations for up to nine years. The original four partner civil society organizations (CSOs) worked mainly in and from Sumatra, three other Kalimantan-based organizations were included in 2013. All partners share the common goal of strengthening local communities in their rights for self-determination, to obtain recognition of their rights to land use and in the protection of their traditional livelihoods, while at the same time stopping land grabbing practices. Primary target groups are local smallholder farmers, the majority of which belong to indigenous groups. About 50,000 small farmers benefit either directly or indirectly from the interventions by the MISEREOR partners. Some of them are characterized by traditional lifestyles, for whom the natural resources are the basis of their livelihood strategies, but also have a spiritual significance. But the target groups also include smallholder farmers who originally emigrated from over-populated regions of the country in search of a new existence and settled within forested areas of Sumatra and Kalimantan. Other target groups are existing community organizations, local or national government representatives, as well as media representatives.

The CSO approaches can be divided into three pillars: Advocacy, lobbying, and campaigning constitute a central part of their strategies. The mobilization of the affected local population as well as the wider national and international public, direct lobbying of local governments and corporations or the use of formal channels for legal complaints are aimed at stopping concrete cases of land grabbing. The official and legal recognition of community rights for land use in the frame of local policy initiatives, the implementation of village self-administration or the use of national programs of social forestry is a second approach. In this context, CSOs support communities in mapping their land in participatory processes, agreeing with neighboring communities on boundaries, documenting traditional knowledge on the use of natural resources as well as in the development of land use plans. The third pillar aims at the protection and strengthening of livelihood systems. It entails support for community organizations that represent community interests to external stakeholders, that
focus on the management and marketing of local resources or on village-level self-administration.

The present cross-sectional evaluation was conceived as a joint learning process, with the aim of identifying successful practices and strategies across different organizations and regions, but at the same time also encouraging the exchange between partner CSOs and the development of synergies between them. The methods used included field visits and observations in 12 districts in seven provinces, key informant interviews and focus group discussions with community members and representatives of village administrations, representatives of local government institutions, other NGOs, national government institutions as well as team members of the MISEREOR partners.

The Learning Process found notable achievements in the resolution of land conflicts and the protection of land rights to date. Land grabbing practices in the context of expanding palm oil and timber plantations were successfully halted in a number of regions. Due to massive demonstrations and public pressure the local government in the Provinces of Jambi and Central Sulawesi, for instance, revoked concessions covering an area of about 136,000 hectares (ha). Indigenous communities in Jambi have been awarded land titles in the context of social forestry programs covering an area of 5,800 ha, while another 16,300 ha are currently still in process.

Direct negotiation and mediation in the case of an acute conflict between indigenous groups and the company, which manages a reforestation and conservation project on behalf of international environmental organizations in the Hutan Harapan in Jambi Province, on the other hand, led to the long-term recognition of land use rights by the local communities. In addition, this agreement, which had been forged involving the participation of all key stakeholders, had also effects on national and regional level policy development: Based on this experience the revision of a ministerial regulation by the Ministry of Forestry and Environment for the first time included mediation and open-ended negotiation as possible forms of conflict resolution. Furthermore, the provincial government also wants to develop structures and mechanisms for resolving land conflicts at the local level in cooperation with local CSOs. In other cases, MISEREOR partners made important contributions to the protection of forestry areas and agricultural land against conversion into plantation areas by facilitating local communities to conduct participatory processes of land use and development planning and by working together with local governments to develop and implement policies promoting food security and sustainable agriculture. A prerequisite for these successes was the strengthening of community actors and their institutions. While in the early days of MISEREOR’s support partner organizations consisting mainly of activists were still the main driver of all activities, the mobilization and strengthening of the target groups are now the focus of all partners. One of the most important results is the fact that smallholder farmers largely have the awareness and the motivation to defend themselves and fight consistently for their own land rights and against land grabbing over long periods of time. Community members, who are affected by the expansion of plantations and by the degradation of their natural environment as a consequence of coal mining use formal and informal processes and mechanisms advocate for their interests. These include the use of procedures for conflict resolution, the submission of formal administrative complaints, the demand for disclosure of public data and information, as well as steps in litigation processes, but also the use of social media in order to get in direct contact with political decision-makers. In the promotion and strengthening of institutions, MISEREOR’s seven partner organizations have also brought about some important developments: In some regions, indigenous groups have set up organizations representing their interests towards state and corporate actors. In others, farmers’ organizations have stabilized and expanded their joint productive activities, and in others, there are initial initiatives for the establishment of village-
owned enterprises. The networking of community groups beyond village and regional borders has taken place in selected cases, but has not yet led to the establishment of long-term structures as an expression of solidarity and for the joint representation of interests in the political arena at regional and national level. The MISEREOR partners have also provided mutual case-related support in the past. Exchange on strategic issues, learning from the experiences of others and coordinated action to influence political processes, however, has so far hardly taken place. Impacts of achievements in the protection of land rights on the livelihoods of smallholder farmers has so far only been visible in individual cases and has not yet been strategically addressed with targeted interventions by the MISEREOR partners. Both at the level of target communities, as well as within the supporting civil society organizations, skills and experiences related to adapted agricultural techniques, to the processing of primary products, as well as the commercial marketing of products are largely still missing. Further impeding the access to markets it the often limited infrastructure connecting the remote forest areas with the nearest markets and partly also cultural obstacles.

In view of the trends of increasing land conflicts in Indonesia over the last 10 years, the engagement of the MISEREOR partners are generally of high relevance. The strategies of the partner organizations adequately harnessed existing opportunities to defend the rights of smallholder farmers against the commercial interests of plantation and mining companies. On the other hand, the civil society organizations have largely been working on a case by case basis. In the future, experiences and the results achieved to date need to be further consolidated by focusing more on the legal recognition of land rights or the development of community-based forest management models. This also includes a more strategic use of current political priorities, such as the expansion of social forestry programs targeting 12.7 million hectares, the implementation of land reforms and village autonomy, and the expansion of the cooperation with the government in order to achieve structural and larger-scale effects. At the same time, ‘traditional’ approaches of community organizing, participatory mapping, land use and development planning as well as campaigning will still remain relevant in view of the fact that an end to the expansion of plantations and mining activities is not yet in sight. The economic use of the protected land for agricultural production as well as the processing and marketing of products should also become an important part of future sustainability strategies. It is recommended that the partner CSOs not only develop their own technical expertise in this field, but also conduct research and expand their networks. In order to influence structural changes, on the one hand, a more systematic strengthening of community organizations and the facilitation of peer-learning and movement-building across communities and regions will be needed. MISEREOR partners, on the other hand, will also need to connect communities to different government programs and support, and to develop policy input on the basis of data analysis and field work. Where politically acceptable they should also enter into strategic partnerships with local governments. At the end of the Joint Learning Process, the MISEREOR partners themselves came to the conclusion that there are potentials for synergies that should be developed jointly in the future. These include an increased exchange of information, knowledge and competencies, joint campaigning as well as joint positioning towards and negotiation with policy-makers, as well as exchange and learning in the context of developing marketing opportunities for agricultural and forestry products. It is recommended that MISEREOR takes on a moderating role during the initial phase of increased collaboration between CSO partners in order to foster trust building and the development of a common strategic orientation for joint action.
## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMAN</td>
<td>Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara Indigenous People’s Alliance of the Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMDAL</td>
<td>Analisis Dampak Lingkungan Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL</td>
<td>Areal Penggunaan Lain Non-forest estate (Land outside the forest estate designated for non-forestry use such as agriculture, settlement, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APP</td>
<td>Asia Pulp and Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPN</td>
<td>Badan Pertanahan Nasional National Land Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMZ</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUMDes</td>
<td>Badan Usaha Milik Desa Village-Owned Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO1</td>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Crude Palm Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Direktorat Pengelolaan Konflik Hutan Adat dan Tenurial Directorate for Customary Forest and Tenurial Conflict Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRD</td>
<td>Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Local House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPIC</td>
<td>Free prior and informed consent Participation and consultation of an indigenous population prior to the beginning of a development on ancestral land or using resources within the indigenous population’s territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-cinDe</td>
<td>Gerakan Cinta Desa Movement to love the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAM</td>
<td>Hak asasi manusia Human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGU</td>
<td>Hak guna usaha The right to use land as an agroplantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK</td>
<td>Hutan Konservasi Conservation Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>Hutan Lindung Protected Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPH</td>
<td>Hak Pengusahaan Hutan (Logging Concession)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Hutan Produksi (Production Forest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT</td>
<td>Hutan Produksi Terbatas (only selected trees are allowed to be cut, e.g. applied in mountainous regions to prevent erosion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT</td>
<td>Hutan Produksi Tetap (forest can be completely cut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTI</td>
<td>Hutan Tanaman Industri (industrial plantation forest, mostly timber)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Hutan Tanaman Rakyat (community-based forestry scheme involving communities in forest management, based on cooperative or farmer group proposals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HuMa</td>
<td>Perkumpulan untuk Pembaharuan Hukum Berbasis Masyarakat dan Ekologis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICEL</td>
<td>Indonesian Center for Environmental Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMN</td>
<td>Impartial Mediator Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISPO</td>
<td>Standards for palm oil production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUP</td>
<td>Izin Usaha Pertambangan (Mining Business License)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPHHK-HTI</td>
<td>Izin Usaha Pengelolaan Hasil Hutan Kayu-Hutan Tanaman Industri (License for Utilization of Forest Timber from Timber Plantation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JariTangan</td>
<td>Jaringan Petani Pangan (Network of Food Farmers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JATAM</td>
<td>Jaringan Advokasi Tambang (Mining Advocacy Network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKPP</td>
<td>Jaringan Kerja Pemetaan Partisipatif (Working Network for Participatory Mapping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalteng</td>
<td>Kalimantan Tengah (Central Kalimantan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalsel</td>
<td>Kalimantan Selatan (South Kalimantan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemen ATR</td>
<td>Kementrian Agraria dan Tata Ruang (Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemen Desa PDT</td>
<td>Kementrian Desa dan Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal dan Transmigrasi (Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Areas and Transmigration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemen ESDM</td>
<td>Kementrian Energi dan Sumber Daya Mineral (Ministry for Energy and Mineral Resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemen LHK</td>
<td>Kementrian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan (Ministry for Environment and Forestry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHDTK</td>
<td>Kawasan Hutan dengan Tujuan Khusus (Special Purpose Forest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIP</td>
<td>Komisi Informasi Publik (Public Information Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMB</td>
<td>Kelompok Makekal Bersatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komnas HAM</td>
<td>Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia (National Commission for Human Rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPH</td>
<td>Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan (Forest Management Unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPK</td>
<td>Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (Corruption Eradication Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpSHK</td>
<td>Consortium in Support of a Community Forest System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSP</td>
<td>Kantor Staf Presiden (Presidential Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSPPM</td>
<td>Kelompok Studi dan Pengembangan Prakarsa Masyarakat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP2B</td>
<td>Sustainable Food Lahan Pertanian Pangan Berkelanjutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPHD</td>
<td>Lembaga Pengelolaan Hutan Desa (Village Forest Management Unit (compulsory organization in the context of the hutan desa scheme))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPSK</td>
<td>Lembaga Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban (Witness and Victim Protection Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTB</td>
<td>Lembaga Tiga Beradik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP3EI</td>
<td>Masterplan Percepatan dan Perluasan Pembangunan Ekonomi Indonesia (Masterplan for the Acceleration and Expansion of Indonesia's Economic Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musrenbangdes</td>
<td>Musyawarah perencanaan pembangungan desa (Village development planning forum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMS</td>
<td>Organisasi Masyarakat Sipil (Civil Society Organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDLH</td>
<td>Pertemuan Daerah Lingkungan Hidup (Regional Environmental Meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Perkumpulan Evergreen Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perda</td>
<td>Peraturan Daerah (Regional Regulation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdes</td>
<td>Peraturan Desa (Village Regulation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP</td>
<td>Center for Empowerment and Agriculture (of the Diocese of Palangkaraya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP2B</td>
<td>Perlindungan Lahan Pertanian Pangan Berkelanjutan (Protection of Sustainable Food Crop Farming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMKM</td>
<td>Poros Masyarakat Kehutanan Merangin (Merangin Forestry Community Axis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO1 – PO7</td>
<td>seven Partner organizations of MISEREOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT. DAM</td>
<td>PT. Duta Alam Makmur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD</td>
<td>Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RKHD</td>
<td>Rencana Kerja Hutan Desa Village Forest Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPJMDes</td>
<td>Rencana Pembangunan Desa Jangka Menengah Village Mid-Term Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPO</td>
<td>Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTRW</td>
<td>Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Regional Spatial Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Surat Keputusan Decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPKS</td>
<td>Serikat Petani Kelapa Sawit Oil Palm Farmers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLPP</td>
<td>Simpul Layanan Pemetaan Partisipatif Service Network for Participatory Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SML</td>
<td>Simpang Macan Luar community Indigenous community in Batanghari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPI</td>
<td>Serikat Petani Indonesia Indonesian Farmers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVD</td>
<td>Society of Divine Word Steyler Missionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNKS</td>
<td>Taman Nasional Kerinci Seblat Kerinci Seblat National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU Desa</td>
<td>Undang-Undang Desa Village Law No. 6/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAHLI Sumbar</td>
<td>Wahana Liar Sumatra Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALHI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCHI</td>
<td>Yayasan Cakrawala Hijau Indonesia Green Horizon Foundation Indonesia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Forestry is not about trees, it is about people. And it is about trees only insofar as trees can serve the needs of people” (Jack Westoby, 1967)

1 Introduction

For more than nine years, MISEREOR has accompanied and supported various efforts of local communities and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Indonesia to curb land-grabbing practices by large-scale oil palm plantations as well as mining and timber industries. The supported programs cover a wide range of approaches. These include awareness raising and capacity development of affected communities to defend their rights, the implementation of public campaigns, capacity development of farmer and community organizations, the development of local food-based economies, community-based forest management schemes, spatial planning as well as efforts to seek legal recognition for villager’s and indigenous people’s livelihood lands.

Overall, MISEREOR collaborates with seven CSO in implementing these programs, some of which operate individually, some implementing the programs in the form of a more formalized consortium with other local CSOs or engage in more loose partnerships with local NGOs for the delivery of specific contributions to the program. The seven main partner organizations are PO3, PO1, PO4, PO2, PO5, PO6 and PO7.

Four out of seven of MISEREOR’s CSO partners have been supported in three consecutive project phases with funds by the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and would, therefore, be due to an external evaluation. Three other CSO partners working in the same field with similar approaches are currently only approaching the end of their first project phase. Instead of commissioning four separate evaluations, MISEREOR decided to rather embark on a Joint Learning Process involving all CSO partners. The main objectives of the Joint Learning Process have been formulated by MISEREOR as to

- extract and analyze lessons learnt on different strategies in solving land conflicts and defending indigenous land rights applied by the different partner organisations
- initiate learning on different strategies with MISEREOR and the Indonesian partners
- explore questions on the role of alternative livelihood systems as well as strategies at the national and international level as part of their overall strategies
- extract lessons learnt at the level of individual organizations and their chosen strategies as well as at the level or the sector in general.

The Joint Learning Process covered a 3-day Kick-Off Workshop involving selected members of all partner organizations, field visits to generally at least two project sites per organizations and a final Reflection Workshop all of which were moderated and accompanied by a team of three consultants. It was implemented between mid-September and early December 2016. The reporting consists of one individual report per organization highlighting achievements in line with project objectives and organization-internal findings as well as one overall report

---

1 These include PO3, PO1, PO2 and PO4
2 see Chapter 3 for more details on the methodological approach
3 Joana Ebbinghaus as lead consultant and Ima Susilowati and Zulkifli Lubis as national consultants.
focusing on lessons learnt and recommendations across the different programs and organizations.

2 Context and Project Descriptions

2.1 Framework Conditions at National and Local Level

It has been nearly 20 years since the authoritarian New Order regime in Indonesia ended and a sweeping democratization and decentralization process took off. On the one hand, the reform era has provided an increasingly better democratic climate, but on the other hand, it has not resulted in any significant changes in the structures controlling natural resources. Government policies since 2000 still favored the small group of business conglomerate who control the biggest bulk of the country's natural wealth. Meanwhile, the rights of local communities who are dependent on the use of natural resources that they inherited from generation to generation are often neglected by both government and corporates. Land grabbing practices continue to serve the interests of the forestry, plantation and mining industries, that of large infrastructure development, and recently, even the programs related to climate change mitigation. Everything is done in the name of development to improve people's welfare, but in reality, it often leads to excesses in the process of exclusion or eviction of local communities from their own land. In fact, civil society organizations in Indonesia, including MISEREOR's partners, still face many challenges today in realizing the rights of forest-dependent communities, even though it also must be acknowledged that there have been many changes in external conditions, which are more positive in recent years.

Land grabbing is not a new phenomenon, which is unique to Indonesia, since the practice is also taking place in many developing countries in Asia, Africa as well as Latin America. In Indonesia, the practice of land grabbing had emerged since the colonial period\(^4\), but it experienced a massive expansion throughout the era of the authoritarian Soeharto regime. Timber companies, which received concessions from the government, began to exploit Indonesia’s natural forests since the late 1960s to produce logs and pulpwood. Since the mid-1980 many of the forest concession areas were later converted into industrial forest areas (timber plantations) which were generally controlled by the same group of companies; some of them were turned into plantations, mostly for palm oil, which were controlled by private companies and state enterprises\(^5\). Practices of human rights violations, violence and abuse of power committed by state security forces and companies' minions against communities whose rights were deprived by companies are common phenomena that occurred in the process of land grabbing in the New Order era\(^6\).

\(^4\) During the second half of the 19th century most of the area in Java and Sumatra was controlled by foreign plantation companies through long term concessions (approximately 100 years) given by local sultanates.

\(^5\) Almost all of the HPH (Hak Pengusahaan Hutan) or Forest Concessions and HTI (Hutan Tanaman Industri) or timber plantation in Indonesia, were turned into oil palm plantation companies, controlled by groups that are owned by the tycoons known as a family business cronies of late President Suharto.

\(^6\) Bad practices as such, have not completely disappeared after the reform era, and still occur in some areas in Indonesia, as especially the work of MISEREOR partners in Kalimantan show.
Furthermore, at the beginning of the reform era in early 2000, the practices of illegal logging and state forest encroachment occurred widely in many areas due to expiring timber concession and a general absence of law enforcement. Migrants from outer provinces occupied forest areas especially in Sumatra to establish agricultural land and small-scale plantations, while the group of large enterprises again re-targeted forest areas as well as communities’ lands for business expansion. The partnership scheme offered by companies to control the communities’ land in turn potentially threatened the security of food land as well as local agricultural products. All that led to a process of sustained drastic deforestation in Indonesia. In the period between 2000-2012, deforestation rate of Indonesia’s natural forests reaches 0.8 million hectares per year\(^7\), but official data from the government put the annual rate of deforestation in 2013-2014 at only 170,626.1 hectares, and 70% of those were located in Kalimantan\(^8\). There are estimates that 1.7–3 million ha of Indonesian forest were lost to palm plantations between 1990 and 2005, accounting for more than 50% of total deforestation during that period\(^9\). These conditions have had a direct impact on the loss of biodiversity and the threat of marginalization of indigenous communities\(^10\).

The process of land grabbing for the purpose of palm oil plantation expansion happens through conversion of forest as well as other areas of other use (APL)\(^11\). The development of the palm oil industry around the world, including Indonesia as the largest producer, is part of the networks of multinational agribusiness that are based in developed countries\(^12\). They develop large-scale palm oil plantation development projects to address the world’s food and energy crisis\(^13\). Currently, Indonesia is the largest exporter of CPO (crude palm oil), supplying 50% of the world’s demand with a total production of 32.5 million tons in 2014. Indonesia's economy is highly dependent on exports of CPO. Therefore, efforts to increase outputs are carried out albeit at the expense of forest land. While trends in the oil palm industry in Malaysia went towards intensification and optimization of plantation production, the strategies in Indonesia have always been further expansion of plantation areas with low productivity. The palm oil industry directly employs 7.5 million people, making it also an important source of income for manyIndonesians\(^14\). In welcoming FAO’s initiative that rallied international support to tackle the world’s food and energy crisis, the Government of Indonesia in 2009 opened the door to foreign investors to develop its business in Indonesia. One of them is MIFEE (Meruak Integrated Food and Energy Estate) project by allocating 2.8 million hectares of forest in Papua\(^15\). The area of palm oil plantations in Indonesia is


\(^{8}\) See Data Statistic Ministry of Environment and Forests Year 2015.


\(^{10}\) See Petrenko et.al (2016)

\(^{11}\) APL (Other Purpose Area) is a category of land outside the forest estate designated for non-forestry use such as agriculture, settlement and usually used by communities.


\(^{13}\) See Pesticide Action Network Asia and the Pacific (2013). Building Community Resistance Against Land Grabbing: Documentation of Cases in Selected Communities in Asia - Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, the Philippines and Malaysia, Penang.


\(^{15}\) Although the initial allocation plan for the development of food crops in MIFEE project reached 70%, the development of oil palm plantations to produce biofuels factually used as a top priority. See Yasuan (2011), Pesticide Action Network Asia and the Pacific (2013) and Petrenko et.al (2016).
currently at about 11.6 Million hectares with a production of 33.5 Million tons; more than 60% of its area is in Sumatra. The expansion rate of oil palm plantations area has been rapid, from just over 1.1 million hectares at the beginning of the reform era (2000) to 11.6 million hectares today (2016). Expansion of palm oil plantation area by a group of large companies was suspected of not just to increase production of CPO, but also as part of a strategy to accumulate land acquisition for long-term interests.

The strong influence of multinational corporation networks on the expansion of extractive industries in Indonesia on the one side is threatening the sustainability of ecosystems and has the potential to exclude local communities from their land. But on the other hand, the consumers of agribusiness products in developed countries are starting to be critical towards the pattern of unsustainable resource management, human rights violations, and the marginalization of indigenous communities. Various conventions, standards, and international regulations serve as an instrument of control over corporate or industry players who ignore the principles of sustainability and human rights. In the context of the management of the palm oil industry, the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), for example, developed certain standards as prerequisites for CPO products to be accepted in the international market, especially in Europe. That scheme, theoretically, is an instrument to change management practices that are not sustainable and ignoring the economic and socio-cultural rights of the local community. The problem, however, is that the European market only covers 30% of world palm oil products, while the biggest market are China and India. China, which is known to be less adherent to international regulations, is not only a potential market for palm oil products from companies that do not follow the standards of the RSPO, but also has a strong influence towards the government of Indonesia and the economy of this country. This will certainly be a new challenge for civil society organizations, including MISEREOR’s partners.

The forest and peatland fires that repeatedly occur in Indonesia is an environmental disaster that triggered the government to make policy changes. Large-scale forest and peatland fires happen in every El Nino climate cycles, with the last one in 2015, which resulted in a thick smog (haze) covering most parts of Indonesia and neighboring countries. Repeated fires in Sumatra and Kalimantan areas are related with land clearing processes and lately has become part of the strategy of land grabbing by some corporates to expand the area of palm oil and timber plantations. Related to the issue of climate change, the Indonesian government is committed to reduce the national carbon emissions by 29% under current conditions or by 41% with international assistance until 2030. Since 2009, Indonesia has obtained international donor support to implement REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) schemes. NGO networks concerned with environmental issues generally oppose “carbon trade” schemes in addressing problems of climate change. REDD projects in Indonesia failed to achieve its objectives, and internationally, this scheme has also lost its relevance. On the other hand, the government is also trying to reduce cases of forest and peatland fires through a moratorium on new licenses for the conversion of natural forests and peat lands to extractive industrial areas that was issued in late 2015. This policy, however, is not running effectively, because in fact the

---

17 An interview with the National Executive Director of a PO on December 9, 2016, revealed that about 13 million hectares of oil palm plantation business permits were issued by the government to date, but only about 9 million hectares of land have been tilled for planting by companies.
government is not able to firmly enforce the rule of law. A number of cases of corporations taken to court in the event of the forest fires in 2015 ended with acquittal.

Generally, a number of difference need to be noted regarding land grabbing trends in different parts of Indonesia. In Sumatra, the availability of land for further expansion of plantation companies is now exhausted. Direct threats and intimidation of local communities from companies and the security forces have significantly dropped. Patterns of collaboration among CSOs, communities and local governments in addressing land tenure conflicts have been developed; and the role of CSOs in the process to develop rural communities is largely appreciated by local governments. There are many examples where CSOs are actively involved in the process of conflict resolution on resource management, ranging from the district, provincial and national level. In Kalimantan, on the other hand, conflicts between corporations and local communities are still tinged with intimidation from security forces as well as collusion between companies, politicians and the local bureaucracy. Concessions had been handed out at a more massive scale than in Sumatra, and almost 70% of the villages in Kalimantan are covered by concessions awarded by local governments to oil palm, timber and mining companies since 2007. Kalimantan holds Indonesia’s biggest coal reserves, which makes the country the 5th biggest producer and biggest exporter of coal in the world\(^\text{18}\). Hence, advocacy, campaigns and community organizing are still very relevant strategies in Kalimantan. Meanwhile, in the eastern part of Indonesia, especially in Sulawesi, Maluku and Papua, the threat of expansion of plantation companies is still very strong. Local communities are vulnerable to being exploited because of low education levels, high poverty rates, and limited access to information related to the negative impact of palm oil plantations; advocacy, campaigning and community empowerment are relevant strategies to fight further expansion. On the other hand, the eastern region still has the advantage of local commodities that have the potential to be developed as an alternative to palm oil.

The transfer of power to the new presidency lead by Joko Widodo-Jusuf Kalla (2014–2019) has brought a positive trend for the struggle of civil society organizations working on issues of natural resource management and agrarian reform. President Joko Widodo is the first Indonesian head of state to emerge from neither the political elite nor the military. He started with an ambitious agenda (“Nawacita”) to eradicate corruption, reform the bureaucracy, improve the quality of live especially in rural Indonesia, upgrade large-scale infrastructure, boost economic growth, resolve past human rights violations and lead a so-called “mental revolution”. His commitment on environmental issues and land reforms, which is made explicit in the current National Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMN), 2015-2019, is a pragmatic approach to link the goals of more equitable development and economic growth, promotion of economic independence in strategic sectors such as food security and improvements in the quality of governance. The RPJMN explicitly states that for the agrarian reform scheme called TORA (Tanah Obyek Reform Agraria -Land for Agrarian Reform) 9 million hectares will be allocated for distribution to the residents of marginal communities. Moreover, the government has expressed its commitment to transfer the management rights of forests to communities who live in and around the state forest through social forestry schemes covering an area of 12.7 million hectares\(^\text{19}\). This is a significant policy initiative,
because for the first time the Indonesian government shows a serious commitment to carrying out agrarian reform and recognize the rights of local communities in forest areas. Third, the government is committed to continuing the moratorium on granting new licenses on the area of primary forests and peatlands\(^{20}\). Forced into action by the forest fires of 2015, which took the form of a dramatic human as well as environmental disaster, the government formed the dedicated Peat Restoration Agency (BGR) to lead restoration efforts of degraded peatland areas\(^{21}\). However, the effectiveness of this policy change, will only show over time, whether the government is committed and able to enforce stricter rules and policies against big companies. Fourth, the government also made changes to the bureaucratic structure of some of the ministries in order to respond to the issue of sectoral dynamics directly related to the needs of society, as seen in the case of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry\(^{22}\). To integrate and synergize between the different policies related to land and forest protection the Jokowi’s administration has committed itself to overcome the problem of numerous overlapping and contradicting maps by producing one integrated mapping system through the One Map Policy.

Moreover, the government has opened up space for NGO activists to enter into the structures of the government bureaucracy. The KSP (Office of the President Staff) is a new agency to serve the president in monitoring the performance of the ministries and also to make sure that the goals of development programs are achieved in due time. Some prominent NGO activists were recruited by the President to serve as technical advisors. They have strategic roles and direct access to provide input to the president. The presence of these NGO activists in the inner circle of the President are an opportunity for NGO networks to develop communication, collaboration and synergies with the government. Other relevant opportunities include the legislation which gives space for greater participation of local communities in democratic self-governance. Law No. 6/2014 on Villages may be cited as an example of a highly prospective entry point for CSOs to develop synergies with programs of community empowerment. Another example is the Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/2012, which confirms that the forest inhabited by indigenous people is not state forest. This decision which is the result of a judicial review of Law No. 41 Year 1999 on Forestry constitutes a fundamental correction of the principle of "state right to control land" (domein verklaring) in Indonesian agrarian law. This law is an answer to the issue of recognizing community rights to forest areas, since forest area is generally defined as state land\(^{23}\).

\(^{20}\) A moratorium on new permits in the area of primary forest and peatland was first issued by President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono through Presidential Decree Number 10 Year 2011, but suffered from weak law enforcement.

\(^{21}\) The main reasons for setting of fire are to clear land for oil palm plantation, prepare for land acquisition and to force inhabitants off the land. The practice of massive draining and conversion of peatland driven by palm oil production contributes to the intensity of fires. See World Bank (2016). The Cost of Fire.

\(^{22}\) In the organizational structure of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, for example there is a Conflict Management Directorate, Tenure and Indigenous Forest, which is under the Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership.

\(^{23}\) Implementation of the Decision of the Court 35 as an entry point to the recognition of indigenous forest has been started with the issuance of a Decree on Traditional Forest for 9 of Indigenous People (MHA) which was handed over symbolically by President Joko Widodo at the State Palace on December 30, 2016.
Although many positive changes at the policy level, but there are still many challenges to be faced by civil society organizations in the future. The complexity of the regulations on natural resources management will lead to the ineffectiveness in the sense of implementation. There are also wide gaps of mindset between various levels of government in response to the new policies. Looking ahead, the CSO is also not enough to just focus on addressing the issues of power and governance of natural resources, but they have to begin to enter new areas, namely the production and consumption management system. Only with the recognition of the rights of community governance over natural resources provided by the state can be useful and can be maintained on an ongoing basis.

2.2 Overview of Projects and Interventions

2.2.1 Project Goals and Strategic Approaches

The following gives an overview of the current MISEREOR CSO partners involved in this Learning Process, and their projects:

Figure 1: Overview of MISEREOR Partners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner CSO</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Time Frame of MISEREOR Support</th>
<th>Project Region</th>
<th>Current project budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PO1         | “Justice on Land for Livelihood Sovereignty: Strengthening Local Institutions and Knowledge to Fight against Land Grabbing and Expand Community’s Right and Access to Sources of Livelihood in selected areas of Sumatra, Kalimantan and Sulawesi, Indonesia” (Project-No. 416-900-1132 ZG) | October 2014 – October 2017  
Previous programmes:
- 2005 (small grant)  
- 2007-2009  
- 2009-2013  
- 2011-2012 | Province of North SumatraJambi ProvinceKalimantan ProvinceSulawesi Province                                                                                | EUR 357.000                                                                                      |
<p>| PO3         | “Empowering poor and disenfranchised communities affected by planned oil palm plantation expansion                                                                                                               | January 2015 – December 2017                                                                   | EUR 357.000                                                                                           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PO2</th>
<th>“Save our local food land” – Right to land, right to food (Project No. 416-011-1021)</th>
<th>2015-2018</th>
<th>Riau Province) (Jambi Province) (Sumatra Province)</th>
<th>EUR 303.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO4</td>
<td>Develop models of community forest system in the remaining tropical rain forest in Jambi province with a community-based forest management and land use scheme in upland ecosystems in Jambi province (Project-No. 416-011-1020 ZG)</td>
<td>June 2015 – December 2016</td>
<td>Jambi Province)</td>
<td>EUR 140.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO5</td>
<td>“Empowering community groups towards community based village development in West Kalimantan” (Project No. 416-903-1015)</td>
<td>June 2015 – May 2018</td>
<td>Kalimantan Province)</td>
<td>EUR 200.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO6</td>
<td>“Strengthening community resilience countering degradation of sources of livelihood in Central Kalimantan” (Project No. 416-037-1014)</td>
<td>May 2014 – April 2017</td>
<td>Kalimantan Province)</td>
<td>EUR 159.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO7</td>
<td>“Encouraging the role of and strengthening people’s position in defending the sovereignty of land and living resources” (Project No. 416-016-1004)</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
<td>Kalimantan Province)</td>
<td>EUR 77.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISEREOR’s CSO partner organizations all share the overall mission to support and empower local communities that are under threat to be marginalized by forest degradation and the expansion of palm oil plantations, timber and mining industries. Some of the partners have traditionally been activist organizations (such as PO4 and PO7 or PO1) and have their roots in fighting the massive deforestation and human rights violations by the pulp and paper industry during the heydays of crony capitalism under President Suharto. Others (such as PO5 and PO6) have rather been born out of concern for social justice and the social, economic and political empowerment of local communities which in turn led them to also tackle the continuously contested access and control of forest-depending communities over natural resources.

The shared overall goal is the establishment of community sovereignty in determining their lives including the access to and use of traditionally owned natural resources, but also including expressions of their cultural identity. Main objectives include stopping land-grabbing practices, the official recognition of community rights to manage traditional territories as well as the protection and strengthening of smallholder livelihood systems. The overall objectives and strategies applied by the MISEREOR partners is determined by the specific conditions in each project location. The following gives a brief overview of the key characteristics of the different projects.
Figure 2: Overview of Project Key Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Holder</th>
<th>Project Key Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO3</td>
<td>Project locations in five different provinces of Eastern Indonesia that are oil palm expansion areas, still weak organization of civil society, key strategy: building advocacy capacities for rejecting plantations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO4</td>
<td>Project locations in 13 neighboring in the Province of Jambi, location of previous conflict with timber company, key strategy: advocacy and capacity strengthening for the recognition of community-based forestry management through <em>hutan desa</em> (Village Forest) scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO1</td>
<td>Five locations in four provinces, main strategy: support in conflict resolution between communities and corporations as well as restoration areas, post-conflict economic strengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO2</td>
<td>Locations in four provinces, main approach: strengthening village governance for the protection of food land and economic strengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO5</td>
<td>Locations in four districts of West Kalimantan, main approach: strengthening of village governance in post-conflict areas (previous conflicts with timber and oil palm plantations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO6</td>
<td>Four districts in the Province of Central Kalimantan, community organizing and advocacy in the case of conflicts with oil palm, timber, rubber and mining companies, use of media as a tool for education and advocacy as well as for strengthening local knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO7</td>
<td>Two locations (highland and lowland) in South Kalimantan, oil palm and mining expansion, community strengthening and advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Broadly speaking, there are three major strands of approaches applied by the different MISEREOR CSO partners. The first approach is directed towards fighting and stopping land-grabbing practices. Key underlying problems are on the one hand contradictory laws and regulations as well as processes of granting concessions that do not apply principles of good governance including the application of the ‘free prior and informed consent’ (FPIC)25 principle. Here, the CSO strategy is to conduct policy analysis and advocacy, to file official complaints to relevant agencies26, to lobby for a review of already issued concessions that do not comply with existing rules and regulations and to highlight the legitimacy of community claims of traditional territories. In the case of illegal practices, the role of CSOs is to advocate for improved law enforcement. In some cases, the corporate claim is so imminent causing an

25 The ‘free prior and informed consent’ principle entails the participation and consultation of an indigenous population prior to the beginning of a development on ancestral land or using resources within the indigenous population’s territory. It implies informed, non-coercive negotiations between investors, companies or governments and indigenous peoples and gives communities the right to decide whether they will agree to the project or not once they have a full and accurate understanding of the implications of the project on them and their customary land. FPIC has been widely accepted by international conventions and ‘corporate social responsibility’ policies of companies working in sectors of extractive industries, forestry, conservation, plantations and large infrastructure such as dam building.

26 This could be directed at sub-national government agencies such as regional Forestry Offices, the Ministry of Forestry and Environment (KemenLHK), the Ministry for Energy and Mineral Resources (KemenESDM), the Corruption Eradication Commission, the National Ombudsman or the National Commission for Human Rights.
open conflict with communities where CSOs take on the role of a mediator or facilitator supporting conflict resolution efforts.

As a second approach, efforts are directed towards achieving official recognition for community rights to manage land. This requires the legal recognition of community rights based on different already existing schemes, such as community forest, customary land/forest, and community-based forestry management schemes. The basis for this is a process of participatory mapping and inter-community border negotiations and interventions to prepare the legal processes at different levels for the recognition of the spatial maps and boundary agreements. As a precondition for this approach, communities in a certain geographical area need to stand united in their position to reject commercial investment and in their commitment to collaborate with other communities.

The third approach aims at the protection and strengthening of livelihood systems. It entails a variety of efforts to strengthen existing community, governance and economic institutions and processes, the formation of new organizations and networks across different communities, tackling power relationships as well as strengthening community capacities. General community organizing and fostering larger networks between communities is more or less an element found at different degrees in all programs. While two out of the seven main project partners have started to systematically strengthen village-level governance processes, the development of capacities and structures for economic development and better market access has not yet been clearly conceptualized and is more done incidentally in cases where opportunities arose. Yet, all organizations acknowledge that these three pillars are mutually reinforcing.

Activities implemented by the CSO partners are taking place directly at community level, at district and provincial level, at national and to a limited extent also at international level. At community level, activities include community-organizing efforts from trust building and raising community awareness on the implications of land grabbing, to social, political, economic and cultural rights of communities and bringing out traditional knowledge and values related to land and natural resources. Capacity development encompasses technical aspects related to advocacy strategies and securing tenurial rights, such as on participatory mapping. Other capacity development activities encompass the implementation of community-based forestry management schemes, negotiation and lobbying techniques, the use of legal and administrative channels in accessing information and filing complaints (including documenting the violation of existing laws and human rights), the documentation of customary practices, the implementation of the regulatory framework for village self-governance according to Law No. 6/2014 (Undang-Udang Desa) as well as the use of social media. Furthermore, CSO partners also act as facilitator and mediator in acute conflict situations.

The majority of MISEREOR partners also strengthen networks across different communities by facilitating cross-visits, organizing joint meetings, include them in annual partner meetings or facilitate exchange via social media.

At district level, CSO partners directly interact and collaborate with government agencies, partly more in the sense of traditional advocacy organizing public campaigns to build up pressure. Partly, they have already established collaborative relations with different government agencies and provide advice and input in the improvement of government functions or the further development of local policies. CSO partners also support
communities to directly interact and represent their interests towards local and regional governments.

At national level, MISEREOR partners use their networks to solve specific cases, such as garnering support in solving conflicts or obtaining the necessary recognition of community land rights from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. In that, they also make use of the various CSO networks they maintain. Interventions are also directed at influencing the national policy framework and setting standards for corporations in dealing with local communities. International networks are only used incidentally, for instance, in the case of solving the conflict between PT REKI and a local community in Batanghari where international donors of the conservation project were contacted to support conflict resolution efforts.

Target communities are largely rural, forest-dependent communities. Predominantly, they can be characterized as indigenous communities having occupied the area and lived of forest and other natural resources already over many generations. In part, this also implies distinct traditional and customary practices and lifestyles, but in part, these communities have already adopted modern lifestyles. Some community groups are also migrant or mixed communities consisting of farmers who entered forestry areas mostly at the time when logging concessions had expired in the late 1990ies and early 2000 and there was a political vacuum that left former concession areas mostly unmanaged. Specific for the PO3 program target groups also include palm oil plantation workers as well as urban youth who are to be activated under the project as a support group for local villagers. The total number of grassroots people who benefit from the seven projects amounts approximately 50.00027.

Furthermore, the projects also target existing community organizations, other local civil society organizations, local and national government officials as well as members of parliament as intermediaries as well as media representatives and academics.

2.2.2 Project Partners

The seven main CSO partners of MISEREOR are Civil Society Organizations (CSO) that have mostly been established between the end of the Soeharto era 1998/1999 up until mid-2000. Only the ‘PO6 has only been formally established in 2011. Some of them take the legal form of an association (perkumpulan) based on organizational as well as individual membership and regular elections of the chairman (e.g. PO3, PO4, Central Kalimantan and South Kalimantan), others (such as PO1, PO2, PO5) have been established as foundation (yayasan) with a tendency for a crystallization around individual (partly founding) leaders28.

---

27 This figure is calculated on the basis of indirect benefit for the communities the MISEREOR partners are working in, not direct involvement in concrete project activities.

28 Key differences between Yayasan and Perkumpulan are that Perkumpulan as a membership-based organization with a social mission is accountable to its membership as the main basis to enforce standards of good governance. In the case of Yayasan the Law on Foundations from 2001 introduced other mechanisms to ensure accountability and the application of good governance mechanisms such as the obligation to issue annual programs and financial reports, to undergo audit and publish financial reports. In the public discourse CSOs in general increasingly refrain from denoting themselves as NGO (LSM = Lembaga Swadaya Masyarakat, which is the literal translation of NGO). They rather use terms such as the English CSO, or OMS (organisasi masyarakat sipil = civil society organization) as NGOs have already a negative connotation in the eyes of the
The size of MISEREOR partners greatly differ and is mostly dependent on the age of the organization and the diversification of the funding resources. PO5, for instance, has xx staff members (x of whom are working on the MISEREOR project), while a young organization, such as PO6, with single funding from MISEREOR only has x. Depending on the size of the organization, the CSO partners have more or less elaborate organizational structures. There is usually one Project Coordinator, which is in most cases the Director, and one Project Officer with more responsibilities of implementing the program in the field. Usually, there are still other technical positions, such as for community organizing and strengthening, participatory mapping or media development as well as two finance staff members. The division of tasks between the different team members is partly along geographical lines, but has in most cases evolved along technical responsibilities.

Collaboration of the current partner CSOs with MISEREOR goes back to a small grant of EUR 2,500 given to PO1 in 2005 for lobby and information campaigns related to fight against the operations of a pulpwood plantation in Jambi. This collaboration was for MISEREOR the entry point to support CSOs in Indonesia related to community access and rights towards forest and land resources as PO1 then facilitated the contact with PO3. The collaboration with PO3 later expanded to PO2 and PO4. The first contact with organizations in Kalimantan was established when MISEREOR in 2011 supported the ‘Center for Empowerment and Agriculture’ (PLP) of the Diocese of Palangkaraya in campaigns against land grabbing for palm oil plantation and coal mines in the Barito Area (EUR 63,000). With the aim to expand the collaboration network to organizations in Kalimantan, in 2013 MISEREOR organized a partner meeting in South Kalimantan. Existing MISEREOR partners at the time were asked to identify relevant CSOs in Kalimantan working in the same field. During the workshop, they presented the specific challenges they experienced in their region. In the aftermath of this workshop MISEREOR asked a couple of CSOs to submit a proposal – either as a consortium with others, such as PO6 and PO7 (South Kalimantan) – or as an individual organizations such as PO5. Hence, more than half of the organizations supported by MISEREOR are currently in their third project cycle, while the others only in their first, leaving still a lot of room for learning and improvement.

3 Methodological Approach

This Learning Process was conceived by MISEREOR as a participatory exercise to facilitate joint learning and exchange between the different partners. It was expected that this format could on the one hand yield a number of good practices and reveal specific successes that could inspire other organizations and possibly be further replicated. On the other hand, the process of joint learning was expected to motivate them to explore and seek more actively opportunities for synergies between them. Hence, the evaluation questions were largely formulated as to rather identify trends across the different organizations than assess public due to a long history of elite capture of NGOs or the establishment of NGOs for the sole purpose of personal or political gains.

29 The external MISEREOR consultant who supports partners in aspects of project administration and financial management generally encouraged legal project holders to differentiate between the position of finance officer and cashier. However, MISEREOR generally only provides funding for finance staff of the legal holder, not their consortium partners.

30 See Appendix for the full list of evaluation questions.
individual organizations in specific aspects of their project implementation. On the other hand, the consultant team was also requested to prepare a short report per individual partner broadly assessing overall objective achievement as well as identifying possibly critical aspects to be followed up by MISEREOR together with their partners. These findings and assessments are needed to account for those projects towards the *Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development* (BMZ) that are currently in their third 3-year period. The design for the overall evaluation process, therefore, had to cater on the one hand the need to generate representative data and insights at a meta level. At the same time, the process had to produce data at the project level that allow for an assessment to what extent project objectives have been achieved and what internal organizational aspects are supportive or compounding in that. The general process flow is outlined in the graph below:

*Figure 3: Overview of Evaluation Process*

Partners participated at different points in the course of planning the Learning Process, collecting data, reflecting and analyzing:

a) The Kick-Off Workshop in Jambi from September 19 to 21, 2016 that was largely attended by two representatives from each partner organization provided partners with the opportunity to add to some of the existing evaluation questions. This was not only done by generally opening the floor to formulate own questions, but also by first initiating a discussion on the framework conditions under which the partner CSOs are operating and then externalizing their hypotheses that guide them in their strategy development, before they were invited to explore their own questions. This step-by-step approach aimed to help them to reflect on the relevance of their work and their strategic choices. Criteria for sampling respondents and regions as well as choices for field visits were also jointly taken during the Kick-Off.

b) The Kick-Off was immediately followed by a 2 day trial of the evaluation instruments in two nearby project locations of PO1 and PO2. These trials were jointly conducted
between partners and consultants. The ensuing discussions covered the substance of the findings as well as the suitability of the methodological approach for data collection.

c) The phase of data collection in the field, which was implemented between October 24 and November 30, 2016, mostly started with a joint 1-day meeting involving different staff members such as the director, field staff and financial staff. Field visits were largely accompanied by staff members who were most familiar with the situation on the ground. The field visits were in half of the cases concluded with a joint reflection meeting with staff members discussing the findings from the field, clarifying open questions and exploring future priorities (PO4, PO1, PO2, PO3). In the case of PO5, PO6 and PO7 this was not possible due to logistical reasons.

d) During the final Reflection Workshop that took place in South Kalimantan, on the December 5 and 6, 2016, the consultants presented preliminary findings according to the evaluation questions concerning the entire sector. The partners provided additional input on how they saw their organizational strategy and achievements fitting into this picture. Most of the second day then was used to explore future trends, common areas of interest as well as how to pursue these common areas of interest.

Data collection generally followed the principal of triangulation seeking to obtain different perspectives on the same subject. The instruments consisted of secondary data collection and desk review, key respondent interviews (partners, communities, government, other CSOs), focus group discussions, direct field observations and transect. In key informant interviews and holding focus group discussions meetings were kept rather small as much as possible separating interviews with village officials and elites from those with other community members. Separate discussions were especially sought with female community members. The total numbers of informants involved in the evaluation process amounted 153 excluding the team members of the partner organizations.

Generally, the logistics of this learning process was the main compounding factor in data collection. Distances between locations were huge and accessibility sometimes restricted due to the raining season leading to muddy and slippery roads where our cars were frequently stuck for hours as well as more serious floodings of villages. In the case of the field visit to the PO6 project site a flight connection was cancelled and the trip had to be rerouted leading to one day less in the field, so that no government officials could be included in the interviews. The amount of time available for each organization was ultimately very limited. It was an average of one week per organization. But with distances to be covered between locations of up to 12 hours by car it ultimately didn’t leave a lot of time per location for interviews with communities, local governments or other stakeholders. Where overnight stays with communities were included in the itineraries data was significantly richer than during a limited day-time visit only\(^{31}\). Spending evening hours together were particularly helpful to collect data from non-elite community members as well as women.

Overall, there was a discrepancy between the collection of robust enough data to assess the attainment of objectives by individual organizations and the inquiry into higher-level questions of relevance and sustainability of strategies under such a tight schedule. If this learning exercise had been limited to the inquiry at a higher level, there would not have been the expectation to divide the time equally between all project partners and visit at least two
locations per organization. Instead, the sampling of respondents would have included, for instance, also villagers from neighboring communities not receiving CSO support or even communities collaborating with corporations as well as also include more respondents from national level seeking forecasts to future trends instead of limiting the interviews to just of few of the main contact persons of the CSO partners. Specific cases would have been investigated in more depth and detail to extract key lessons learnt, which was challenging on the basis of a number of short interviews.

4 Findings

4.1 Relevance

The political developments especially since 2014 when the Jokowi-Kalla administration was elected into office have provided a number of opportunities for national NGO networks. The community resistance approach vis-à-vis the regime in power as it was done during the New Order seems largely irrelevant at present. The practices of land grabbing are still ongoing, yet the practices of abuse of power by state officials who are backing closely colluding with corporations are no longer the dominant reality. This has led many CSOs to develop more accommodative and collaborative strategies. Resistance to the practice of land grabbing are more directed at corporations and not to the government anymore. In building up resistance and pressure, campaigns at an international level are still relevant, especially to fight against and anticipate corporate exploitation practices in areas such as in recent expansion areas in Sulawesi, Maluku and Papua.

Other potential opportunities used by MISEREOR’s CSO partners are the social forestry and agrarian reform programs undertaken by the government. The role of NGOs in facilitating local communities thus far to accept and to follow social forestry schemes are very important and the contributions of CSOs in this respect are recognized by both the local government and central government. In the absence of adequate state mechanisms to settle numerous acute land conflicts across the country it has been highly relevant for CSOs to also take the role as mediator or facilitator bridging the settlement of land conflicts between communities and corporations. The enactment of Act No. 6 Year 2014 on Village Government also opened opportunities for CSO networks to synergize community empowerment programs supported by donors with the support programs and funding from the government. Not all of MISEREOR’s CSO partners, however, have to date seen and used the Village Act as an important entry point for protecting control over natural resources.

In general, it can be concluded that the targeted goals of MISEREOR’s partner organizations are still relevant for the target areas and the envisaged beneficiaries. Efforts to achieve protection of land rights and access to forest resources is crucial to protect their sources of livelihood. However, each organization, usually in line with local condition and their specific organizational history takes a different emphasis how the protection of rights is going to be achieved. In the case of PO4, PO1, PO3, PO6 and PO7, for example, legal recognition over the forest areas traditionally managed and used by local communities is the main target. Eight of the 13 assisted villages of PO4 have not received legal recognition of their traditional management area that overlap with protected forests and production forests sites. The rights of local communities in four PO1 assisted provinces are not been protected because their
land area are overlapping with the existing Forest Management Unit (KPH, *Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan*) and national parks, some are even in conflict with the company. The PO6 assisted communities in Central Kalimantan are still in conflict with the mining company. Meanwhile, PO3 assisted communities in Central Sulawesi, Maluku and Papua/West Papua whose indigenous land is threatened to be dominated by palm oil plantation companies.

The threat of the degradation of natural resources due to large-scale plantation expansion seems to be far lower compared to 5-10 years ago. With the exception of the eastern region of Indonesia, which is the target location of PO3, significant expansion of plantation activities in Sumatra and Kalimantan can only be done within existing concession areas. However, it should be noted that there is still a process of degradation of natural resources on a regular basis due to heavy forest fires occurring especially in the area of peatlands in Riau, Jambi, South Sumatra, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan and South Kalimantan. So far, the projects of the seven MISEREOR’s partner organizations have not yet focused on peatland. Programs aimed at stopping the degradation and restauration of peat areas are important to be supported as they are also areas of indigenous communities who are economically vulnerable.

PO2 and PO5 are two out of seven of MISEREOR partner organizations that are currently focusing on the effort of strengthening communities to protect food land from the threat of the company’s expansion. Programs aimed to improve the living conditions, food security and food sovereignty are still very relevant to be conducted, not only in locations that are currently accompanied by the PO2 and PO5. Similar efforts need to be done in other areas, such as the program regions of PO4, PO1, PO6 and especially in the eastern region which are the focus area of PO3. Palm oil expansion has clearly threatened food security and the availability of food land, damaging the ecosystems of food land adjacent to the oil palm plantations, and lead to a loss of diversity of the types and sources of local food. The expansion of palm oil companies that target unproductive food land through the potential plasma partnership scheme offers reduces the availability of food land in the long term. On the other hand, the involvement of villagers in small-scale palm oil partnership systems (2 hectares) is also a potential threat to food security, as the result of their palm oil is insufficient to substitute the food costs that are missing.

PO1 is the only MISEREOR partner that focuses on the resolution of land conflicts between rural communities and other parties. The presence of a third party that can be trusted by the local community to help them find a fair settlement over disputed land control is very important. PO1 is in the position to provide relevant support to indigenous communities who are threatened in their livelihoods by acting as a facilitator or mediator in the process of conflict settlement. In the situation where local communities who have a weak legal position are faced with strong corporate parties, judicial settlement (litigation) does not always bring benefits to the local communities. The patterns of non-litigation conflict resolution, building consensus, collaboration and win-win solution in such situations is the best choice.

Apart from the goals mentioned above, there is one important goal that is not yet represented in the program of any of MISEREOR’s partner, which is economic empowerment. It is an urgent need of all communities visited during this Learning Process as without systematic efforts to facilitate their economic empowerment, the results of previous struggles can be not beneficial in the long term.
Current intervention strategies such as advocacy, community organizing, capacity building on non-violent conflict resolution, development of community networks as well development of integrated resource management are currently still highly relevant and necessary in order to effectively strengthen communities in defending their land rights.

Improvements in the legal system, such as the Constitutional Court Ruling No. 35 on the rights of indigenous peoples, and Act No. 6/2014 on Village Government offer new opportunities that especially in the future will still gain in relevance as a framework under which community empowerment efforts can be made more effective. The existence of new schemes on social forestry and agrarian reform as already outlined before provide additional opportunities for communities to obtain recognition of their management right in forest area. But all of opportunities and rights will not be obtained automatically. The involvement of civil society organizations to oversee the implementation of every policy remains important. Advocacy activities against land grabbing undertaken by large companies as well as those related to the implementation of development projects (e.g. infrastructure) remains necessary. One of the reasons is the fact that the mindset of government officials at various levels are not uniform and often depend on the overall reform dynamic in specific regions or even of individual government officials. Under such conditions, awareness raising and capacity development among communities as well as advocacy towards government officials and companies to actually enforce and adhere to existing legal framework does not lose any of its relevance.

Organizing rural communities will also remain a key strategy for CSO in the future. Implementation of the Village Act has so far mainly followed formal procedures, but has not yet brought about fundamental changes in the mindset of villagers, the village administration nor local governments. The paradigm of “participation” is still largely considered tantamount to mere physical presence, not in the sense of discourse and contesting ideas for the sake of actual social and economic empowerment of communities.

Advocacy activities to obtain recognition of the management rights of forest areas are still important, as the Constitutional Court ruling No. 35 year 2012 could not be put forth without the fulfillment of a number of regulations associated with it. Indigenous communities will need to understand these regulations and will need CSO support for consolidating community members and in fulfilling all administrative requirements. In that respect, the development and further strengthening of community networks to enter into direct dialogue with decision-makers on further representing their interests and communicating their challenges in complying with existing regulatory frameworks.

Systems of integrated resource management still need to be more effectively promoted and developed in the future. To date, the focus has mostly been on assisting individual communities or administrative villages while efforts of landscape-based integrative management are still undeveloped. MISEREOR’s partner organizations already recognize the importance of developing a landscape-based integrative management to cover the gap with villages that have not become yet the object of assistance programs. The Village Act provides a framework for institutionalized cooperation between villages. Therefore, the Village Act is also potential instrument for CSOs in the effort of developing landscape-based integrated resource management systems.
4.2 Outcomes and Impacts

4.2.1 Protection of Land

PO4 up until today contributed to the overall protection of 98,048 ha of forest the concession of which was revoked due to massive protests by communities from 53 villages that was supported by a large NGO alliance\(^{32}\). As a direct result of PO4 support within this area, 5,752 ha have in 2011 been legally recognized for a period of 35 years under the *hutan desa* scheme implemented in 5 villages\(^{33}\). It is important to note that the key for sustaining the legality will be the establishment of the organizational structures and capacities at community level to actually implement the scheme on a sustainable basis. The basic risk is if after legal recognition has been obtained communities fail to implement the social forestry scheme provided by the Ministry of Forestry their permits could theoretically also be revoked again. The implementation of social forestry schemes generally entails a lot of technical provisions that communities need to understand and be able to put into practice. Ultimately, the communities will need to establish structures and capacities for economic use of the designated forest area so that the protected forest becomes a source for improving livelihoods. During annual evaluations from government side progress on that need to be visible. An important achievement in this regard to date is the establishment of the first cooperative under the umbrella of the Village Forest Management Unit (LPHD) in one of the five villages. Under the current project, there are eight more villages, three of which are in the process of obtaining the permits under the *hutan desa* scheme, while the other five are still exploring which of the existing social forestry schemes are the most suitable. These eight villages together manage an area of 16,324 ha that will be submitted for legal recognition.

In Central Sulawesi, PO3 contributed to the revocation of a concession that was held by oil palm company since 2011 covering an area of 38,000 ha. The project village fell into the concession area. 69 ha had already been planted with oil palm under a partnership scheme with local farmers (*Plasma*). PO3 was involved in awareness raising and organizing of some of the local communities. 20 village head in turn issued a joint statement of rejecting oil palm plantations entering their area. After massive community protest, the Bupati revoked the concession in 2013, which was confirmed by a Supreme Court decision in 2015. The legal recognition of community rights towards the land is currently still outstanding. Communities have started to map their territory and identified the potential resources to be developed there.

Among the concrete results of the work of PO1 in protecting land rights of local communities are the indigenous in Jambi Province that was able to come to an agreement in December, 2015 with the restoration company PT REKI after four years of negotiations to secure their

\(^{32}\) Around the Kerinci Seblat National Park, which previously had been a logging concession area, the local government had issued in 2007 a concession for an industrial timber company covering an area of 98,048 ha. Since 2009, PO4 had joined forced with 17 other CSOs supporting local communities rejecting the expansion of a company. Their efforts were successful and the concession revoked in 2009.

\(^{33}\) In 2011, the Forestry Ministry legally recognized the forest areas managed by 17 villages under the *hutan desa* (village forest) scheme covering a total area of 29,501 ha. Obtaining legal recognition includes a Decree by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, a permit by the Governor and the approval of the management plan for the *hutan desa* area. To support these 17 villages in the realization of the scheme PO4 entered an alliance with three other CSOs) who in turn divided those villages among them. While PO4 initially supported 5 villages, one last village is jointly supported by the four organizations together due to a politically sensitive situation of horizontal conflicts between indigenous and migrant community members.
access and use of forest land and resources. The original area mapped as community-managed territory amounted 828 ha. However, half way through the negotiation more than half of the area then was claimed by another community group finally leaving the first community with 299 ha. PO1, furthermore also facilitated the conflict resolution process in the nearby migrant community with PT REK34. Here, the MoU was signed in January 2016 granting the community 1,219 ha from the concession area on a partnership basis for agroforestry activities.

The community in North Sumatra Province was among the first 9 indigenous communities whose right to manage their traditional incense forest as a customary forest (hutan adat) was recognized by the President in December, 2016 on the basis of the landmark Constitutional Court Decision MK No. 65/2013. This recognition covers an area of 5,172 ha. In the end the support of various organizations contributed to this, including PO1 who particularly focused on supporting participatory mapping and an economic valuation of natural resources. However, the need for support does not end here. The recognition of an adat community always needs a regional regulation as well as the endorsement by the Parliament. It needs to be noted, however, that this Presidential initiative constitutes an impulse setting necessary follow-up steps into motion, but it cannot alone solve the complex issue of customary community rights towards land.

In Central Kalimantan, PO6 supported a village managing an area of 12,000 ha in collaboration with two neighboring villages to reject a timber plantation company expanding into their area since 2014. Community organizing and participatory mapping lead to a strong unity of the communities in opposing the plantation company. While they are still awaiting official legal recognition of their territory from district and national level, the company has withdrawn from the area and stated it would respect the community-managed areas that have already been mapped.

Besides the importance to obtain legal security from district and national government agencies for the long-term protection of community-managed territories village-level policies (peraturan desa – village regulations) are increasingly important as well. As the village head and village elites are usually the ones coopted by corporations, the use of village governance mechanisms combined with awareness raising is both an expression of a commitment and also an important prevention measure to thwart potential future land grabbing endeavors or land conversion by community members. Village regulations outlining customary land are also a prerequisite for the legal recognition of community territory by the Ministry of Forestry and Environment (KemenLHK) in the context of existing social forestry schemes as well as the acknowledgment of community territories by district policies – in case the land is outside of forest areas.

PO5 predominantly supports villages that have experienced or are still facing threats from land grabbing. In West Kalimantan, they have to date supported 15 villages in mapping their customary territory and compiling spatial plans as a basis to further protect the land in the future six of which have already been verified to date35. The government of the District intends to replicate the approach to all 193 villages in the district. PO2, on the other hand, takes a focus on preventing the conversion of food land into non-food oil palm cultivation or

34 This is actually outside of the MISEREOR-funded program.
35 The original target was 6 villages. However, neighboring villages became interested as well and additionally requesting PO5’s support in participatory mapping making it a total of 15 villages.
other use. To date, they supported 24 villages to integrate maps of their customary land into village-level policy development including spatial plans and village mid-term development plans. Furthermore, PO2 was instrumental to advocate for the adoption of a district regulation in August 2016 to protect local food land from conversion (LP2B) in line with national policies to promote sustainable agriculture (Law No. 41/2009 on Food Land). The implementation of the regulation will create incentives for food farmers by offering certification of their land free of charge if they will register it under the LP2B policy.

**4.2.1.1 Relevance of Mapping**

Participatory mapping is a basic and key element of all CSO partner approaches. This predominantly entails a process of mapping the territory that local communities traditionally manage and use for livelihood purposes (*wilayah kelola*). It involves the identification of external borders – most of the times constituting the borders with a neighboring community, which, thus, need to be jointly agreed upon – as well as the designation of areas of particular use. The verification process usually involves the wider community that were not part of the actual mapping exercise and can include the collection and documentation of traditional knowledge and the history of the community occupying that land. A modified version is a process of social mapping, which is mostly done in relation to traditional *adat* communities and places more emphasis on the social and spiritual value of the land and existing natural resources. The specific technical approach ranges from training community members in all steps of the data collection and verification process and supporting them in the implementation, involving external specialists in the process until operating drones to collect the data which afterwards then still has to be verified in a participatory process together with communities.

PO1, PO6, and PO3 for instance, generally take the approach to train community members so they become the main actor and take the responsibility throughout the mapping process. PO5, for instance, is the only among the MISEREOR partner organizations that has already experience in partly also including the use of drones in mapping exercises.

A map of community territory prepared by the respective community is generally a powerful instrument and a basic prerequisite for any kind of formalization as well as legal recognition. In order to become aware of encroachments from corporations and taking actions on that, communities need to have a clear understanding and proof of the territory that has been within their realm and use since generations and the way of managing it. On the other hand, maps can also be misused. The availability makes it easier to sell land. Hence, supporting communities in mapping always needs to go hand in hand with awareness raising, a clear commitment to protect community land and close accompaniment. Efforts to protect land include different levels of interventions. Especially since the promulgation of the Village Law (*UU Desa No.6/2014*), villages have a strong basis for self-governance. Hence, the first step is a formal adoption of a map with proper coordinates at village and inter-village level. The mapping can, thus, be part of solving border conflicts with neighboring villages. It becomes part of village spatial planning and village mid-term development planning. This can secure the productive use of land and prevent future sale of land. Stronger legal security is achieved

---

36 With the exception of digitalizing the map, this is something the supporting CSO or an external specialist is usually doing.
when integrated into District Spatial Plans (RTRW). The formal adoption of a community territory map at village level in the form of a village regulation (Perdes) is a precondition to obtain legal management right (hak kelola) of forest areas within one of the existing social forestry schemes, which are administered by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. This is generally seen as the strongest legal protection. The social map that had for instance been prepared by a community with support from PO1 describes how this traditional community lives and moves around within the area of a National Park, the geographical place and natural resources that have specific significance to them. This product was perceived by the community as crucial to being able in the future to advocate towards the National Park management not to be barred from entering certain areas of the Park and to be invited to participate in the review of the management plan.

Besides the actual product, the process of developing and verifying the maps has also a strong relevance for the ultimate goal of protecting land. Exploring an area by foot, taking coordinates, collecting and verifying information on traditional use and practices creates an understanding of the value of the land, a sense of the risks associated with plantation expansion and usually strengthens the commitment to protect the land. As the collection of coordinates with GPS devices is a technical task, which is mostly performed by younger tech-affine members of the community the process also helps to pass on traditional knowledge to the younger generation and involve them actively in further advocacy efforts.

“Previously, we didn’t know how serious the reduction of food land is. Only since we collaborate with PO4 and have conducted mapping of our land we know that agricultural land is really shrinking. This was a trigger to make us think about regulations that could prevent that land conversion is becoming bigger and bigger. What is happening is that agricultural land is converted into palm oil plantations and plantations are converted into housing areas. Previously, we didn’t know, now we know that the shrinkage of agricultural land is significant. That’s why we now compiled programs that the land is not further reduced.” (Village head in West Sumatra)

The case of one Village in South Kalimantan, is an example where the mapping process was not consistently designed in such a way that community members were the main actors and drivers – with negative effects on the actual outcomes. Initially, there was a three-day training for community members giving an introduction into the importance of mapping and the different technical steps. Due to a limited budget allocated for this activity, however, actual mapping and taking of coordinates was done by members of a CSO specialized in participatory mapping with branches in many forest-rich regions of Indonesia. In the

---

37 These include the following schemes: Community forest (hutan kemasyarakatan), Village Forest (hutan desa), Customary Forest (hutan adat) and Community Plantation Forests (hutan tanaman rakyat).

38 The National Park management has devised a zonation system where the most inner zone is barred from any kind of human intervention. The community, however, has traditionally traversed that entire park. In line with customary practices, families or entire clans, for instance, wander around a large territory when one of their members has passed away. They also have specific places far away from the locations where they settle semi-permanently when family members give birth.

39 In this case only IDR 10 Million had been allocated for the mapping process by PO7. Members of the CSO confirmed that the participatory mapping process of one village needs a budget between IDR 50 and 60 Million, depending on the topography of the area. The time needed for one community can take between 4 to 6 months for the mapping alone, while the following verification process, especially in cases where there is no
beginning many community members were involved who gradually dropped out. In the end, it was mainly one hamlet head still being actively involved. Follow-up after this process, however, remained unclear and the community is not aware, how to further use the map that has been prepared.

A case for the use of drones can be made under those circumstances where the topography is very difficult and mapping by foot would be very time-consuming and, hence, also costly\textsuperscript{40}. The aerial view can sometimes have an eye-opening effect for communities if for once they can imagine the full layout of their land, but also understand how close and, thus, imminent external threats are. Therefore, there is no general conclusion that can be made on the adequacy of traditional versus more high-tech approaches in taking coordinates as part of a community mapping process. What is all-decisive, however, is that the overall process is designed in such a way that the community is in the lead role of driving the process, the interpretation of data, the verification, story-telling and the decision-making on what follow-up steps would be most needed.

The overall relevance of participatory mapping for protecting community access and use of land is also confirmed by the fact that the district government in West Kalimantan, after seeing the results in PO5 partner communities stipulated the replication in all villages and allocated a budget for procuring the necessary GPS devices from the district budget 2017.

4.2.1.2 Resolution of Land Conflicts

It is difficult to find reliable data showing the incidence, type and trends of agrarian and tenurial conflicts in Indonesia, an overview of solved and unsolved cases or even reliable quantitative data on land titles and land use rights issued in the last couple of years. One of the reasons is the definition and delineation of tenurial and agrarian conflict. Official government data are not online available. Many publications cite data published by The Consortium for Agrarian Reforms (KPA) over the years. KPA states that the incidence of agrarian conflicts is continuously on the increase. From 2013 to 2014 the KPA noted an increase by 27.9%. For 2015, the KPA calculated a total of 252 agrarian conflicts affecting 400.430 ha of land and 108.714 households. 50% of these conflicts are related to plantations, followed by infrastructure development (28%) and forestry management (9.6%)\textsuperscript{41}. In terms of size of land affected by the different types of conflict 302.526 ha are affected by plantation-related conflicts, followed by forestry (52.176 ha) and mining (21.127 ha).

The regional distribution of agrarian conflicts shows a clear concentration in Riau (14.4% of all agrarian conflicts), followed by East Java, Southeast Sulawesi, South Sumatra and North Sumatra.

\textit{Figure 4: Regional Distribution of Agrarian Conflicts according to Provinces (2015)}

\textsuperscript{40} The costs of mapping per drone depends on the topography. An average figure would be IDR 30 Million for a mid-sized area which makes it generally more cost-efficient than traditional approaches.

\textsuperscript{41} KPA (2016). Catatan Akhir Tahun 2015, Jakarta.
Perkumpulan untuk Pembaharuan Hukum Berbasis Masyarakat dan Ekologis (HuMa), another NGO, maintains a database on land-related conflicts and has collected data specifically related to customary land. For 2015, they record the highest incidence of conflict cases on *adat land* in Central Kalimantan (72 cases), followed by Central Java (38), West Java (34) and North Sumatra (19). But when it comes to the size of land affected by these conflicts West Kalimantan scores highest with 551.073 ha, followed by West Sumatra (420.230 ha), Central Kalimantan (254.671 ha) and Central Sulawesi (138.739 ha).

Major contributions to the high level of conflicts are overlapping legal regulations with regard to forestry and the management of natural resources and accordingly unclear status of land. This in turn leads to overlapping claims between plantation companies and local communities. Conflicts also erupt due to weak enforcement of company compensation agreements with communities, misconduct by plantation security guards, police, and military personnel and an overall rising pressure on land, including conflicts between indigenous communities and migrants.

PO1 collects since 2010 for the Province of Jambi detailed data according to the source and type of conflicts. The data is mostly sourced from public media.

*Table 1: Overview of Different Types of Conflicts in the Province of Jambi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of conflicts</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts related to oil palm</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


43 Data provided by PO1
This more differentiated data is very useful to understand and further investigate the complex nature of land and forest related conflicts. While the plantation industry is not the only source of conflict as shown in the table above, it is surely the biggest and the number of tenurial and agrarian conflicts has steadily increased in recent years. Despite the recently issued moratorium on new plantation and coal mining concessions declared by President Joko Widodo in April 2016 a significant reverse trend cannot be expected in the new future. It is estimated that the Indonesian palm oil industry collectively possesses approximately 6-7 million hectares of undeveloped acreage, which – according to an estimation of Watch Indonesia – could allow them to maintain current rates of expansion for the next decade. The aggressive drive for expansion by the oil palm industries during the last decade is seen by activists not only as a strategy to expand production, but also serving the goal to accumulate and control as much land as possible.

As it is difficult to establish a baseline to assess the relevance of MISEREOR partner efforts and achievements in solving land-related conflicts, it is equally difficult to come up with a sound quantitative figure of conflicts that have been solved to date by MISEREOR partners. In many cases, they have been one actor among many contributing to a breakthrough.

Unclear is also how to define a conflict and when a conflict can be considered to be solved –

---

45 Interview with the Executive Director of a National CSO. The current area covered by oil palm concessions amounts approximately 13 million hectares, while the area currently planted is only about 8 to 9 million hectares. Productivity of oil palm plantations in Indonesia, however, is far below plantations in Malaysia.
46 E.g. as in the case of a Region where PO4 was originally one of 18 CSO supporting local communities in their opposition to the timber company or in the case of PO1 collaborating with other CSOs supporting the community in their conflict against the pulpwood plantation company PT Toba Pulp Lestari (PT TPL).
once a plantation refrains from further developing their concession? When a concession is revoked or when communities actively manage land? Hence, the relevance rather needs to be seen more in the light of structural effects or larger impacts.

While in the past, CSOs mainly supported communities in campaigning against encroachments on their land, which included advocacy and lobbying tactics, but also open confrontations such as organizing mass rallies, demonstrations as well as the creation of national as well as even international publicity. Here, the role of MISEREOR partners over the years – some of them outside or before collaboration with MISEREOR – lead to substantial successes where companies agreed to withdraw from a certain area due massive community resistance, plantation concessions were revoked or forest was protected through community-based management systems or village-based policy development

Since a few years, the focus has shifted more towards legal recognition of community-managed land under one of the existing social forestry schemes, environmental partnership schemes or village-level policy development. Another strategy applied now is to advocate for direct integration of community maps that have already been formally adopted through village regulations into regional Spatial Plans (RTRW). With a view on the government plans to allocate a total of 12.7 million hectares to social forestry in the coming years, this will become one of the key approaches for land protection with a long-term perspective. For 2015, Kemen LHK recorded a total of 265 community groups operating under one of the social forestry schemes (hutan kemasyarakatan, hutan tanaman rakyat, hutan desa and partnership). The 2010-2014 Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Forestry had planned for an area of 500.000 ha to be allocated for the Village Forest (hutan desa) scheme. The five villages with an area of 5.752 ha that were recognized during this period as hutan desa due to PO4 support in collaboration with MISEREOR, is in mere quantitative numbers only a fraction. What makes this case highly relevant, though, is the density of community-based forestry management schemes in one area supported by a larger alliance of different CSOs. In the future, this will provide interesting learning opportunities, especially with regard to the development of joint strategies of representing their interests and finding solutions to main challenges in turning their village forest into an economic asset.

PO3 to date has played a specific role in contributing to structural effects in relation to forest and land related conflicts. Until 2012, it was Board member of the Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO). While the legitimacy of RSPO is widely debated, it

47 Examples: PO5 supported the local communities of 5 districts to insist that the withdraws communities’ lands from the Location Permit (Izin Lokasi) of some HTI and oil palm plantations. In 2011, the contributed to the protection of 52.700 ha of land in 5 villages the form of Village Forests. PO3 contributed to the coordinated efforts of 20 communities in Central Sulawesi to fight an oil palm plantation, which also led to the revocation of the concession covering an area amounting 35.000 ha. PO1 claims they protected over the years through their programs more than 50.000 people from eviction, violence and loss of access to land as well as supported to establishment of community-based management of forests covering about 150.000 ha. PO2, by supporting communities in the adoption of land-use plans in 12 villages protected an area of 95.400 ha.

48 For instance envisaged by PO3 in Central Sulawesi


51 Many criticize membership of the RSPO as a green-washing strategy. There is no mechanism to verify and enforce the application of the voluntary RSPO Principles and Criteria. Certification also takes place at the level of plantation, not at company level. Hence, large corporances can partly produce according to sustainability criteria and use the label, while they partly produce or source palm oil from non-certified plantations. See:
nevertheless also created standards for handling complaints and solving conflicts for its member companies\textsuperscript{52}. If an acute conflict involves a RSPO member, there are resources and certified mediators available that can be accessed. When PO1 and PO2 were involved in supporting a community in their conflict with PT Asiatik, they were able to access RSPO resources. Within RSPO they also advocated for the development of standards for laborer working in plantations which are currently in process. One of their focal areas has been the national policy level and the support of their members in solving cases. MISEREOR CSO partners also confirmed that they usually collaborate with PO3 in solving specific cases as PO3 with their strong networks at national level can facilitate access to a variety of national level actors. Other relevant achievements were successful interventions towards national policies, such as the 2011 Judicial Review that PO3 initiated against the Plantation Act (Law 18/2004) that resulted in an adjustment to the Law by Constitutional Court to strengthen legal clarity in obtaining concessions. Other achievements include regional policies on sustainable oil palm (Central Sulawesi and Central Kalimantan) and the suspension of IFC investment in the Wilmar Group in 2009 because of joint lobbying together with an alliance of 19 NGOs.

PO1’s successful role in facilitating a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between PT REKI as the manager of the restoration area \textit{Hutan Harapan} and the \textit{Simpang Macan Luar} community after years of heated conflict can be said to have had a broad effect on conflict resolution efforts in Indonesia. It has become a model case, as it was the first of its kind where a company holding a restoration concession and a local community that had traditionally lived in the area for several generations negotiated an agreement\textsuperscript{53}. After this MoU was concluded in 2015, both the \textit{Integrated Team for Conflict Resolution} by the Provincial Government in Jambi (\textit{Tim Terpadu}) as well as PT REKI itself used the approach as a model to negotiate further agreements with other communities surrounding the restoration area.

The steady increase of forest-related conflicts during the last decade has also one of its roots in the fact that there had never been a single institution and clear administrative channels for conflict resolution and, therefore, the number of unresolved cases also piled up over time. Relevant government units were fragmented and were not effectively supporting conflict resolution efforts\textsuperscript{54}. The newly established \textit{Directorate for Complaints on Tenurial and Adat Conflicts}\textsuperscript{55}.

\textsuperscript{52} In 2016, RSPO had 109 members from Indonesia and more than 2500 worldwide.

\textsuperscript{53} PO1 between 2012 and 2016 facilitated the conflict resolution process between the \textit{Batin Sembilan} community in \textit{Simpang Macan Luar} (SML) as well as the \textit{Kunangan Jaya Satu} community (though not with MISEREOR funding) and PT REKI over a period of almost five years. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in \textit{Simpang Macan Luar} was finally concluded in December 2015 and the one with \textit{Kunangan Jaya Satu} in 2016 and is endorsed by the Ministry of Forestry as well as international donors of PT REKI. Both conflicts have been resolved by agreement between the local communities and PT REKI, in case of the traditional \textit{adat} community \textit{Simpang Macan Luar} PO1 was a facilitator of the negotiation process, while in the case of \textit{Kunangan Jaya Satu} which mostly comprised of migrants PO1 supported the conflict resolution process that was achieved through mediation. The SML MoU outlines the rights of the community to live on the borders of the restoration area, the use of non-timber forestry products, the allocation of land for permanent agriculture and the provision of certain infrastructure (e.g. drinking water) by PT REKI. With PO1’s support, the SML community devised a post-conflict land management plan outlining the model of collaborative management and the different crops that will be planted addressing both household consumption needs as well as developing market production.

\textsuperscript{54} Previously, tasks related to conflict resolution in the Forestry Ministry were spread over different Directorates. Only with the establishment of the \textit{Directorate for Complaints on Tenurial and Adat Conflicts}...
Conflicts (PKTHA) was directly involved in the negotiation and subsequent monitoring process facilitated by PO1. The PT REKI case, therefore, also became a model for them and had an effect on national policies including a Circular Letter from 2015 by the Ministry of Forestry and Environment (Kemen LHK) to restoration concession holders and forest managers to settle conflicts in a non-violent way. More importantly, it directly inspired the development of the Ministerial Regulation Permen No. 84/2015 on Forest Tenurial Conflict Management. Previously, the Forestry Ministry had only two main models of conflict resolution for tenurial conflicts – social forestry and partnership schemes. With the experience from the PT REKI case mediation and negotiation were also included into the Permen No. 84 as additional options. The strengths of these approaches is that the final agreement between corporation and community is not predefined in content and administrative requirements by existing regulations, but is entirely left up to the conflicting parties. As the PKTHA will not be able to handle all conflicts at the local level, the Permen is currently being revised as to include stipulations on the establishment of sub-national conflict resolution desks under the Provincial Forestry Agency and the lower-level Forestry Management Units (KPH). Hence, PO1 is currently collaborating with the Provincial Forestry Office in Jambi to develop a regional-level policy and institutional set-up for conflict resolution in the future. This offers the opportunity to formalize the role that civil society needs to be given in conflict resolution and to make government support in conflict resolution more accessible and effective for communities.

The elaborations above show that the scope of cases solved by MISEREOR partners to date and their accumulated effects in the resolution of land conflicts as well as towards national and sub-national policies have been considerably broad. One of the broadest effects that can be recorded until today is the fact that senior leaders of the big environmental organizations who have been in leadership positions of organizations like PO3 have in the meantime entered mainstream politics by having joined the close circle of the President as part of the Presidential Office.

Looking at the overall figures (development of conflicts, expansion of plantation), however, it seems there has not been any notable change of the status quo. A collaborative exercise of MISEREOR partners during the Kick-Off Workshop to this Learning Process on trends and change since 2009 also indicated a general sense of disillusionment and conclusion that every gain in changing the policy frame will always be followed by immediate setbacks.

The opportunities that come along with the drive of the Jokowi administration to step up social forestry and agrarian reforms in combination with the existing legal framework strengthening community rights for self-governance at village level are only slowly starting to become apparent. A final assessment of the effects MISEREOR partners had and potentially will have on land conflicts in comparison with the scope of problems will also have to take into account how expertise from past experiences - some of them still quite new in the context of an on-going first project phase - will help to position themselves in the future and

(PKTHA) directly under the Directorate General for Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership there is a clear structure and a mandate for conflict resolution.

It is mentioned as one of three model cases for successful mediation on the PKTHA website. See: http://pskl.menlhk.go.id/pktha/pengaduan/frontend/web/index.php?r=site%2Fdetail&id=9

In the case of adat communities there is, in principle, also still the option to apply for the recognition of an enclave providing customary communities with a certain limited area surrounded by forest with a different status. However, the process of legal recognition is very complex and ultimately needs the endorsement by the National Parliament.
to harness newly arising opportunities. Almost all of the partners have developed specific approaches that can be considered effective and in principle scalable – starting from approaches in supporting communities in obtaining and realizing social forestry schemes, accessing public information and using formal legal channels for their advocacy strategies, using village governance mechanisms to protect and develop land resources and facilitating conflict resolution processes between communities and corporations. But they will need to be complemented and stepped up in the frame of a more long-term engagement and a changing role that expands from mere case-based advocacy to harness structural opportunities provided by current government priorities. These relate to long-term community-based management of land, the development of economic potentials from forestry and non-forestry products, but also more systematically developing collaboration with the government in developing the policy frame on land rights, conflict resolution and management.

4.2.2 Community Strengthening and Movement Building

It can be said that across the board all MISEREOR partners have undergone a change from driving campaigns and lobbying activities to more and more placing communities as the main actors in the center of program implementation. The scope of capacity development provided to community members bears witness of that. Paralegal training, training on conducting participatory mapping, training in negotiation and conflict resolution to training for drafting village regulations are just a few examples. PO6, for instance, trains community members suffering from the environmental impacts of mining activities to independently collect evidence and data in the field, compile information, use legal channels and access national-level supporting institutions to submit their complaints to government and legal institutions at all levels and even independently represent their cases, such as at the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). PO1 states that they see their role mainly as a facilitator and in their support in conflict resolution (example of the PT REKI case) they have on the one hand been guardians of the overall process of negotiation, but also supported the collection and verification of all relevant information, providing advice to communities and participating in the multi-actor post-MoU monitoring. The decision about the final goal in the negotiation process is left to the communities. Their current vision is to still considerably step up this principle and eventually make communities fully-fledged partners in the project implementation managing the majority of funds for their own activities while PO1 envisages their own role as an advisor and a provider of management services. This strategy goal has lead them to reduce the role given to local NGOs as implementing partner, which in their view adds unnecessary additional layers of administration and can lead to problems related to transparency and accountability. In Central Sulawesi as well as in East Kalimantan, they have started increasing the direct collaboration with local community organizations such as female farmer groups or community forums. The role of the local NGO partners, on the other hand, has been reduced to tasks especially related to facilitating interaction with district governments57.

57 This includes that community organizations also compile activity-planning documents and submit a request for funds directly to PO1. In the case of the National Park, the collaboration with a NGO which focuses on literacy as an instrument of general empowerment of the indigenous community the collaboration is more intensive. Without collaboration with and through this NGO it would have been difficult to earn the trust of the
PO3 generally also states that they respect the needs and decisions of communities how to deal with corporations and also in case they decide for entering a partnership. They see themselves as providing knowledge and increase awareness on the negative impacts of oil palm cultivation and monoculture, but the final decision if communities decide to accept or reject oil palm they leave up to the communities. In those cases where communities have already entered collaboration with oil palm plantations they are still committed to support them in order to ensure that all their rights are respected.

However, in their facilitation approach, they highly depend on and leave the day-to-day interaction to local NGO partner with whom they mostly have personal relations. Direct visits to communities by PO3 staff is reduced to strategic moments or particular capacity development activities. The mode of collaboration with local partner NGOs, on the other hand, is more based on trust than on consistent control mechanisms.

Empowering communities in their fight against the expansion of plantations into community areas and for obtaining legal rights towards their land needs on top of general awareness raising and capacity strengthening two basic things. It needs functioning and strong community organization which have the mandate and the capacities to represent community, interests in the political arena, manage community land and ultimately also support the access to markets for agricultural and forestry products. Secondly, in leading the struggle against the interests of powerful corporations it needs movement-building across individual communities in order to become a critical mass which is in the position to exert pressure.

MISEREOR CSO partners have demonstrated different approaches in facilitating the establishment and strengthening of existing community organizations. A basic approach has been to establish and strengthen task-related informal community groups, such as farmer groups, women's groups, mapping groups or groups with an appointed coordinator to conduct data collection and advocacy work on behalf of the community. Overall, all MISEREOR partners state they conduct some sort of strengthening of village cadres as well as community organizations. In this regard, PO6 takes a different perspective than most other MISEREOR partners, including their own consortium partners. They consciously opt not to focus on the formation and strengthening of formal community organizations, which in their perspective have the tendency to produce individual leaders who can be easily coopted. Their approach is to rather support and collaborate with a variety of grassroots groups (farmer groups, mapping groups etc.) and facilitate the formation of networks among them. This way they expect to rather nurture a larger number of community leaders from below who not necessarily represent community elites.

Other examples of community organizations that have been established or strengthened by MISEREOR partners are formal community organizations such as Village-Owned Enterprises, Village Forest Management Units (LPHD) as stipulated by Forestry Ministry community and to ensure regular communication. Here, the true organizations have truly complementary functions in strengthening the local community.

58 This approach is also consistent with one of the work areas of PO3 focusing on oil palm plantation workers’ rights. PO6, for example, would in this perspective be at the other end of the spectrum. While they focus on empowerment of communities to defend their rights, rejection of oil palm is a prerequisite for them to further support communities.

59 For example: network of rubber farmer groups or network of community advocacy groups coordinating their efforts.
regulations\textsuperscript{61} or organizations representing the interests of \textit{adat} communities\textsuperscript{62}. Some of these organizations have started to see the need to expand into joint economic activities as the establishment of the first cooperative under one of the LPHD shows. Another example is the network of rubber farmer groups that explores options to directly sell their produce to a nearby rubber factors in order to get better prices than if they use middlemen as they have done before. In addition, the management of the demo plot that was part of the MoU between PT REKI and the community in Batanghari will eventually also need some kind of organizational framework. More systematic joint agricultural production, post-production or marketing through dedicated organizations however has not been promoted by the MISEREOR partners yet. Overall, they see the importance of strengthening community organizations. Over time, in established organizations there is also progress visible, such as the emergence of more transparent financial management practices, regular membership fees or independent recruitment of new members. However, largely MISEREOR partners do not have specific interventions planned that are directed towards organizational development and there is largely a conceptual framework mission for that.

Traditional knowledge and customary practices and rules of environmental management are largely documented in the context of mapping processes towards customary territory. A part of the PO6 project especially focuses on the use of media to externalize and document traditional knowledge. PO4 supported communities to explore and record traditional borders and resource management practices. But what still remains is to also integrate this knowledge into community-based forestry management schemes (e.g. through the LPHD as supported by PO4).

\textit{“For us the documentation of traditional knowledge on forest management was particularly useful in our collaboration with PO4. The original Melayu Jambi community in our village had actually already a good understanding of the old history of our community, how different territories were divided between communities, where the borders had been, which is called ‘tembo’ in our old scripts. Some of the older generation still remembers this tradition well, but as far as I know, there is only one person in the area of Koto Sepuluh who still has one of those scripts and who is able to read it as it is written in Arabic writing, called ‘Jawi’. Now, with the support from PO4 we have documented the history of our village, the borders to the neighboring villages, and our traditions in managing the forest areas during the old times. All of this has now been inserted into a village regulation on natural resources management, so that the community of Tanjung Mudo has now its own document which is a reference for its community members.” (Hamlet head of Tanjung Mudo)\textit{}}

Networking and exchange between communities happens in many locations. Generally, it needs to be differentiated though between those networks that emerge in response to an

\textsuperscript{61}E.g. So far PO4 facilitated the establishment of LPHD in five villages that have already obtained the status of \textit{hutan desa} for their community land.

\textsuperscript{62}Examples here include a community organization established by young men from an \textit{adat} community in 2006 to represent the interests of the community that still keeps a distance from modern life to the outside world. The original purpose was advocacy and the overall protection of community interests. In the future, they see the need to more actively unite different communities and coordinate joint economic activities of their community (supported by PO1).
immediate shared threat or exchange to facilitate more general learning from each other or to explore long-term joint advocacy interests. MISEREOR partners have repeatedly facilitated the joint struggle of a large number of communities against plantation expansion, usually as part of a larger alliance of supporting CSOs. In the case of threats from mining companies it has however, proven much more difficult to establish a movement-like solidarity and collective action between different communities. The experiences of PO6 in Barito Timur are one example for that. Among the reasons are that mining companies are usually to a greater extent than timber or oil palm companies closely interlaced with local political interests. Up until 2015, regents and mayors had the authority to issue mining concessions, which had been widely used in the past to finance political campaigns during regional elections. As a consequence of Government Regulation No. 2/2014 on Regional Government, however, this authority was transferred to the provincial level. Mining companies also largely collaborate with the local armed forces in protecting their interests and the level. Hence, where communities are affected by overlapping claims over land by mining companies there are strong efforts on company side to win communities over by offering compensation, jobs or other benefits for the communities. On the other hand, there is also still a high level of intimidation and frequent use of violence by the military or company security guards against those who resist. Hence, even within one village it is sometimes challenging to build enough motivation and commitment to fight against mining corporations and even more so across different communities. Particularly challenging is the establishment of larger networks also in more traditional indigenous communities. Where communities are not yet fully engaged in permanent agriculture, but live partly of hunting and gathering, social units with a strong cohesion tend to be small and rather directed towards the survival of the own group. This is especially the case in those communities that had a lot of negative experience with intrusion and interventions from external actors violating their sovereignty, basic human rights and traditional life style.

Exchange and learning between different communities takes places in many places, however, mostly still facilitated by the supporting CSOs. Examples include here exchange between farmers from Papua and Central Sulawesi facilitated by PO3 to learn about different cultivation techniques, the establishment of a communication forum between the five LPHD supported by PO4 or food farmer exchange initiated by PO2. PO6 facilities cross visits between community members they are supporting and PO1 organizes since a few years an annual meeting where they invite members from all their target communities for a weeklong workshop to share, plan and learn together. Despite successful mass opposition to immediate land grabbing threats – that largely dissipated in case threats had been halted -

63 PO4 since 2009 up until now has supported 13 villages in their efforts to fight against expansion of a timber company. In the early days up until November, 2009 when the concession of the timber company was revoked they joined forces with 17 other CSOs supporting an alliance of 53 villages in 6 sub-districts. PO3 on the other hand was one of a few CSO assisting 20 villages in their opposition to fight for the revocation of the plantation concession of PT. Sarana Transnaker.

64 Expansion of mining activities despite the recent moratorium will most likely still increase in the future as, for instance, in Central Kalimantan alone among all concessions that have already been issued, only about 30% are currently exploited, while about 70% are only in the exploration phase (Data korsup ESDM, KPK, Dirjen Pajak).

65 Community members supported by PO6 have experienced frequent intimidation by the security apparatus including criminalization, being followed, being beaten up

66 Examples are the Makekal Hulu community as well as the Simpang Macan Luar.

67 Interview partners from different target communities within this Learning Process confirmed that they found this annual meeting especially valuable as they received inspiration and motivation from interacting with other communities and hear about their progress and achievements.
and initiatives by MISEREOR partners to facilitate linkages and exchange between different communities or community organizations the formation of real movements cannot be observed. What can be found are in a few cases seeds of larger networks that start to operate without external support, such as the one established with support by PO2 already during the previous project or the network between Village Forest Management Units (LPHD) supported by PO4. Both networks, in principle, share common advocacy interests and provide a forum to learn from each other. But while one clear enemy or clear overarching goal is missing self-directed strategic action is generally still weak. In the case of the LPHD network, for instance, joint activities are currently rather directed against migrants who enter the area of their Village Forest than at solving strategic issues in managing their land including the development of economic potentials.

4.2.3 Livelihood Impacts

Generally, MISEREOR partners have not yet conceptually moved towards the development of livelihood systems.

The implications of protected community land is generally that communities have a secure basis to develop their livelihoods. However, the legal recognition of traditional user rights does not automatically lead to improved and more secure livelihoods as well as higher household incomes. Determining factors are complex. They depend on the knowledge and practices of communities and include aspects such as in how far there has already been land degradation effects from previous plantation activities, community capacities to further develop the economic potential of the land, access to adequate infrastructure and existing power imbalances that might affect the ability of farmers to access markets with their products.

In areas of traditional communities, livelihoods tend to be still characterized by subsistence agriculture. A limited patch of land might be burned down and replanted by using a variety of intercropping techniques, such as planting rain-fed rice in-between perennial plants and fruits and higher-value trees. This approach is usually enough for a family as a source of livelihood. However, as forests and the land that is part of their practices of shifting cultivation is being reduced, more intensive agriculture and techniques producing a substantial surplus that can be marketed will be needed in the future. In many cases, local communities are still lacking the technical skill to do so. The Simpang Macan Luar community in Batanghari, for example, used to be traditionally hunters and gatherers while also earning some extra income from working as laborer in timber concessions. Prior to about 2003, they practiced shifting cultivation, cultivated their own rain-fed rice and collected not-timber forestry products, such as rattan, fruits or honey for their own subsistence or the market. Since they

68 There are numerous definitions of ‘social movements’ in the sociological literature. Sydney Tarrow, for instance, defines social movements as “collective challenges to elites, authorities, other groups or cultural codes by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interactions with elites, opponents and authorities. (Tarrow, S. (1994). Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics, Cambridge University Press). Hence, some of the key characteristics include collective behavior, extra-institutionality, their network character and multi-centeredness, shifting and fluid boundaries of movement membership and a long-term orientation in working towards social change.

69 In most of the villages supported by PO4 have started to conduct forest patrols to watch out for possible outsiders illegally opening farming areas in their Village Forest. There is also a social ban on young girls from indigenous communities to get involved with migrants.
settled permanently down, they do not practice permanent agriculture anymore. With the settlement of the conflict with PT REKI and the agreement as part of the MoU to develop a demoplot, they will need to develop and partly re-introduce agricultural practices for their own consumption as well as for marketing purposes. The eventual goal is to have improved food security, but also develop a number of marketable products. The Orang Rimba community of Makekal Hulu, on the other hand, are still mainly hunting and gathering, while the also have rubber trees as their main source of cash. They also used to have shifting cultivation practices including rain-fed rice, but but gave it up at the expense of rubber planting around 2000 when market prices were still high. Individual community members, experiment with the cultivation of jemang (dragon blood), a kind of rattan plant that is used as natural dye, for the pharmaceutical industry as well as in cosmetics. They used to collect it wildly and have started now to cultivate it as the market prices are considerably high. Depending on the type and the overall quality market prices per kilogram range between IDR 50,000 and 300,000 (between EUR 3.50 and 20.00). If the fruit are processed market prices can go up to IDR 4 Million (EUR 280). According to estimates of community members cultivation of an area of 2 ha could sustain several families. But the knowledge of cultivation techniques as well as the access to wholesale buyers is still limited to a few members. And adoption of new cultivation techniques in this community would not necessarily depend on improved legal security of their forest user rights, but rather be an issue of culture, technique and the willingness of self-organization.

PO2 has their focus on improving village governance as an entry point to protect land from conversion to oil palm and other plantations. They combine the promotion of village policies to protect local food land with awareness raising and encouragement of villagers to open new food land and expand their agricultural activities. A promising strategy is to integrate the protection and expansion of local food land in village-level mid-term development planning (RPJMDes). This way problems related to the cultivation of land and the production of additional economic value such as by improving access to land and access to markets can be tackled in a more comprehensive way. Before 2014, local communities in the project area of PO2 and their consortium partners followed the general trend of land conversion (paddy, rubber and others) to oil palm cultivation. This trend has been reversed after 2014, mainly due to government policies aiming to improve food security and local governments providing a lot of agricultural inputs such as seeds, fertilizer or tools for free, but also low market prices especially for rubber. The use of agricultural inputs has led to a significant increase in harvest yields from 7-8 tons per hectare as compared to previously 4-5 tons per hectare. The relevance of PO2 interventions is to reinforce this trend by backing it up with village-level policies and investment. PO5’s support in the development of land use plans and village regulations have encouraged an existing women’s group to start cultivating vegetables on so far idle land. The income from selling it on the market generated additional funds for the group that was reinvested in farming activities.

Sources of livelihood in Central Sulawesi that have been traditionally planted and have the potential to be further intensified and better marketed if community land is protected against conversion to oil palm are spices such as nutmeg and cloves.

In an area where community forest was legally recognized as Village Forest due to PO4 support, the community sees the forest area rather as a back-up for future generations. They feel safer now, but so far do not really have a concrete plan for economic use yet. However, as part of the regulations for the management of Village Forests the LPHD will eventually
have to develop management plans with concrete production targets. Generating livelihood impacts, as seen from the above examples, will in all communities require a complex set of interventions which goes beyond technical training on cultivation and marketing techniques, but also encompasses changing attitudes and deep-rooted practices.

4.2.4 CSO Network Development

To a large extent, MISEREOR partners had known each other before and in part interact with each other at a professional level. Firstly, there are personal relations (but also controversies) as the different organizations belong to the same ecosystem of organizations sharing similar values and maintaining informal links. On the other hand, there are also institutional links as a number of CSOs members in the MISEREOR network are members of PO3, as regional organizations have common roots in a national network or individual people serve on each other’s Board as members. While occasions such as the PO3 Congress once every four years is an opportunity to get together and discuss about changing external trends and overall strategy questions there generally have not been any initiatives to jointly reflect about program-related challenges or learn from each other. Not even the three organizations operating in Jambi (PO1, PO2, PO4) have ever met institutionally in the context of the MISEREOR program to discuss about their approaches, individual lessons learnt or operational aspects. The three consortium partners in Central Kalimantan come closest to regularly conducting joint reviews and discussing specific program-related challenges, but also using the opportunity to collaborate under the MISEREOR consortium to learn from each other in terms of technical skills, such as participatory mapping techniques and approaches. This is the only example where CSO partners have done field visits to learn and see activities of other organizations. Generally, this is something that is not done between different organizations. PO5 and PO2 who share a similar approach in strengthening village governance as an entry point to protect community land against plantation expansion stated that only at the Kick-Off Workshop for this Learning Process they communicated for the first time about their respective programs. There for the first time they learned how similar their approaches were, but also where they differ in their implementation approach.

Generally, this Learning Process could only be a start to sensitize the partner organizations for areas where they can learn from each other, learn together or explore options for complementary action. Learning pertains to two basic areas: Learning from experience to date to adapt and improve current practices as well as learning to prepare oneself for future challenges due to the changing external environment providing both new opportunities as well as challenges. Joint learning also needs to include a process of defining, interpreting and analyzing good practices. Currently, there are a number of approaches that are almost uniformly done by all MISEREOR partners, such as participatory mapping. Participatory mapping has in many cases supported important awareness-building processes in communities, was an element of conflict resolution or the basis for communities to use existing village governance instruments to protect their land. However, there are still differences in the ways that mapping has been implemented as well as the subsequent follow-up steps. None of the approaches, though, should easily be dubbed as being per se a ‘good practice’ that should be further replicated. Furthermore, there are a number of approaches that are rather developed and applied by selected organizations and that could constitute an effective addition in existing strategies for some of the other MISEREOR
partners. This includes, for instance, the systematic strengthening of village governance processes including mid-term development planning, financial and spatial planning as well as the drafting of village regulations as one way of making the protection and economic use of natural resources a priority in village-level decision-making (PO2, PO5). Other approaches are the promotion of social media in the context of facilitating direct communication between communities and decision-makers (PO1), making use of the right towards public information to access concession-related data for advocacy purposes (PO6) or entering a formal MoU with village governments prior to engaging in capacity development programs (PO5). An assessment of the usefulness of different approaches, however, always needs to be done in the context of the specific local conditions and needs.

A positive example of synergies created within networks, but not limited to MISEREOR partners is the preparation of a unified map based on numerous participatory community maps supported by different CSOs, that was initiated by PO3 together with other organizations and networks. This data was combined with data on concessions for oil palm plantations as well as mining. What this unified map represents is an effort to bring together the results of the work of numerous NGOs in Indonesia in facilitating participatory maps of community-managed land over many years. By handing it over to the government during the last PO3 Congress in November 2016, the network created a bridge with the priorities of the current administration on agrarian reforms and improving forest governance through the massive upscaling of social forestry schemes. By and large, however, synergies with other CSOs especially arise in the context of individual advocacy cases where contacts, specific skills or knowledge across different organizations are mobilized.

In principle, there are many opportunities associated with the conceptualization and expansion of a joint learning agenda among MISEREOR partners. The first would be to enhance existing strategies and practices by reviewing them, discussing and comparing them with others or inviting an external view and perspective from fellow CSO practitioners. In developing their further agenda, MISEREOR partners all acknowledge the need to find ways to integrate an economic perspective into their community support. This involves the identification of marketable products from protected land, improvement of production processes, creating added-value through post-harvest processing techniques, packaging as well as ultimately marketing agricultural as well as agroforestry products. To be able to do this, CSO partners will need to develop their own capacities and prepare themselves organizationally for that. Joint learning and sharing of resources as well as exchange of expertise among MISEREOR partners including also other existing networks every organization brings in would be a useful strategy for further organizational and program development. Thirdly, a more institutionalized framework for joint learning needs to serve the purpose to explore and decide about strategies for jointly achieving greater impact. Greater impact could be achieved by taking complementary roles at community as well as at policy level, coordinating more systematically the advocacy agenda of different CSOs, connecting target communities across different program areas to facilitate learning and movement-building or by designing specific interventions of collective action.

---

70 see: http://geodata-cso.org/

71 Up until 2013, 3.9 million hectares of customary land has been mapped through participatory processes by Indonesian CSOs. (Jakarta Post, 24 June, 2013). In an interview during the Learning Process with the national coordinator of JKPP, Deny Rahadian, he even gave the figure of 10 million hectares that have been mapped today through participatory mapping.
4.3 Effectiveness

4.3.1 Program Logic and Approaches to Planning

Practices for program planning, the elaboration of strategies to achieve change and the degree of participation of target beneficiaries or other partners differ across the MISEREOR partners. It is predominantly a reflection of the history and character of the organization as well as how the collaboration with MISEREOR has evolved over time. For those organizations that have been supported by MISEREOR over several periods already the overall goal has largely not changed much for one project period to another while the more specific objectives evolved out of the experience in the preceding period. Generally, the MISEREOR partners share the overall goal to protect community rights and access to land as a source of livelihood, economic empowerment and cultural identity as a way to achieve sovereign communities. In organizations such as PO3 or PO4 and PO7 that have the legal form of an association there is an institutional mechanism involving all their members in the organizational strategy development. In a four-year cycle individual as well as organizational members come together to analyze trends, decide about strategic priorities as well as organizational aspects that impact on the strategic orientation of the organization, such as the election of a new director, statutes or ethical standards. The translation of the organizational strategy into a project-based logical framework in the context of the collaboration with MISEREOR, however, was largely done by key staff members.

PO1, for instance, engaged in a process of deep reflection that lasted more than a year (between 2011 and 2012) to devise a new strategic orientation that moves away from pursuing own advocacy objectives and instead supporting in a facilitating role the strengthening of local communities to represent their own interests. In the continuous further development of the organizational strategy, they also looked for external reference and involved the services of an experienced external evaluator. Their annual planning, on the other hand, involves representatives from the target communities as well as other local NGO partners during the annual meeting. Here, community members report about the achievements and changes in their communities and jointly decide what should become the focus working area in the coming year. PO2 mostly developed their current program logic on the basis of their experience in preceding projects. They do not have a general practice of involving beneficiaries in strategic or project planning exercises. On the other hand, the preceding project had a significant research component, which also actively involved the Sumatran Food Farmer Network Jari Tangan, which they had helped to establish. PO5 also involves their target beneficiaries into their organizational mid-term strategy development. The more recent partners from Kalimantan that became MISEREOR partners in 2014 derived their intervention logic mostly from what had been identified during the partner meeting in South Kalimantan in 2013 as the most pressing issues in their respective regions.

The joint exercise of developing an overall ‘theory of change’ with all project partners during the Kick-Off Workshop of this Learning Process externalized a comprehensive view on the problems faced by forest-dependent local communities as well plausible hypotheses how different intervention areas are mutually reinforcing. The three intervention areas of fighting

72 See Chapter 2.2.1 Project Goals and Strategic Approaches for a more detailed overview of their intervention logics.
against land grabbing, working towards the legal recognition and protection of community-managed land as well as the strengthening of livelihood systems were seen as equally important columns of their work that are closely interlinked. Nevertheless, they all acknowledged that the third column is largely underrepresented in their current work. Project plans and indicators, however, in many cases do not represent their core work and strategic approaches and the variety of targets as well as their quantitative amount defined in the indicators are often overly ambitious and not realistic (e.g. PO6, PO3, PO7). The gap between the overall goal and the level of project objectives, which rather take the form of outputs than outcomes, is substantial in all project outlines and do not make sufficiently clear how the objectives/outputs contribute to the achievement of the overall goals. A conclusion of the Learning Process has been that MISEREOR partners have generally a deep understanding of the complex set of conditions and factors determining the sector they are working in and have a realistic theory of how change can take place. Some CSO members are still confined, though, by ideological convictions and beliefs dismissing that policies such as the Village Law or government programs on agrarian reforms constitute real opportunities or represent a departure from the previous status quo. By and large, however, all MISEREOR partners are in a process of re-positioning and exploration how to harness specific policy and political opportunities. What has been largely missing to date, though, is a sound analysis of future trends and scenarios and a discourse how the CSO community will have to respond to that in the long run. There are a few factors contributing to the disconnect between how project objectives and indicators are formulated and the way the program implementation evolves in the field. The most important one is the fact that capacities in realistic and meaningful project planning are largely still weak. In many cases, project objectives are rather formulated as outputs. As a consequence the gap between project objectives and overall goals is very large and the partners do not have a clear concept of how the project contributes to higher-level systemic changes and how such changes are expected to take place including contributions by other important actors. The quality of biannual reports varies significantly between the different partners, in part also further exacerbated by the lack of professional translation services. Some partners include quite thorough accounts of changes in the external context, but the majority focuses on reporting of activities. The reporting guidelines requiring to comment on the progress in indicator achievement are often not followed and if, then there is by and large insufficient reflection and explanation in how far this relates to working towards higher-level goals. MISEREOR as a donor generally takes a flexible stance and allows its partners to deviate in their project implementation from initial plans – as long as it doesn’t have budgetary consequences - without much justification or explanation why the original strategy needs to be adjusted. MISEREOR partners, hence, do not see their logical frameworks as binding documents, but rather as an initial strategizing exercise, which naturally evolves over the course of the project implementation. In their regular reporting, on the other hand, they don’t make strategic changes and the reasoning for additional activities sufficiently clear so that the further along in project implementation regular reports do not give full account of the realities in the field anymore.

4.3.2 Objective Achievement

Except for PO3 and PO7, MISEREOR partners have not necessarily accomplished all objectives and related indicators of the current project phase, but have substantially
contributed to the achievement of the overall goal. In all five projects (PO1, PO2, PO4, PO5 and PO6) objectives at grassroots level related to strengthening awareness, competences and solidarity, the development of maps, management and spatial plans as well as the development of village-level policies have largely (even though not always to the originally planned quantitative extent) been achieved. Objectives at higher level, such as the legal recognition of community claims at district and national level or objectives related to communities serving as pilots and directly influencing district policies have in part not been achieved yet. Influencing policy-making generally requires a long breath. Organizations such as PO4, PO6 or PO5 take the starting point of community strengthening and from there aim to influence higher-level policies. Hence, some of their objectives were, therefore, not realistically planned. PO2 and PO1, however, in part follow a parallel strategy to involve local or even national government representatives from early on into project interventions.

PO4 in its current project phase has taken the preparatory steps required to apply for the recognition of community rights over forest land areas under one of the social forestry schemes. These include a mapping of the customary areas, inventorizing economic assets and documenting traditional knowledge (such as traditional practices of natural resource management as well as customary borders). Some of these plans are already drafted as village regulations, but not yet adopted to date. The plan for their current project was already ambitious considering a regular three-year framework based on the experience how long it took to obtain Village Forest status for the existing five villages, but unrealistic for a project of only 17 months.

PO3’s current project is running from the beginning of 2015 until the end of 2017. Since early 2016, MISEREOR halted the release of funds for project implementation due to internal management problems. Hence, little could have been achieved to date. In addition, achievements under the PO7 project in its first funding phase by MISEREOR have been limited. The original project plan was highly unrealistic and especially inadequate financial planning made the sound implementation of activities and the realization of the overall project plan impossible. Internally, PO7 was also faced with organizational problems, among them the departure of the previous Director who had developed the project proposal to MISEREOR, personnel change within the consortium partner and an overall situation of being understaffed and underfinanced.

4.3.3 Partner Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

Planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME) practices of all seven MISEREOR CSO partners are weak. Reports to MISEREOR are due on a six-monthly basis. Field staff generally report on activities, results of activities, overall achievements and challenges. Especially in the case of collaboration with other organizations in the frame of a consortium Project Coordinators generally have to deal with field reports or data that are not necessarily in line with the data.

---

73 See Chapter 4.2 on key outcomes and individual organizational reports for more detailed information on objective achievement.

74 For instance, PO2 has since 2014 collaborated closely with the District Agricultural Agency and played a prominent role in advocating for a local regulation on *Land for Sustainable Subsistence Agriculture* (LP2B), which was adopted by the local parliament in August 2015. PO1 has collaborated for several years with the Forestry Ministry as well as the Provincial Forestry Agency and Conflict Resolution Task Force in facilitating the conflict resolution process of two communities with PT REKI.
and information they need to compile the regular project reports, including progress in indicator achievement or change in the external environment. Hence, Project Coordinators generally also have to conduct regular field visits to verify information and collect additional data sometimes finding that the submitted information only partially represent developments in the field. None of the seven projects has a proper monitoring and evaluation system that outlines key data that need to be regularly collected, data collection methods and intervals. Organizations of the size of PO5 (27 staff members) or PO3 (20 staff members) should have dedicated personnel and an organizational unit for monitoring and evaluation, which they do not have up until now. There are also no systems in place how to regularly consolidate field reports to feed into project progress reports. As organizations engaged in regular advocacy activities, most of the MISEREOR partners collect information of relevance for their work, including regional data on concessions, plantation areas or conflicts. These data are collected from public media and from within their networks with other government and non-governmental organizations. None of the organizations collects primary data from communities to monitor the impact of their work on agricultural production, income or overall livelihood aspects. There is limited quantitative data available except for participant numbers in certain activities that are collected. None of the organizations collects disaggregated data for men and women. What they do largely collect is the size of land covered by project activities and also protected as a result of their work. On the other hand, even the basis to calculate the number of beneficiaries is often not quite clear and differs across the organizations. Regular reflection and learning is done by teams in a number of organizations, but more in an informal manner, during regular coordination and evaluation meetings or by jointly conducting field visits. Others admit, they are mostly following a high implementation pace and take little time to analyze, probe their own assumptions and interpretations and learn together. Partner CSOs generally do not systematically observe, analyze or record other external factors influencing the achievement of their objectives.

4.3.4 External Factors

Some of the external factors that have influenced the achievement or non-achievement of objectives - as confirmed by respondents in this Learning Process - are:

- International market developments. Market prices of crude palm oil (CPO) as well as rubber have been relatively low during the past 2 years influencing decisions if the conversion of land is economically attractive for farmers.
- The massive forest fires of 2015. The forest fires that raged in parts of Sumatra and Kalimantan burned an area of 2.6 million hectares between June and October 2015, causing respiratory and other illnesses of half a Million people, strained political relations with the neighboring countries such as Malaysia and Singapore and cost the country about US$ 16 Million according to estimates of the World Bank.

75 Some organizations refer to beneficiary data as those directly participating on project activities. In the case where beneficiaries are broadly seen as those community members who somehow benefit from the interventions and results of the project, some organizations claim it is the entire community, while others define a certain percentage of target communities as beneficiaries of the project.

76 The economic costs were more than double the damage and losses from the 2004 tsunami (which affected provinces in Indonesia and other countries), and equal to about 1.8% of Indonesia’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This estimate includes losses to agriculture, forestry, transport, trade, industry, tourism, and other
hand, it was a disaster of enormous scale affecting communities particularly in Central Kalimantan and South Sumatra. But it also forced the government to take serious action such as issuing a moratorium on new oil palm permits, prosecuting a number of large companies whose role in contributing to some of the fires could be proven and establishing a dedicated agency for peat restoration. It also triggered considerable donor attention for strengthening smallholder farming as preventive measure against future fires.

- Government priorities and policies: The current administration of President Jokowi has taken a number of policy initiative to improve food security in the country including setting ambitious goals for agrarian reforms. While there is no indication that they will seriously tackle large-scale industry involvement in land grabbing trends, a key area of intervention for the government is to improve the lot of smallholder farmers through social forestry schemes and planned redistribution of land. In the frame of Law No. 41/2009 on Sustainable Food Crop Land (LP2B) regional governments, as, for instance the District of Siak in Riau since 2014, have started to scale up massive subsidy programs for agricultural input (seeds, fertilizer) and equipment (hand tractors, water pumps) as incentive for local farmers to maintain their food crop land. These local policy initiatives significantly contribute to the awareness and motivation of communities to protect their land against conversion to oil palm and be susceptible to efforts to promulgate village-level policies on natural resources protection.

- Other government priorities such as the aim to achieve self-sufficiency in energy production, however, work against the advocacy goals of MISEREOR partners to have already issued mining licenses revoked. Indonesia is currently already the largest exporter of coal for power stations worldwide. While the export market is on the decline, President Jokowi has launched a program designed to provide an additional 35 Gigawatt (GW) of power capacity by 2019 to cope with electricity shortages in the country, and reduce the country's dependence on petroleum. Out of the planned 35 GW, coal-fired power plants will represent 20 GW. Hence, domestic demand for coal will still be on the increase in the coming years.

- In some areas, local adat traditions support efforts to protect land: in West Sumatra, for example, customary practices prohibit the sale of land without the consent of the extended family. In Batanghari local communities emphasize that growing rice is part of their social status while losing paddy fields is considered equal to losing face.

- Organizational changes at national level. With the merger of the Ministry of Forestry and Environment and its overall institutional overhaul in January 2015, President Jokowi aimed to overcome institutional fragmentation and streamline his policy agenda on forestry governance reforms. Since then, the Ministry for the first time has a dedicated Directorate for Customary Forest and Tenurial Conflict Management, which promotes alternative ways of conflict resolution.

---

sectors. Some of these costs are direct damage and losses to crops, forests, houses and infrastructure, as well as the cost of responding to the fires. See: The World Bank Group (2016). The Cost of Fire.
4.4 Efficiency

The level of efficiency in managing project funds, time, and human resources varies greatly among the seven partner organizations, partly also in line with geographic conditions, the organizations have to deal with. The quality of project resources management generally corresponds with organizational governance and project achievements. Good organizational governance brings good management of resources, which positively correlates with the achievement of expected deliverables. Five out of the seven organizations, PO6, PO1, PO2, PO5, and PO4, have generally demonstrated sufficient efficiency in project and resources management.

Sufficient efficiency in management of resources is evident from the consistent application of finance and program rules and procedures that ensure the implementation of project activities according to organizational standards. Rules and procedures in finance management include those on Program Fund Request, Program Cash Management (petty cash), Staff and External (other party’s) Loan Request, Advance Reporting and Accountability, and Purchasing and Procurement. In terms of program management, the five partners mentioned above generally have also complied with reporting standards by MISEREOR, from activity reports to six monthly reporting to MISEREOR.

PO7 as the project holder in the consortium faced particular challenges in good organizational governance with a change of director early during the implementation phase and a lack of sound handing-over procedures and efforts to guarantee the regeneration of staff and knowledge. The original project design is unrealistic, while the respective financial plan is underresourced to accomplish even some of the defined project objectives. The financial plan and the financial management arrangements set up from the start of the project included unclear budget allocations for other consortium members as well as unclear finance procedures and work mechanisms both internally within PO7 and between members of the consortium. Efforts are under way to improve the mechanism for proposal and budget development as well as financial management for the following project phase.

Meanwhile, PO3 has struggled with governance and management issues as shown by the results of organizational audits from the past three years. Financial management procedures and practices do not comply with international standards and standards of transparency. Efforts to make improvement on financial management of the organization has not received sufficient attention to date.

Generally, the development and institutionalization of standards for organizational accountability including sound reporting standards and transparency towards own constituencies and the general public has not been a priority of MISEREOR partners in recent years. Most of the CSO partners, for instance, do not publish annual reports including budget figures on their websites or are members of existing networks and initiatives of Indonesian NGOs to establish accountability standards – with the exception of PO5\textsuperscript{77}. This can be explained from an historic perspective where the majority of organizations has their roots in activist circles who have engaged in advocacy and campaigning for many year without receiving any kind of funding relying on their personal commitment as much as informal networks. A number of these organizations still rely to a large extent on
extraordinary personal commitment of their members being driven by a sense of moral obligation towards the communities they support. Those organizations that have already acquired funding from different international sources and accordingly grown over time have had a bigger chance to develop internal financial administration and management structures, systems and standards, usually at the behest and with support of their international donors. The regular support of the MISEREOR financial management consultant to gradually improve internal mechanisms has proven to be very important and valuable.

PO5 and PO2 have both carried out “Village School” interventions. Compared to other activities, this constitutes the largest allocation of funds. Both organizations have managed the funds for this activity differently. By sourcing out the entire work package to an external service provider, PO2 has basically relinquished control over some of the deliverables, which constitute at the same time indicators for one of their two project objectives (preparation of two guidelines on village development and village organizing). The two products have not been delivered to date by the consultant. The approach of outsourcing makes this area of activity also particularly costly, while there has not been a clear strategy how to transfer the knowledge gradually to own staff for effective follow-up and possible replication. Meanwhile, PO5, chose to hire external facilitators to jointly deliver . “Village School” activities, which has proven to be more cost-efficient.

The strategy to collaborate with local NGO partners in programs spread out over a large geographical area as applied by PO3 and in part by PO1 is generally a strategy of aiming to save costs and optimize direct interaction and accompaniment, as expenses for travels to remote area are generally a substantial part of the project budget. On the other hand, this approach creates problems when the cooperation is only based on output achievement without a shared understanding of the program logic and implementation strategy. This dilemma will remain in organization with an identity of being a national organization. But even MISEREOR partners focusing on one Province are still faced with the challenge to overcome partly enormous distances and challenges like bad transportation infrastructure.

MISEREOR’s flexibility in responding to partners’ needs and problems has been considered very helpful. As long as problems are communicated well and proper justifications are given, MISEREOR is usually considered as responsive to the need for budget and activity adjustment. The six monthly audit has also helped partners in monitoring project financial management. Reserve fund, which is an allocation of 5% of the total fund of the program for any unplanned activities and any exchange rate loss, are considered very helpful.

With regard to other potential sources of funding, MISEREOR partners have started to connect communities with district government programs or sources of funding as well as using village budgets or connect communities with other donors. The following gives a few examples:

- Together with another CSO, PO2 has helped a village community to get connected to UNDP to get funding for the construction of blocking canals in peatland fire prevention.
- With PO4 support a Village Forest Management Unit (LPHD) has raised funds from the village fund for 2017 to cover the implementation of their activities.
- PO5 accessed government funding for the construction of an early childhood education building
- The Village of Oncone Raya of Parigi Moutong has committed to make use of village funds for 2017 for community mapping activities.

This approach, however, still has a large potential for more systematic upscaling.

With the district government, it is likewise possible to connect community groups with relevant local government offices to get in-kind support. This has been done by POS by utilising waste land to be turned into an agricultural area for farmer groups. The local office of Agriculture has also provided vegetable seedlings.

Complementarities with programs funded by different donors could also be achieved in a number of cases, such as in the case of PO1 where the program funded Ford Foundation funding is complementary (different locations) to the MISEREOR program with a stronger focus on influencing policy-making. The policy orientation leads to a stronger need to produce evidence. The development of an index measuring the impact of conflict resolution on a reduction in poverty is currently in planning and will benefit the entire PO1 program.

Long-term support is key for communities to being able to establish network with other sources of funding, including the village and district government as well as with other donor.

4.5 Sustainability

The sustainability criteria generally means that results and benefits will last and continue even without the support by the MISEREOR partner CSOs. The protection of community land against encroachments from corporations is a long-term process with numerous external factors coming to bear that is not easily achieved within a period of a few years. While in the past, Indonesian CSOs largely pursued the goal to achieve legal recognition of community rights as the final objective it is in the meantime widely understood that legality alone is no guarantee that communities will have long-term access and control over their sources of livelihood. Sustainability of legal recognition needs proper long-term management and use of land, complying with national regulations (e.g. on social forestry schemes), but also providing communities with enough income to sustain their livelihoods. If the latter cannot be achieved over time, communities might eventually be forced to sell their land and move to other sources of income. Agreements between communities and corporations as a result of conflict resolution processes will need effective implementation and independent oversight. Otherwise, already settled conflicts can easily erupt again. Hence, the continuous representation of community interests towards other stakeholders, land use management and marketing of agricultural and agroforestry products all need strong community organizations. During the Kick-Off Workshop of this Learning Process MISEREOR partners formulated one basic concept of sustainability highlighting the following three criteria – beyond legally secured rights of their land:

1. Communities organize themselves.
2. Communities access external assistance.
3. Communities have independent sources of income.

Similar considerations apply to new policies that have been adopted with support by CSOs, such as a local policy on Sustainable Food Land (LP2B) (PO2). It is not sufficient to accomplish the adoption of a policy, but engagement has to continue until the implementation as a lot of problems can occur that lead to failure or unintended effects.
policies. LP2B policies, for instance, aim to set incentives, but they cannot enforce or hinder farmers to sell their land in case of emergencies or due to livelihood decisions. Hence, the supporting role of PO2 (in this case) is still highly important, especially with regard to disseminating information on the new policy to farmers, supporting them in their decision-making, following the process up until certification and providing feedback to the local government in how far the policy is effective or where might be obstacles with regard to its implementation.

Factors influencing the sustainability of achievements in terms of secured land rights and livelihoods that are more sovereign are especially political as well as market-related factors. Much will depend on the ability and commitment of the current as well as the subsequent administration after the 2019 elections to effectively implement policies and programs on social forestry, agrarian reform, food security and curbing climate change. It is equally important how coherence and integration will be established between the current legal framework on village governance and social forestry/agrarian reform programs. And even in case the national government will show consistency in implementing their priorities in the natural resources sector, local political conditions might differ considerably in supporting these national priorities. The Forest Governance Index of 2012 and 2014 measuring the following four criteria: 1) Certainty of forest area; 2) Fairness in forest management; 3) Transparency and Integrity of Forest Management and 4) Capacity of Law Enforcement gives account of that.

Figure 5: Comparison of Forest Governance Index in Indonesia 2012 and 2014

![Forest Governance Index 2012 vs 2014](image)

Market-related factors such as global and national price developments and the ability of CSOs in supporting communities to overcome disparities in market access including marketing channels, transportation, etc. will likewise be decisive to achieve sustainability of results.

Overall, in the past the orientation of most MISEREOR’s partners had been to solve specific cases of communities under concrete threat. Hence, they also used to have a history of providing assistance in unforeseen urgent cases, but on the other hand, also easily letting go

---

78 With the exception of PO2 that explicitly focuses on overall empowerment approaches as preventive measures in protecting land instead of those, where individual conflicts have already erupted.
if an immediate threat had been solved. All organizations in their work will need to deepen their practices of analysis, learning and scenario-development to expand their organizational strategies to more strategic long-term perspectives including a better understanding of the kind of sequence that is needed to follow through support for communities until sustainability has been achieved. One of the opportunities to realize this is to use the network of MISEREOR partners as a forum of joint learning, exchange as well as a sounding part to test and probe new ideas.

It becomes increasingly evident that the administration of President Jokowi has chosen to take a pragmatic approach in its overall orientation towards more equitable economic growth. Ownership patterns of large-scale plantations cannot be changed in the near future, leaving little to no room for significant redistribution of land in order to create income effects for rural communities. Consequently, government priorities are currently directed towards boosting local-level small- and medium-scale economic cycles. This is seen as one of the key potentials to stimulate broad-based economic growth, to reduce poverty and decrease regional disparities between Java and the outer islands. In this light the aim of the presidential agenda to allocate 12.7 Million hectares of land for social forestry schemes and 9 Million hectares for agrarian reform is not stopping at changing landownership patterns, but ultimately create the basis for economic development in rural areas.79

While social forestry schemes are not the only entry points for securing legal rights in the access to forest and land, it will definitely be one of the most promising in the coming years. The experience of PO4 in supporting the recognition of Village Forests in five villages to date is highly valuable and opportunities to evaluate and replicate some of these experiences should become a matter of common interest among MISEREOR’s partners. In taking a long-term perspective and working towards sustainability of accomplishments of communities CSOs will not only need to accompany individual communities on their path to develop (legally) protected land as a source of stable livelihood and income, but also develop strategies to influence and collaborate with relevant market as well as government actors. CSOs will need to be able to bridge between the needs of communities and existing government programs as well as influence decision-making and policy development. This, in turn, will require them to develop a sound understanding of market barriers and requirements communities have to deal with. However, were forest areas have already been converted into plantations or are covered by existing concessions even though they might not be developed yet, advocacy work by CSOs will still remain highly relevant. Advocacy goals will need to be directed at fighting against further expansion of oil palm and timber plantations as well as mining concessions and improve the overall policy framework. Hence, the MISEREOR partners will need to carefully explore where and how they are going to expand their strategies and programs. What is quite clear is that eventually they will need to develop new expertise, knowledge and networks in order to remain relevant and achieve bigger impacts in the future. The next presidential elections in 2019 and the upcoming regional elections in 2017-2018 will constitute critical moment’s for political negotiations when the CSO sector needs to be ready to offer their concepts and more strongly than in the past offer themselves as partners. As also the Executive Director of a national CSO has put in in an interview:

79 Interview with Abetnego Tarigan, executive staff and senior advisor in the Office of the President (KSP).
“The concept of community-managed areas (wilayah kelola) needs to be expanded to encompass the principles of control, management, production until consumption.”

The areas of change they will have to master include

- Development of own technical expertise related to agricultural production, post-production as well as marketing.
- Expansion of networks with government actors both at local as well as at national level that are currently limited to key actors in the forestry sectors and in part village empowerment as well as agriculture to reach out to new sectors, such as cooperative development, trade and industries and access to credit.
- Synergies will need to be developed between the village governance and the economic empowerment agenda linking between the relevant government agencies and accessing services for communities as well as influencing local as well as national policies. Synergies will also need to be developed at community level linking village policies to protect land with the national agrarian reform and social forestry mechanisms.
- Networks with other civil society actors for exchange, learning and pursuing common advocacy interests need to be expanded to the above sectors.
- Deepening practices of internal evaluation and reflection on own programs, conducting research and analysis and documenting good practices.
- Improving approaches to external communication to foster collaboration with government and other non-government actors.

The awareness of MISEREOR partners how they will need to adjust to the changing external environment and learn from experience to date to accomplish greater and more sustainable impact is only just starting. Ideas how to prepare organizationally for these future challenges and opportunities have largely been described along the lines of using and expanding existing networks to acquire new knowledge related to economic empowerment and moving together as a network of MISEREOR partners to support learning and common advocacy goals.

4.6 Cross-cutting Issues

There is a weak integration of gender perspectives in all stages of the project cycle among all partners due to a lack of understanding of gender mainstreaming and limited effort on MISEREOR’s part in strengthening and getting partners on the same level about this issue. None of the MISEREOR partners has done a proper analysis of the problems and needs of women and during the stage of project planning.

In project implementation, a special intervention was developed for strengthening women, namely empowerment of women groups by PO5 and training for raising the awareness on domestic violence by PO6. A women empowerment effort focused in one village has been conducted long before cooperation with MISEREOR started. Under the MISEREOR-funded project these women received capacity development on issues which are not traditionally associated with women, including village development planning.

---

80 Interview in the context of the Learning Process in Jakarta on December 9, 2016.
Staff members of PO6 indicated that the organisation has interpreted MISEREOR’s requirement for integration of gender into the project implementation by introducing domestic violence issue as a specific women’s issue halfway through the project journey. The intervention was conducted in a Village in Central Kalimantan and was the result of MISEREOR’s encouragement to create a model of intervention that is specifically targeting women. However, PO6’s intervention is not conceptually or geographically related to interventions to strengthen the rights of indigenous people to land, prevent the degradation of natural resources or decreasing livelihood opportunities. Specific interventions for women in the sense of affirmative action may be necessary but should not have been approached as a single intervention disconnected from the rest of the program.

In areas not affected by a concrete conflict situation where the Village Law is used as the main entry point for protecting natural resources (PO5 and PO2 program), women have nevertheless benefitted from the programs:

- Both women and men, especially members of the village administration have learned about the importance of women’s participation in various levels of village planning and governance processes as mandated by the Village Law. Among women who are not village cadres, the strengthened awareness has led to an increase in women’s participation in village meetings81. Women had the courage to question their exclusion from past village development planning processes, have been more confident to express their opinions and demand their involvement in village development activities. Trained female cadres demanded that instead of past development priorities funded from the village budget, such as the construction of a mosque and a road, village funds should be for a building for early childhood education instead. The village government finally accepted their proposed priority.

- Existing women’s groups such as a purun82 craft group or women’s farmer group have been further strengthened in their organizational capacities by MISEREOR partners and serve besides the original purpose of joint economic activities in the meantime also as a forum for discussion and the generation of ideas among the women. The members of a women’s farmer group, for instance, have taken the initiative to solve the unclear legal situation of their land, which falls under the newly established Forest Management Unit (KPH).

In conflict areas, women have a different potential than men to take an active role in

81 e.g. As could be observed during field visits in West Kalimantan and South Sumatera.  
82 a type of reed

One interviewee was born into a poor farmer family. At young age, while still in middle school, she decided to become a nurse. Ever since then, she never asked for any payment from her patients, but receives whatever they are able to give. In 2006, she directly experienced the impacts of the oil palm expansion when a company entered her village. Even though 95% of the villagers had signed a letter rejecting the company, they nevertheless obtained the HGU concession from the district government as the village head colluded with the company and had forged a letter of support from the community. The company started to burn down houses of community members and destroyed boundary markers between villages, which eventually lead to horizontal conflicts between villages and between communities and the village elites. In addition, the environmental impacts were massive for local communities. One of her patients died when she tried to save her children who were still inside her house, which the palm oil company had set on fire.

Now, as she approaches her retirement age she is relentless in providing moral and practical support to communities faced with threats from extractive industries. She constantly moves from one village to another, helps to organize villagers, collects data and information and links communities to external support, such as from PO6. The security apparatus knows her strategic role, but never dared to approach her.
advocacy and community organising as they will not be subjected to direct intimidation to the same extent as men. This is evident in a Village of Central Kalimantan, which is currently facing a conflict with a mining company, where a local nurse plays a key role in mobilizing and supporting local communities in their struggle. However, MISEREOR partners have so far not yet conceptually considered how to especially empower women in the context of conflict resolution efforts nor to analyse the specific threats and needs of women.

Conflicts between a community and mining companies can affect women in a different way than men. The following effects were highlighted by women:

- Their sense of safety and security is threatened by the intimidation of the mining company’s security officers against the women’s husbands. However, this has not discouraged these women to continue to fight. In cases where women and children were witnesses of violence, it is very hard to recover from the traumatic experience.
- Herbs and leaves that they used to collect for their daily diet and as traditional medicine have now disappeared.
- Before the mining company was operational, water from a nearby source was channelled right through the village. In the meantime, women have to walk 30 minutes to the river to fetch water since water from the source was redirected to the mining area.
- There is a notable increase in respiratory diseases, especially among children due to the amount of dust produced by mining operations. It is usually women who tend the sick, which limits them in their own economic activities.

Conflicts also arise at the household level where women’s roles change as a result of women empowerment activities in Central Sulawesi. As women participate more actively in group activities, their husbands who so far have not been included in awareness raising became suspicious and acted out against them. This has served just as one example how important it is to integrate gender sensitivity into the project cycle.

Partner organisations generally do not have any conflict or risk mitigation standard procedures in place that staff members can refer to. Also at an organisational level, there are no mechanisms for risk assessment as a basis for taking management decisions. In such a context, members of the team must be aware and sensitive of the psychological burden of those who work in ongoing conflict situations or are dealing with the constant power gap between the corporations and the local people without much prospect of significant progress.

Specific social and political dynamics such as village head election also create particular vulnerabilities to conflict for organisations working in village governance strengthening. In such situation, severe frictions often happen between supporters different candidates so that project activities have to be postponed until the election ends to prevent potential suspicion of supporting a certain candidate. This has been a necessary approach to preventing partner organisations from getting involved in local conflicts related with head of village election.

In areas of acute conflicts between plantation companies and communities, the supporting CSOs generally take a rights-based approach aiming to prove community rights to land and natural resources. According to the experience of the CSOs oil palm plantations more often tend to collaborate with the local police to intimidate opposing villagers, while mining companies generally rather collude with the armed forces. Interference of corporations into community affairs aiming to co-opt village leaders and traditional elites, however, also create in many situations horizontal conflicts between villagers or between neighbouring villages.
Here, CSOs have largely little effective instruments to mediate and contribute to conflict resolution.

In terms of program M&E, a few partner organisations collect disaggregated data available for particular intervention such as training, workshop and so on. However, overall MISEREOR partners do not collect any data that would show changes in gender relations. In addition, specific benefit of the project for men and women are not covered in project reporting.

Besides gender, other cross-cutting issues are also not evident in the M&E and regular program reporting.

5 Conclusions

1. In sum, MISEREOR’s CSO partners have so far done highly relevant work. They have made communities become aware of the negative impacts of monoculture and in particular oil palm on their livelihoods. They have informed them about their rights and possibilities to defend themselves. They empowered them to stand up against companies and colluding government as well as military or policy officers. They have developed different approaches to support communities in their efforts to solve acute conflicts with timber, oil palm and mining companies, protect their land against land grabbing efforts by corporations and prevent the conversion of land used for agricultural purposes into palm oil plantations. The context was mostly characterized by collusion between business players and government officials as well as by opaque, fragmented and unclear administrative and judicial processes both at local and at national level. Hence, it needed a lot of force, perseverance, wit, networks and expertise to navigate communities through this process. While there had been many achievements in the past to mobilize communities to ward off immediate threats and encroachments from corporations and create the foundation to maintain indigenous livelihoods the next level of obtaining legal security has only recently been opened by CSOs. In order to remain relevant in a sector characterized by changing political and economic framework conditions and seize the opportunities that the current administration provides, CSO partners need to expand their capacities and organizational strategies. On the one hand, government priorities related to social forestry and agrarian reforms provide promising entry points. On the other hand, the policy framework for village self-governance also provides important opportunities. What is equally important for all strategic approaches is to take into account how forest and protected land can become a stable sources of livelihood and income. Every organization needs to consider for itself what are most promising areas for their development and change in the future, and explore options with openness and creativity.

2. Social Forestry schemes provide major opportunities. However, as the experience of PO4 shows, the process of fulfilling all requirement is lengthy and there is not much experience yet to deal with the post-legal recognition challenges – strengthening community-based forestry management institutions, complying with current regulations requiring villages to define clear production targets and creating a sound
understanding and consensus within partly traditional communities on such management models, developing collaborative models for economic production and marketing.

3. Social forestry permits and legal recognition of community rights towards forest areas and land in general is not an end in itself. Rather, it needs to be positioned as an entry point for broader community empowerment in forest management. To date, most efforts, be it from government, NGOs or donor communities, have focused on enabling communities to gain legally recognized rights. In the case of Customary Forests (hutan adat), for instance, this requires a complex set of policies (Perda, parliamentary decision). But even for Village Forests the administrative process is lengthy and complex, as much as the requirements communities have to fulfill to keep the right they have obtained. It needs to be taken into account that legality obtained for a certain limited community area can have effects on neighboring communities with similar characteristics or vice versa (e.g. becoming a motivation, causing frictions or jealousies, effects of different approaches to forestry management, of land sales, etc.). Supporting single communities is a start, but ultimately, in order to achieve long-term protection and develop economically as well as socially viable forms of community-based forestry management, it needs landscape-based approaches.

4. Consolidated communities conducting coordinated advocacy efforts are decisive for successfully protecting land by using legal instruments under the Village Law No 6/2014 and even more so when seeking legal recognition at district as well as at national level. CSOs can only partially contribute to this. Ultimately, there are many influencing factors including local leadership, social and traditional dynamics, which to a large extent are outside of the control and influence of supporting CSOs. However, starting from building a strong and unified community is always key.

5. The national policy framework is ever-evolving and all decisive for efforts countering land grabbing and empowering forest-dependent communities. On the one hand, community rights cannot be effectively protected by political advocacy and campaigning alone, even more so with a government agenda to significantly scale up social forestry. Hence, it will need more intensive engagement of CSOs to strengthen communities, facilitate conflict resolution as well as post-conflict community-based forestry management. On the other hand, expansion of oil palm and mining in particular will still continue – within existing concession areas or directed at increasing conversion – thus, it will still remain highly relevant for CSOs to stay involved in national and international level policy advocacy and development. In order to achieve impacts in policy influencing, CSOs need to more systematically work together and coordinate their efforts than they have done in the past.

6. Organizations that in the past focused mostly on campaigning and ‘battle’ tactics will need to tilt towards a more collaborative approach towards the government and in part even companies if they want to achieve greater and more sustainable impacts. This will require efforts to seek opportunities where to offer their specific strength and expertise, in order to work together with local governments as well as national government institutions. In view of the need to move into the field of economic empowerment as a way to ensure sustainability in the protection of community land
use communication and collaboration with new government agencies (cooperatives, trade, industry, finance) will become relevant in the future.

7. Providing communities with forest user rights under the existing social forestry schemes are meant to protect their basic rights to continue living within forested areas and pursue livelihood strategies based on forest resources. Therefore, more holistic support will be needed for communities once they have obtained user permits and ownership rights, to enable fuller benefits from social forestry initiatives. Research shows that the ability of communities to get benefits from natural resources is determined by a range of factors, such as access to information, market, decision-making process, the development of effective collective structure as well as network development. Generally, it will need a more comprehensive understanding of the structural causes of injustice and disempowerment of forest-depending communities.

8. Mediation and negotiation have already been acknowledged by government policies (Permen No. 84/2016) as viable means of conflict resolution between corporations and the government on the one side and communities on the other. This creates important new opening for communities and CSOs supporting them.

9. Further development and strengthening of community organizations will be essential to make communities more self-sufficient in representing their interests to external stakeholders. Community resistance still largely depends on external support. So far, there are no larger community advocacy networks established along the lines of common interests of communities. CSOs will need to more systematically connect those communities with similar problems, identifying common interests and build up solidarity and collective action. In order to be able to do this they will need one another and the collaboration across different networks and constituencies.

10. Gender sensitivity and the potential gender-based approaches can have for the protection of natural resources, in conflict resolution as well as economic development has received insufficient attention to date.

11. Partner CSOs in devising project designs and implementing their overall strategy mainly strive for finding an adequate language and cast what they are doing anyway based on their past experience and a critical analysis of current challenges into the logic and format of project proposals. To a lesser extent they use the tools and instruments of project planning and management to scrutinize and challenge their strategic approaches and thinking as well as to tap into collective creativity in considering different scenarios. Sound application of methods related to context, problem and stakeholder analysis as well as scenario and project planning would benefit internal discourse and the opening up towards different strategic choices.

12. MISEREOR partners to date engaged in very limited professional exchange and joint learning. Expanding this holds a lot of opportunities for all of them: Improving individual strategies and practices, chartering future strategies and working towards more collective impact while realizing more synergies as well as expanding strategic joint action. Effective joint learning will need enabling conditions. Among those are
incentives and resources for dedicated learning activities, but also external facilitation.

6 Recommendations

For MISEREOR’s CSO partners:

1. With the increase in formal openings to secure communities’ legal rights towards land, the requirements in terms of competences of CSOs supporting communities are shifting from campaigning and lobbying outside of the political and administrative system towards sound legal competences to work within this system. However, existing profiles and approaches will still be relevant, but generally need to be expanded. This in turn, cannot be separated from the need to support communities in the arduous process of actually implementing the different options of social forestry schemes, using village level governance mechanism as well as obtaining land titles in the context of agrarian reforms. CSOs will need to expand their expertise and skills for establishing and strengthening the organizational structures at community level needed for that (e.g. Village Forest Management Units, cooperatives, village-owned Businesses) as well as for venturing into the whole field of developing the economic potentials of the secured land and forest.

2. Overall, the orientation in advocacy has to shift from case-to-case interventions to more strategic approaches directed towards policy and sectoral change based on the results of analytical work. There needs to be investment into own capacity development and activities that pertain to data collection, processing and provision of information (to the wider public, the government, donors, etc.) and analysis to being able to influence policy development, develop new partnerships with government and donors and own strategy development. This also means that existing media, especially the organizational website, but also social media channels need to be developed and used much more strategically. Data, results of analysis and work examples should be published online on the own website and social media actively used to update the public and own networks on important developments (e.g. advocacy gains, activity information, agreements with government or communities etc.).

3. CSOs need to more systematically develop the field of conflict resolution for them. This does not mean that every organization needs to have trained mediators. But what it needs is a good understanding of basic principles in conflict resolution, mediation and negotiation and partly also a change in mindset in order to be able to act – if circumstances require this – as a neutral facilitator between communities and corporations.

4. MISEREOR partners need to develop a concept of organizational development of community organizations. It’s not about developing one uniform concept as the needs will very much depend on the context, the purpose of the organizations and the specific challenges. However, what is needed is a deeper understanding what is meant by organizational strengthening, what are different options and the diagnostic
tools to better define the development needs and objectives. Such a concept could include, but not be limited to the following:

- problem analysis (including the analysis of power relations and interests) and using this as a basis for the development of advocacy strategies
- data collection and analysis, for instance, through participatory approaches such as Participatory Action Research
- the development of a clear vision and mission as well as accountability mechanisms towards own constituencies, such as members and the wider community
- the development of basic (work) plans
- the moderation of meetings and discussions
- financial administration
- raising funds with a focus on village-owned resources
- the establishment of relations and networks with other communities as well as local government agencies
- the careful development of organizational structures following the mission, real activities and a tested division of roles and responsibilities among members.

5. It needs more conscious efforts to establish advocacy networks of communities developing common issues and stronger solidarity across different geographical areas and specific cases. Network development should be considered as indispensable part of strengthening community organizations.

6. Use Village Law provisions to facilitate inter-village collaboration for the development of landscape-based community-based forestry management models.

7. Develop existing LPHD as model units for equitable community-based forest management and economic empowerment as the planned massive scale-up of social forestry schemes will need good practices examples others can learn from. Experience and knowledge related to social forestry schemes should be shared and possibly replicated among MISEREOR partners.

8. Besides specific gender approaches, it also needs some attention how to specifically reach out to youth and involve them in empowerment approaches. They are the ones who are leaving their areas when communities lose control over natural resources. This could be done by including them in village planning, allocating funds to create income generating opportunities for them at village level and at the same time strengthening their awareness and motivation to protect their land and natural resources.

9. Learn from existing experiences and approaches in Indonesia to facilitate market access of disadvantaged communities, including concepts of the ‘Making Market Works for the Poor’ (M4P) approach.

10. Improve synergies with existing networks and alliances and expand to new ones to improve own capacities, create synergies and influence the policy environment.
Expand networks and relationship building into non-traditional sectors: Related to economic empowerment, on the government side this would be networks with Ministries and local agencies for industries, trades, cooperatives and small credit. On the CSO side: Tackling power structures and technical skills in improving access to markets. Seek collaboration with women rights NGO to jointly conduct research and develop approaches how to mainstream gender across the entire project cycle.

11. Seek new reform opportunities that other sectors provide and include them into strategies towards network development, e.g. the area of complaint handling, access to information or bureaucratic reforms. Here, there are a variety of local and national civil society actors with sound expertise with whom options for collaboration and the development of synergies should be explored (e.g. Jawa Pos Institute of Pro Otonomi conducting research and issuing annual awards related to governance reforms, including environment as one category. Here, opportunities for collaboration could be explored in order to set incentives for local governments and to promote further research. Explore opportunities for collaboration with LAPOR and with provincial Public Information Commissions – KIP)

12. Anticipate and prepare for political negotiations and promotion of concepts in the run-up to the 2019 Presidential Elections as well as local elections between 2017 and 2018. Identify strategic areas for development, establish communication and relations with government agencies including non-traditional ones at national level and strengthen the own bargaining position by acting in collaboration with other MISEREOR partners.

13. It needs more regular and systematic efforts to learn within single organizations as well as across different organizations. The goal to become a learning organization can be approached from many different angles. Above all, it needs systematic efforts as well as dedicated time and resources for learning activities. This includes the establishment of simple routines to reflect on experiences in the field, creating a culture of open feedback and sharing information, where it is acceptable to make mistakes and even reward to learn from them. But this also includes dedicated analysis as preparation for a new project phase, field monitoring, self-evaluation and reflection together with own field staff. It also means externalizing implicit knowledge from the people engaged in the organization and making sure, that individual knowledge is made available to others in the organization, especially in case there is expansion or departure of staff.

14. Update web presence. Use it as an opportunity for own organizational development (who are we? Where are we coming from, how have our strategies changed over time, what is our key expertise, what do we have to offer, who are our partners). All of that is not just a product of promotion, but if done well helps internal clarification and setting strategic priorities and goals as well as fostering to reach out to other external actors.

15. Realize synergies with other MISEREOR partners especially in learning from each other in terms of technical competences and strategic approaches, in developing together new competences, in conducting joint learning and research activities as
well as joint advocacy in particular at national level and in entering political contracts in the run-up to local elections.

For MISEREOR

16. Provide (more) capacity development support, mentoring and feedback to CSO partners in realistic project planning, M&E system development and indicator formulation. This should include conducting sound context, problem and stakeholder analysis as basis for deriving the design of a project or a more pronounced implementation strategy. Consider options to base the initial contract with partner NGOs on a rather broad project outline while allocating time and dedicated funds during the first year to conduct more analytical work that leads to an adjusted project outline including indicators. Capacity development and technical guidelines should be offered not only focusing on how to develop a project logic (in particular emphasizing the difference between outputs and outcomes), but also foster more comprehensive perspectives towards the goals the organization is striving for by requiring the development of a ‘theory of change’. The latter would encourage a more pronounced analysis of the entire sector and elicit strategic thinking about how change at higher level is expected to take place, how project interventions and outputs are related to that and what kind of contributions are expected from other actors in the sector.

17. More clearly conceptualize the first project phase of first-time partners. The initial one until two years are usually needed to establish and strengthen trust with target communities, develop their basic awareness of rights and opportunities for opposition and advocacy as well as capacity development. In the case of collaboration with other CSOs in the form of a consortium the establishment of steering structures and mechanisms also needs time. It should be made clear that it is not expected that during the first project phase objectives at the level of advocacy objectives and local policy change will already be achieved.

18. MISEREOR should carefully consider if the formation of a consortium of CSO partners is likely to be successful, possibly can even generate synergies among the participating CSOs and should, therefore, be encouraged. The experience with CSOs participating in this learning exercise has shown that organizations with different profiles and complementary sets of competences are more likely to work well together than those that are very similar where the division of roles is mainly based on different regional bases. Developing a mechanism of exchange between legal holders of consortia as a means of peer learning and advice could be a helpful measure in setting up and running a consortium.

19. Foster learning, innovation, exchange and collaboration among CSO partners. This should not only involve encouragement and the provision of earmarked funds for facilitated regular meetings, but also for joint research, joint concept development, documentation of experiences, lessons learnt, innovations and impacts.

20. Incentivize and provide for facilitation in establishing initial practices of exchange and joint learning. There are still deep-rooted reservations to open up on own
weaknesses or promote own approaches as superior. In the end, NGOs are also competitors for funding. On top, there are also cultural barriers in giving each other feedback, being critical of each other. Therefore, it will initially need more external support and incentives for processes of learning together, jointly analyzing lessons learnt.

21. Support activities of knowledge creation, knowledge management and display/presentation of knowledge to the outside world (e.g. the overhaul of their web presence, studies) as part of the programs supported by MISEREOR.

22. Consider to identify and support new partners in natural resources management in Eastern Indonesia, especially in Papua, as the level of continuous expansion of extractive industries and plantations is still very high there, while access to information and advocacy networks for local CSOs is still limited. Opportunities for the development of marketable non-forestry products, on the other hand, are rather positive.

23. Facilitate exchange and learning between partners in the forestry and natural resources sector and other MISEREOR partners in Indonesia and at a regional level who are already more advanced in terms of agribusiness development and economic empowerment of poor communities, including contact and exchange with the Non-Timber Forestry Products Network.
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Appendix 1: Key Evaluation Questions

1. Relevance

1.1. What is the national and international context of land rights and land conflicts in Indonesia and what kind of opportunities does this context offer for the work of national NGO networks?

1.2. Which strategies are relevant in different contexts and with different beneficiaries / target groups? What have been supportive and hindering factors?

1.3. Are relevant issues taken up in the project objectives and goals?

1.4. How far are the goals of …
   - Protection of land rights and access rights to forests as life support base for indigenous communities and small farmers,
   - Stopping degradation of natural resources by expansion of large-scale plantations
   - Improvement of living conditions, food-security and food sovereignty,
   - Conflict resolution/prevention concerning land disputes

… still relevant and appropriate for the target areas and the people living there?

1.5. To what extent are the intervention strategies such as …
   - Advocacy against land grabbing by corporations and development projects
   - Organising village communities
   - Promotion of integrated resource management systems (such as agro-forestry and integrated ecosystem management)
   - Advocacy for legal recognition of land rights and community based forest/land management plans
   - Networking from community to district, to provincial, to national, to international level
   - Capacity building for non-violent land conflict resolution

… still important and relevant (for the target communities) in the light of new development (such as UU Desa, Supreme Court judgement on IP land rights)? In how far have strategies been adjusted over time and why?

---

83 Adjusted in coordination with MISEREOR in comparison to original questions included in the TOR of this assignment after the Kick-Off Workshop
2. Outcomes and impacts

2.1. How far has the work of the different organisations contributed to the protection and/or recognition of land rights of beneficiaries, curbing the expansion of large-scale plantations, and improvement of living conditions/development of alternative livelihoods of marginalised communities?

2.2. What are implications of different livelihood systems for the local communities and what kinds of alternatives do exist?

2.3. What are relevance and implications of different ways of mapping – participatory or with elaborated technical means? What is the effect of the mapping activities?

2.4. How broad are the effects seen in relation to the extent of land conflicts in Indonesia? (If possible, assess the broad effects towards the number of solved land rights conflicts, land titles obtained etc.) In how far are the strategies scalable? Do the different partners create synergies in order to achieve more effects or more wide-ranging effects?

2.5. What is the role of the partner organisations in the change processes, what is the role of the population? How are movements for a thematic issue initiated and what are the respective roles of the NGO, their networks and the communities?

2.6. Are the communities networking with each other? Are there synergies created between them?

2.7. How is local knowledge used in the change processes? What kinds of exchange and learning processes are taking place between communities and organisations?

2.8. How are former target groups involved in order to share experiences and to mobilise new communities?

2.9. What is the role and value of networks (NGOs as well as communities) in this context? How are learning processes within the networks initiated (e.g. as conferences, workshops, exposure, joint field visits of NGOs and communities etc.), at which levels are they taking place (strategies, approaches, methods) and what are the effects? In how far are synergies generated between network members?

2.10. How can the networks become learning organisations? To what extent would this open new opportunities for the members?

2.11. What kind of examples for Good Practice can be identified? Which effective strategies can be identified (regarding for example approaches of the organisations like exchange of knowledge, initiation of movements)? What are replicable strategies that can be shared?

3. Effectiveness

3.1. How is the planning of objectives and the development of strategies to achieve change done (at the network level)? Are strategies based on plausible hypotheses for change and linked in a logical way? How is the planning process organised in order to identify the most important issues? To what degree is it a participatory process?
3.2. To what extent were each organisation’s objectives achieved?

3.3. Is a suitable PME system in place that helps to learn from the information gathered and to steer the projects accordingly?

3.4. Is there any data on the achievement of objectives (also quantitative data)?

3.5. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

4. Efficiency

4.1. To what extent are the organisations responding to the importance of accountability and reporting? Does organisational governance cover these demands (from the donors)?

4.2. Is the administration of the projects adequate? Are there any efforts to improve administrative aspects? Are time and financial resources invested adequate?

4.3. Which strategies (from those that are implemented) are cost effective?

4.4. Are there any possibilities to get money for specific parts of the work (e.g. government, other organisations, donors etc.)?

4.5. Is there a reasonable concentration of resources and energy in place? Are long term processes with the communities accompanied in an appropriate way and continuously?

5. Sustainability

5.1. To what extent are the benefits of the various projects sustainable?

5.2. What are the major factors which are likely to influence the achievement or non-achievement of their sustainability?

5.3. Does the internal structure of the organisations support sustainable processes?

5.4. What are different scenarios for the future work? How are the organisations preparing for these scenarios? (to be analysed on the level of the organisation and on the level of effects in lobby work and community structures)

5.5. What does sustainability mean in the specific context and when is it achieved? (to be elaborated with the MISEREOR-partners and regarding different perspectives and levels like own organisation, benefits for the communities, structures at the community level etc.)

6. Cross-cutting issues

6.1. How far were gender issues considered by the various organisations and what are the related outcomes?

6.2. Is conflict sensitivity taken into account in the different projects and overall approaches?
6.3. How is the relationship between rights-based and civic conflict transformation efforts, and what affected this relationship?

6.4. What are specific political and social dynamics in the project locations affecting the implementation of activities?
### Appendix 2: Sampling Criteria and Locations Visited during the Learning Process

<p>| Distance                      |  |
|-------------------------------|  |
| Within reach (from an efficiency, time and financial point of view) | Among the chosen locations there should also be some locations that are remote as it reflects the real conditions and challenges the partner organizations also have to face |
| Conflict                      |  |
| Project locations where communities had to deal with conflict situations (it would be solved by now or not; it was agreed, however, not to include locations where the conflict is currently still in a hot phase as the presence of outsiders might be too sensitive and not conducive for the situation) | Non-conflict areas |
| PO1  |  |
| PO5  |  |
| PO4  |  |
| PO3  |  |
| PO6  |  |
| Overall assessment            |  |
| Considered as successful      | Less successful location in order to learn from the factors influencing the outcomes |
| PO4  |  |
| PO5  |  |
| PO3  |  |
| PO1  |  |
| PO6  |  |
| Length of support             |  |
| ‘Old’ project locations: support for more than one project phase | New project location (recently added, considered as replication or extension of existing program) |
| PO2  |  |
| PO4  |  |
| PO2  |  |
| PO4  |  |
| PO1  |  |
| PO3  |  |
| Target Group characteristics  |  |
| Indigenous communities        | ‘Settler’ communities (<em>pendatang</em>) |
| All the rest                  |  |
| PO1  |  |
| Location characteristics      |  |
| Palmoil plantations           | Hutan Desa (community forest), timber |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PO6</th>
<th>PO1</th>
<th>plantation (HTI), protected forest, REDD area, mining areas etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific case collection**

- **Strengthening of village governance:**
  - PO2
  - PO5

- **Specific political frame conditions:**
  - PO5
  - PO6 Provincial level Central Kalimantan (pro-investment governor, links to thugs)

- **Focus on involvement of women:**
  - PO1: Parigi Moetong
  - PO5: Sambas