Public Final Report

Improving the social-economic impact of biomass production for local communities and indigenous peoples

(“sustainability... not for an image”, T-shirt of interviewed smallholder in West Kalimantan)

Outline of the report

1. **Context and reasons to start the project**: why did you start the project? What is the context of the project? E.g. a description of the local circumstances, important stakeholders, political environment, geographical situation.

2. **Objectives of the project**: description of the aim and objectives of the project; intended results

3. **Activities undertaken in the project**: description of the actual project: what activities have been carried out; what was the project boundary; who were the important project partners

4. **Results of the project**: description of the results of the project. If more detailed reports are available as specific project deliverables, this section can refer to these reports and provide a summary

5. **Lessons learned**: what did you learn from the project? What do you think is important to know for project implementers executing similar projects?

6. **Follow up of the project**: what are your main follow up activities? How do you use the project results and lessons learned in your follow up activities? What is needed to ensure duplication of the project; are activities/actions needed by other organisations?
1. Context and reasons to start the project

This project was started because violations of social rights are regularly reported in the context of palm oil production which is linked to the biomass supply chains. Indonesia has been chosen as the location for this project, given its importance as producing country, the expansion foreseen in this country, and the fact that we had the opportunity to work together with AMAN, a well-established umbrella organization of indigenous peoples in Indonesia. For example, the situation in West Kalimantan was described as follows in a report from 2009:

**Palm oil Indonesia**

‘West Kalimantan is planning to expand oil palm plantations by five million hectares, more than any other province in Indonesia. [...] Forest areas and smallholder agricultural lands without official land title are often classified by the government as “non-productive lands” or “bare lands” and are targeted for conversion to oil palm plantations. [...] Three case studies of four ethnic subgroups of the Dayak Bidayuh indigenous people (Hibun, Sami, Jangkang and Pompang), describe and explore conflict and collaboration between these communities in West Kalimantan in relation to the expansion of oil palm plantations over their customary territories.’

Among other things, this study showed that there is a clear trend that only few indigenous peoples, and mostly only their elites, benefit from engagement in oil palm plantations. Most ordinary members of indigenous communities end up nearly landless and must pursue livelihoods through off farm activities, temporary or permanent migration, often leaving behind their children and elder generations in the village.

*Source: Martua T. Sirait, Indigenous Peoples and Oil Palm Plantation Expansion in West Kalimantan, Indonesia, University of Amsterdam and Cordaid, May 2009*

Local communities and indigenous peoples are therefore greatly concerned about increased biomass production for energy and have little confidence in its potential benefits for them. They generally have one aim and that is for their rights to be respected.

The focus areas for this project were Kalimantan and Papua. Both regions are under massive expansion of oil palm plantation. In December 2009, the Ministry of Agriculture and Plantation announced that oil palm plantation will expand from original planning 9.7 million hectares, to 18 million hectares. Mostly this will be in Papua and Kalimantan.

Obviously, the indigenous peoples and other local communities being faced with the impacts of biomass production are important stakeholders. If we wish to expand biomass production for energy sustainably, positive local social impacts must be safeguarded. How can indigenous peoples and other local communities participate in the current economic development in a way acceptable to them? Apart from the positive social effects, attention is needed for the positive relationship between indigenous peoples, wellbeing and (the conservation of) biodiversity.

Other important stakeholders are the companies involved in the palm oil supply chain. It is challenging for them to apply social sustainability criteria and map the social impacts of their activities. A specific sub-group are the auditing firms. This project could help them undertake meaningful social audits.
International, national and local governmental institutions set the political and policy stage in which the palm oil sector operates. They are therefore very important stakeholders to improve the social sustainability of biomass.

The political debate in the EU about the sustainability of biomass for energy use had resulted in two directives: the Fuel Quality Directive and the Renewable Energy Directive with several environmental safeguards and criteria but very limited attention for the social sustainability of biomass. To guarantee the implementation of these directives, a number of certifying institutes has started to develop a sustainability certificate. CEN/TC 383 'Sustainably produced biomass for energy applications' was established in April 2008 with the goal to draw up a voluntary European framework for sustainable biomass production. The norms to be developed would apply to, but not be limited to, the European Directives. ISO intended to launch a sustainability framework as well. Dutch stakeholders – governmental bodies and commercial parties – asked for a framework for verifiable sustainable biomass. Given the fact that in the Netherlands the Commission Cramer criteria are considered the leading framework for sustainable biomass, the NEN had drawn up NTA8080 (‘Nederlandse Technische Afspraak’) based on these criteria. The NTA8080 was an important reference for our project.

Taking a look at NTA8080, it is clear that social sustainability of biomass production has received due attention. Themes such as competition with food, prosperity and social wellbeing have been incorporated. However, the social themes generally lack clear and verifiable indicators and companies only have a limited reporting obligation. The Commission Cramer itself announced at the launch of the criteria that further research is needed into the indicators that are still lacking.

2. Objectives of the project:
The project’s aim was for buyers and producers to respect the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and other local social stakeholders in the production of biomass. The objectives were to provide them concrete suggestions on how to improve their performance in this respect and to contribute to the due certification of sustainable biomass chains for energy. Another objective of this project was to enhance the voice of indigenous peoples and other social stakeholders in the field of biomass and thus lay the foundation of their further knowledge and capacity building in the future. The table below provides an overview of the specific goals and intended results formulated for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project goals</th>
<th>Intended results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping the (negative and positive) social impact of biomass production for energy purposes on local communities (with specific attention for indigenous peoples) and identifying their capacity building needs</td>
<td>Baseline assessment on the impact of biomass production on local communities (with specific attention for indigenous peoples) and opportunities for them to benefit from the developments of biomass production and expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concretizing the social themes for</td>
<td>Report elaborating on the application of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
biomass production of the Framework embroidering on existing knowledge and initiatives such as NTA 8080/8081, RSPO, BSI, RTRS, etc. Framework with respect to the themes 'prosperity' and 'wellbeing'

C Involving stakeholders in Indonesia on applying social demands in relation to biomass production for energy, including local capacity building Organized and documented stakeholder meeting

D Describing the main indicators and challenges identified in our project on adhering to social sustainability themes for biomass production A summary paper on main indicators and challenges identified in our project on adhering to social sustainability themes for biomass production

E To engage into dialogue with auditors, Dutch and EU biomass importing companies, Dutch and EU policy makers and MEPs on improving the social sustainability of biofuels and the level of assurance of proving compliance with social sustainability issues. A presentation of the main indicators and challenges identified in our project on adhering to social sustainability themes for biomass production during the World Biofuels Market in Rotterdam on 12-14 March 2013 and several meetings with Dutch and EU policy makers and parliamentarians together with a representative of the partner in Indonesia. A survey among auditors, companies, experts and policy makers to further identify ways to improve the sustainability of biomass and the level of assurance of proving compliance with sustainability issues. Organize final workshop in the Netherlands to present and discuss main findings of dialogue, meetings and survey with relevant stakeholders.

F Sharing the project results on national, European and global level through relevant fora (NEN, CEN, ISO) and lobbying for (inter)national support for the application of social criteria Inter)national attention for the application of social criteria in biomass production

3. Activities undertaken in the project

The following activities have been undertaken during the project:
- Seven interviews with stakeholders involved in the Netherlands to map relevant experiences and identify significant local stakeholders
- Desk research of 24 documents to get an overview of the current developments and knowledge
- Field research in West and Central Kalimantan and in Papua and fourteen interviews with stakeholders in Indonesia
- Analysis of how the social themes of NTA8080 can be meaningful adhered to and drawing up of verifiable indicators to assess the social impacts of biomass production
- A consultation and training workshop in Palangka Raya, Central Kalimantan with local indigenous communities from West and Central Kalimantan, Indonesia.
- Presentation of the main indicators and challenges identified in our project on adhering to social sustainability themes for biomass production during the World Biofuel Market in Rotterdam, on 14 March 2013
- Meetings with EU policymakers and parliamentarians, to present main findings of the project and discuss ways to improve the sustainability of biofuels and the level of assurance of proving compliance with sustainability issues
- A survey among auditors and companies about the main indicators and challenges identified in our project
- A summary paper on the main findings of the project, including recommendations for auditors, companies, Dutch and EU policymakers and parliamentarians and civil society organisations on improving the social sustainability of biomass production
- A final workshop with relevant Dutch stakeholders to present the main findings of the project and discuss ways to improve the social sustainability of biomass and the level of assurance of proving compliance with sustainability issues.

The project partners were the Indigenous Peoples’ Alliance of the Archipelago (Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara – AMAN, Indonesia), OxfamNovib (The Netherlands), and CREM. AMAN is an indigenous umbrella organization in Indonesia representing over 2,000 indigenous communities and working to promote the rights of indigenous peoples in Indonesia through research, networking, policy dialogues and capacity building of indigenous communities. OxfamNovib is an international NGO, member of the Oxfam Confederation and CREM is a Dutch consultancy working on sustainability issues.

4. Results of the project

Result 1: The project mapped the social-environmental impacts and challenges of palm oil production (for energy purposes) on local indigenous communities and smallholders in West and Central Kalimantan in Indonesia and identified their capacity building needs which are summarized below:

**Table 2: impacts and opportunities of palm oil production with indigenous communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive impacts</th>
<th>Negative impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Few jobs, but salaries too low</td>
<td>• Loss of land and property/use rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More customers for local shops, but mainly owned by</td>
<td>• Loss of subsistence (food, medicines, materials) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants</td>
<td>decreasing incomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road infrastructure, but also roads damaged</td>
<td>• Loss of culture and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some schools, churches built</td>
<td>• Environment polluted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sometimes electricity provided</td>
<td>• Drinking water contaminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health issues (pesticides, dust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less access to energy (higher prices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Human rights violations (discrimination,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
child and forced labor, no right to organize workers, sexual violence against women, arbitrary detention) • Conflicts (horizontal and vertical)

Main opportunities

• Respect for (customary) land (use) rights, also in the law
• Implementation of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)
• Resolving conflicts between communities and companies/government
• Protection of water sources and cultural sites
• At least minimum wages and respect for workers’ rights

Table 3: main challenges and opportunities for smallholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges for smallholder</th>
<th>Opportunities for smallholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of land to palm oil company without free prior informed consent resulting in conflicts</td>
<td>• Maintain land ownership (independent smallholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The 2 ha plots planted with oil palm promised in return are not provided at all or do not provide for the basic needs</td>
<td>• Access to credit and markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The smallholders depend on the company and are not well organized</td>
<td>• Fair prices and technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The smallholders have a lack of capital, credit and technical support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inequitable and non-transparent price contracts resulting in debts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate infrastructure which prevents delivering the fresh fruit bunches in time to the mills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The quality of the land and the seeds is low and there is limited access to fertilizers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The low productivity results in indebted farmers who then often decide to sell their land to outsiders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The capacity building needs identified in the project include:

• Improve the understanding of the community's rights over the land and issues of land tenure and land ownership, both the personal and the communal or traditional ownership. Through an understanding of the land rights the community can learn about the status of their ownership, the process of recognition of traditional rights, the status of the plantation, FPIC, negotiation skills and other issues.

• Support for local monitoring of violation of rights through palm oil development such as through citizen journalism (sending text messages from the villages) and for community mapping of traditional territories
• Provide continuous facilitation of the situations faced by the community. A required facilitator is someone who understands about conflict resolution and acts appropriately in this role.
• Increase community people’s awareness about running long term plantations for either palm oil or rubber with a higher productivity.
• Coaching on financial management appropriate for the business and households of the community people.
• Training of trainers is needed, so the community can be facilitated by their own local people for capacity development, such as on the need to do mapping, documenting facts, etc. and about understanding economic development efforts.
• The training and increasing the understanding is not only needed for the communities but also for the local government, village apparatus and related agencies.

Result 2: Guidance was formulated for companies involved in palm oil production on the following topics: (1) identification and mapping, (2) information sharing and negotiations and (3) decision-making, verification and monitoring. The table below gives an overview of the suggested guidance.

Table 4: overview of suggested guidance mentioned by the participants of the consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification and Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How should companies respect land rights?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The company should do a consultation process with the landowners to get the approval from the local community on the land status (graveyards for example are often destroyed by bulldozers) and accept that the community has the rights to decide YES or NO on this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The company should release the investment plan in the Indigenous Peoples’ territories and show clearly the map and action plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the community agrees, then the company should do socialization on the work plan with the landowner whose land will be managed for palm oil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How should companies identify claims and rights?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The company should, together with the indigenous people and the government officials do an inventory of the indigenous rights to customary land and community rights and give the report of this inventory back to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To avoid false claims, the company should involve this investigation team to get to know who is the rightful owner. In reality companies sometimes make separate deals with one of the communities or encourage false land claims. In that case, that specific community sells the land, while the other community does not have land anymore and also did not get any money from the sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How should companies deal with existing conflicts?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The company should not interfere in any conflicts, but provide a consultation space between the parties that are in conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If there is a conflict between 2 communities, identification should be repeated to know who is the real owner of the land and the company should be responsible by facilitating to resolve the issues of the conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If there is a company who will invest, then it cannot conduct the mediation process except if the company has invested then the company should conduct the mediation process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Based on input from participants of training workshop and consultation, Palangka Raya, 5 to 8 November 2012.
according to the customary ways in the respective areas.

- The local government should take the responsibility to solve the land dispute among the community. The local government should also conduct the checking of the land boundaries.

### Whom should companies talk to? How should they identify representatives?

- Indigenous institutions, Indigenous Peoples’ organizations, Indigenous women, The traditional head of the village and the Legal aid society that is elected by the people. Companies can simply ask the villagers. Indigenous Peoples’ Organizations also know who are the representatives for a certain area.

### How should companies do mapping? Who should be involved?

- The community prepares the map of the indigenous territory that includes the sacred sites, potential areas for palm oil, etc. which are agreed by the entire community and get the approval from the neighbouring indigenous territory (on land boundaries).

- The mapping of areas must be created in a participatory mapping process with the community to guide the company to see which part of their areas they would find suitable to be managed for palm oil.

- Involve all the landowners, the company and the government and include women and young people.

### Information Sharing and Negotiations

#### What information is needed by the community?

- What is the status of the area that will be used?
- How long will the land be used by the company?
- What is the business model of the company?
- What are the negative and positive impacts?
- The 5W +1H questions about the company: Who owns the company? (including: who are the people involved? does the company have a principle permit? who is the investor? is the company part of a group of the company? who are the related parties?), What kind of company, in what field?, How is the work system? When will the company start? Where is the location of the planned operation? Why invest in our area?

#### On what issues should stakeholders be consulted?

- Legal aspect; (1) Principle permit from the Indigenous Peoples, issued by head of community (e.g. Damang or Mantir); (2) Land and environmental permit: Consulted with local government and related governmental institutions: (e.g. Regent, Plantation Service, National Land Agency (BPN), Environmental Agency (BLH) (3) Other related legal issues consulted with government and environmental activists.

#### Who to negotiate with? How to negotiate?

- With all the representatives from the communities and based on FPIC and the local customs. There should be room to say no.

- Ensure Indigenous Peoples were able to build their capacity to negotiate

- Process needs to be fair and transparent, the company should not hide behind the government which tends to take side to the company

- The representative of the company should have the authority to make a decision

#### What are good business models for smallholders (Landowners from Indigenous Peoples)?

- To be adjusted with the customs and the environmental conditions in the local areas

#### How to deal with complaints?


- To be adjusted with the customs and the environmental conditions in the local areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to deal with differences within the communities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- To be adjusted with the customs and the environmental conditions in the local areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision-making, Verification and Monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How should decisions be made?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Conduct the principles of FPIC. The most important thing is that before making the decision the community must be allowed to do customary deliberation among the community. Every company must allow for at least three stages of meetings; (1) community with the company for information sharing, (2) within communities/to inform and discuss, (3) community with the company to negotiate and deliver the community decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What issues should be included in the agreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Recognize the customary laws, issue on rights, environment and local wisdom, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How should the agreement be made available to the community?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- It should go through the customary mechanism, at least there should be a ritual ceremony, a customary deliberation, and it also needs to be written in a language understood by the community and all the Indigenous Peoples and related parties need to be informed, including in some areas, the spirits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How should the agreement be monitored?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Conduct the evaluation every 3 or 4 months with a joint team (Indigenous Peoples, company and government and institutions that are trusted by the Indigenous Peoples). Option to file a complaint if a conflict arises.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How should conflicts be resolved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Apply the customary law, and re-check on all data and collect the evidence together, because the national laws do not favour Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Result 3:** An analysis was made resulting in suggestions to improve the social themes for biomass production of NTA8080 and a survey among auditors and companies provided insights into their challenges to improve sustainability of biomass.

The social issues addressed in NTA8080 are: (1) competition with food and local applications of biomass (2) prosperity (3) working conditions (4) human rights (5) property rights (6) local well-being and (7) integrity of the company. A comparative analysis was made between the way these social issues are addressed in NTA8080 and the way in which these issues are addressed by other initiatives. The certification schemes of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), the Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels (RSB) and the Shrimp Aquaculture Dialogue (ShAD), as well as a set of relevant indicators for Indigenous Peoples from the report ‘Indicators Relevant for Indigenous Peoples: A Resources Book’ issued by TEBTEBBA were selected for this analysis. Besides this comparative analysis representatives of indigenous communities from West and Central Kalimantan were consulted on relevant indicators for safeguarding their rights. Based on this analysis and consultation a report was made with suggestions on how the social themes in

---

2. Training workshop and consultation of Indigenous Peoples in West and Central Kalimantan, Indonesia, on applying social criteria for sustainable production of palm oil, Palangka Raya, 5 to 8 November 2012 (report not published)
NTA8080 could be further improved, including on criteria, indicators, and methods for implementation and verification.³

A survey among auditors and biofuel importing companies⁴ found that auditing on social issues in certification schemes faces both systemic and practical challenges: Systemic challenges in the sense that that unfair competition exists with schemes that don’t work with accredited certification bodies, as well as the fact that auditing social issues takes time, whereas winning a tender means offering to be the cheapest. Practical challenges include finding well trained local assessors; providing training to all assessors all over the world and for the different certification schemes; the fact that stakeholders often don’t respond to scheduled meetings. In addition, many schemes approved under the EU RED have unclear indicators that allow room for interpretation; and some schemes are leaking (for example they certify a partial area, not an entire mill). All respondents to the survey (both auditors and biofuel importing companies) expressed a clear opinion that the multitude of the EU RED approved certification schemes is creating a race to the bottom and that the EU RED does not include safeguards for the social sustainability issues reported from the projects.

Result 4: The capacity was built of 33 key representatives of indigenous communities in West and Central Kalimantan facing severe impacts of palm oil development.

Capacity building of indigenous peoples communities and knowledge transfer from Western NGOs to indigenous communities took place during the workshop in Central Kalimantan where information was shared on EU policies and rights of indigenous peoples in Indonesia and community members were able to relate this information to their own situation and get feedback from the facilitators on how to realise their rights.

Result 5: Results of the findings of the research in Indonesia were discussed and presented at several meetings and workshops in The Netherlands and in Indonesia.

The project results were shared in stakeholder meetings organized by NL Agency in Indonesia in March 2011, May 2012 and April 2013. In The Netherlands project results were presented during a roadshow of NEN on NTA 8080 on 24 May 2011 and on 21 November 2012 during a debate on ‘Making money in the bio-economy’ organized by Tertium.

An indigenous representative of AMAN from Central represented AMAN both at the World Biofuels Market in Rotterdam, and at a large number of meetings with EU policy makers and parliamentarians where he presented the project results.

³ Published in separate report: ‘Concretizing the social themes incorporated in NTA8080 (criteria for sustainably produced biomass) – a comparison with other certification schemes and relevant indicators for indigenous peoples’ and summarized in chapter 5 of the summary report of the project: Improving the social-economic impact of biomass production for local communities and indigenous peoples Palm oil in West and Central Kalimantan, Indonesia.

⁴ This survey was done in cooperation with a project of OxfamNovib on sustainable biomass production in Mato Grosso, Brazil, funded by Agency NL under the Sustainable Biomass Import program, and in which NCIV was involved as a partner.
The project results and identified challenges were also presented during a final workshop on 25 June 2013 in Utrecht. The workshop was attended by 23 participants representing companies, scientific institutions, NGOs and the Dutch government. The main conclusions and recommendations presented were:

Conclusions

- European demand for biofuels increases impacts
- Large scale monoculture model is not sustainable:
  - Land used for biofuels leads to loss of traditional livelihoods / food security
  - Weak protection of rights and poorly implemented, (no FPIC, false promises, criminalization)
  - Most smallholders end up impoverished
  - Important data (e.g. on health) not in public statistics
  - Big local need for awareness raising and capacity building
  - There is room for improvement of NTA 8080 on social issues

Recommendations

**EU:**
- Limit the contribution of land-based biofuels
- Include adequate social criteria in RED/FQD
- Improve monitoring of sustainability impacts of RED/FQD
- Ensure robust certification systems with a high level of assurance.

**EU, EU governments, companies and NGOs:**
- Provide adequate funding/support for IP’s/LCs awareness and capacity building and for supporting small-scale farmers (organization, yields, income)

**EU RED approved certification systems:**
- Provide robust environmental and social criteria and a high level of assurance

**European importing companies:**
- Only buy palm oil, soy and sugarcane certified under a robust certification system with a high level of assurance.

**The Indonesian government:**
- Recognize customary rights of IP’s and implement legal and judicial reforms
- Avoid expanding the palm oil development on IP’s territories without FPIC

**Palm oil companies in Indonesia:**
- Respect customary rights of indigenous peoples and arrive at agreements with indigenous peoples on palm oil development on the basis of FPIC

**The Brazilian government:**
- Undertake integrated land use planning
- Strict regulations on pesticide use and other pollutants
- Continuous analysis of water quality (pesticides, vinasse)
- Study of incidence of diseases related to pesticides
- National programs supporting family farmers to reach the regions

---

5 This workshop was organized in cooperation in cooperation with a project of OxfamNovib on sustainable biomass production in Mato Grosso, Brazil, funded by Agency NL under the Sustainable Biomass Import program, and in which NCIV was involved as a partner. An extensive summary report including all project findings was distributed during the meeting and is available at: www.indigenouspeoples.nl
These findings and recommendations were discussed by the participants who, generally, supported the presented recommendations. During a discussion in 4 break-out groups, the participants identified additional recommendations for various groups of stakeholders with regard to improving the sustainability of biomass production.

5. Lessons learned

In the future NCIV would start off with a local meeting with the local partner and other stakeholders as it appeared that it was a challenge for the local partner to explain the purposes of the project as certification of sustainable biomass is as much an unknown as well as it is a sensitive and contentious issue.

The interviews conducted by AMAN in Indonesia taught us that among indigenous peoples in Indonesia very little was known about certification of sustainable biomass and that no good experiences of indigenous peoples with palm oil development were reported. Using palm oil for biofuels in western countries is regarded as solving western problems at the expense of indigenous peoples in Indonesia. It was therefore a challenge to explain the intent and objectives of our project and get commitment of NGOs and indigenous communities to be involved in this project.

Primarily for this reason, the fact finding missions in Papua and Central Kalimantan took much longer preparation time than expected, which was needed to explain the purposes of our project to the regional levels. Because of all the negative experiences of communities with the palm oil development, there is much resistance locally against the idea of using palm oil for energy purposes. And therefore hesitation to engage with our project. However, through intensive communication and explaining the purposes of the project, we were eventually able to engage some local communities in Papua and Central Kalimantan in field interviews.

Another lesson learned is that more time needs to be calculated for a project taking into account the capacities of the local partner. For example, the reporting about the field visits took longer than expected. This was partly due to illness of the regional coordinator in Papua, and the passing away of the regional coordinator in West Kalimantan and partly to lack of experience with reporting (which requires verification and justification of the facts) and partly to the organization of the Fourth General Assembly of AMAN. (2200 communities, 500 other invitees). This took most of the capacity of the AMAN staff for several months. But the project also benefitted from the GA as AMAN adopted a policy on large plantations which it did not have before. This resulted in better understanding of the project among the communities after the GA and increased their willingness to participate in the stakeholders meeting. We were able to solve this problem by extending the implementation period.

6. Follow up of the project

An initial outline of follow up activities were identified in cooperation with AMAN:
Monitor indicators for criteria to enhance local wellbeing and sustainable economic development for indigenous peoples’ communities and smallholders when producing palm oil in Indonesia.

Use criteria as tools for sustainable palm oil production planning. Create support amongst governments, NGO’s and commercial parties to implement and improve these sustainability criteria. Implementing these criteria is executed by using a FPIC (Free Prior Informed Consent) process, participatory mapping, citizen journalism and satellite imagery with Open IR technology.

Current programs will be challenged to improve their program and new programs are/can be improved.

The project aims to assert influence by both requesting governments to implement new rules and regulations as well as motivate the industry to adopt these new criteria through policy dialogue.

This was presented by AMAN during a stakeholders dialogue in Jakarta on 16 April 2013 but we have not yet been able to further develop this plan and look for the necessary funding.
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