

**Factsheet**  
**World Bank / AIIB Indonesian National “Slum Upgrading” Project:**  
**Safeguard Violations and Weak Country System Analysis**

**Indonesian Legal Resource Center, ELSAM, WALHI – Makassar, WALHI – SulSel,**  
**Ecological Justice, Ulu Foundation**

**Update - May 2017**

**Overview of Concerns**

- We are hearing reports that where the planned implementation of NSUP is questioned or rejected by the community, those voicing concerns about the proposed forced resettlement are subjected to discriminatory treatment from local officials. There are reports that important administrative functions are either denied or delayed, such obtaining or updating National Identity Cards (KTP), Family Identity Cards as well as certification of low income status (which entitles the certificate holder to various subsidies, including “rice for the poor”, health insurance, school costs and other subsidies). There are even reports that those raising concerns about the NSUP project are not being given their rations of “rice for the poor”, and that others who raise objections are presented with delays in obtaining their “rice for the poor” upon which many depend to feed their families. As a result affected communities in certain locations are becoming increasingly frightened and uncomfortable. This should be of substantial concern to the World Bank and AIIB.
- Additional violation of WB safeguards, including:
  - A failure to carry out meaningful public consultations
  - Information disclosure – 87 cities have plans; 150 “slum kelurahan/sub-districts” have “Community Settlement Plans” – no disclosure of cities/sub-district plans
  - Violation of WB and AIIB Gender Requirements, Lack of Gender Mainstreaming
  - Indonesian EIA & Environmental Permit Requirements Substantially Weaker Than WB OP 4.01 and AIIB requirements
  - Significant problems with lack of consultation requirements for Environmental Permit
  - Land Grabbing under Indonesia’s 2012 land law and new Presidential Decrees
  - Compensation Problems, Problems with Rule of Law
  - Threats are being made to local activists monitoring project, those facing evictions face administrative difficulties
- Miscategorization / Recategorization of project from Category A to Category B; This is a high risk project, but as of May 19, 2017, environmental and social risk was only characterized as “moderate”
- “Voluntary” land “Donation” or forced resettlement?
- Significant potential for conflict and increasing anti-Chinese xenophobia
- Weak Assessment of Country Systems, Gaps and “Gap-Filling” measures

**Demands:**

1. Given the flawed ESMF and violations of WB Safeguards, this project must be **completely reviewed by the World Bank and AIIB prior to implementation**. Substantial new environmental and social due diligence is required.
2. The World Bank must **correct all violations of WB Safeguards prior to** implementation of the project.

See details below.

**Background**

Indonesia’s President Jokowi has launched the ambitious “100-0-100 Program” with a laudable goal of 100 per cent access to potable water, 0 slums, and 100 per cent access to sanitation for urban inhabitants by 2019. The

Cities Without Slums Program (KOTAKU) is a national platform funded by various sources, including central and local governments, the private sector, and various financial institutions. The KOTAKU program has been budgeted as a high priority program in the draft 2017 National Budget (Draft Budget) and in the National Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMN) from 2015 to 2019.

Unfortunately, however, “slum”-related projects in Indonesia have often been plagued with a history of violence, impoverishment and forced resettlement and, for this reason, the official designation of an area as a “slum” may be seen by residents as a preliminary step prior to the violent forced eviction of the inhabitants of the area.<sup>1</sup>

Resettlement poses risks to vulnerable urban populations including economic hardships and disruption of the social fabric.<sup>2</sup> In Indonesia, amongst the urban poor, many evicted women use their homes, or shops connected to their homes, as part of their income generating activities prior to eviction. Women evictees face particularly adverse consequences from evictions, most notably interruptions to income-generating activities they run out of their homes as well as heightened risk of sexual and gender-based violence. As the principal targets of sexual and gender-based violence, women and girls are particularly exposed to such abuse by forced evictions. The chaos during an eviction, and the disruption of community structures and the change to less secure living circumstances in the aftermath of an eviction, may all increase the risk of such violence.<sup>3</sup>

This five-year long project is of remarkable importance since not only is it the first project ever approved by the newly-created AIIB, but it also represents the first project co-financed jointly by the AIIB and the World Bank. It is also the first AIIB project in Indonesia, which is the AIIB’s eighth largest shareholder and which hopes to become the largest borrower from the AIIB. The outcome of this project, including its environmental and social impacts as well as the manner in which the borrower, the World Bank and the AIIB respond to civil society input will set the benchmark for the predicted future stream of large scale high impact AIIB, World Bank Group and other projects. The fact that Indonesian civil society members have already found themselves on the receiving end of threats and intimidation for bringing up concerns with this project raises substantial alarms.

On July 12, 2016, Board of Directors of the World Bank approved increasing Indonesia's government debt by \$216.5 million for the KOTAKU project, equivalent to 2,814 trillion rupiah, under the title “National Slum Upgrading Project” or NSUP. The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) Board also voted to approve co-finance of debt for the project of the same amount, namely \$ 216.5 million or equivalent with 2,814 trillion rupiah to support the NSUP. Thus the financing by the World Bank and AIIB totals \$333 million, equivalent to 5.628 trillion (1 USD = Rp. 13,000). This joint WB-AIIB project will utilize World Bank Safeguards for implementation.

Until now, a year after approval, the World Bank has only disbursed a small amount of funds. From the \$216.50 million committed by the World Bank, there is only 14.50 million dollars disbursed, which is about 7% of total commitments. The May 19, 2017 World Bank Implementation Status and Results Report also describes that city-level Settlement Improvement Action Plans (SIAPs), to alleviate slums over five years including investment plans, were prepared by 2015/2016 but will be reviewed in 2017 in 87 out of 154 cities, including 20 priority cities. The report also indicates that “community settlement plans” (CSPs) have been prepared in 150 “selected slum kelurahans” [sub-districts/wards], but none of these documents are accessible on the World Bank website.

---

1 Jakarta Post, Forced evictions getting harsher, March 17, 2016. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2016/03/17/forced-evictions-getting-harsher.html> Reuters News: Indonesian Slum Dwellers Challenge Eviction Law in Landmark Case, “According to the Jakarta Legal Aid Institute, which has been helping evicted families, there were 113 forced evictions last year, with each round typically involving many dwellings. A total of 8,145 families and 6,283 small businesses were affected in 2015, the group said. Another 325 evictions were set to take place this year, the institute said, citing the government's planning documents.” <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-indonesia-landrights-slums-idUSKCN1201QK>, Sep 30, 2016; Rima News, Penggusuran dan Penggusuran di Era Ahok Jadi Gubernur Jakarta, 28 September 2016, <http://rimanews.com/nasional/peristiwa/read/20160928/305143/Penggusuran-dan-Penggusuran-di-Era-Ahok-Jadi-Gubernur-Jakarta>;

<sup>2</sup> For example, Understanding the impact of involuntary slum resettlement on women's access to healthcare in Mumbai, India, *Journal of Comparative Social Welfare*, Volume 24, 2008; See also, Josh Kelaty, In pictures: housing, class, and mass evictions in Jakarta, <https://jkelety.com/2015/01/03/in-pictures-housing-class-and-mass-evictions-in-jakarta/> and Human Rights Watch, *Condemned Communities: Forced Evictions in Jakarta*, 2006

<sup>3</sup> *ibid*

- **A failure to carry out meaningful public consultations** (see “Anatomy of a Fake Consultation” fact sheet). It has been well documented that for the NSUP project there has been no meaningful consultation as required by World Bank or AIIB. The ESMF was not subjected to meaningful public consultation, merely a fake consultation in Jakarta at the Department of Public Works, with only one NGO mentioned in the “minutes” of the consultation”, despite planned impacts in 156 cities. Discussion topics included “how to deal with the squatter issue and customary lands.”<sup>4</sup> Initial project documents clearly identify 20 cities where the project will be implemented during the first year of operations yet no record of consultations in these locations is presented in the documentation. This is a substantial violation of World Bank and AIIB requirements.
- **Information disclosure:** Failure to provide project materials in a language accessible to the local population on WB and AIIB website; As of September 2016, all 13 documents – including Environmental Impact Assessment, Resettlement Plan, Indigenous Peoples’ Plan, are still only available in English on WB website; some of these documents date back to June, 2015 and no translations have been provided on the WB website; AIIB’s website provides even less information -- only has 2 short documents (3 pages, 16 pages), both of which are in English; Indonesian KOTAKU website, a government run website, provides translations of many of the documents but it is difficult to find a link with the WB or AIIB sites which provide details about required safeguards, accountability, or grievance mechanisms. It appears that only it is primarily, or solely, the **project level grievance mechanism and not the Inspection Panel** which is described in the documents in Bahasa Indonesia.
- **Miscategorization / Recategorization:** The project was initially rated as a Category A project, likely to involve significant environmental and social impacts, resettlement impacts and impacts on Indigenous Peoples. Suddenly, in 2016, the project was “downgraded” to Category B (requiring far less environmental and social due diligence) and language was added forbidding Category A impacts and insisting that resettlement would be avoided and where necessary would be “voluntary.” The project documents include a “voluntary resettlement” document to be signed by project-affected peoples who “voluntarily” give up their land. In addition, it appears that some of high risk/high impact aspects of this project are being pushed to the government-funded portions of the project in an effort to avoid linking the WB and AIIB to the damaging activities detailed in earlier project documents, predicted to have high negative impacts on impoverished affected communities. Is this an effort to avoid the application of WB and AIIB safeguard to activities including forced resettlement and environmental destruction? Safeguards still apply to indirect, induced impacts of all components of the WB/AIIB project, regardless of funding source. This is still a very high risk project and should be re-categorized as Category A. According to AIIB and WB safeguard requirements, the impacts of all aspects of a project must be analyzed and accounted for in the determination of categorization and clearly this project has potentially highly significant impacts, and must be considered a Category A project.<sup>5</sup>
- **Violations of AIIB & BD Gender Requirements - No Mainstreaming of Gender Perspectives.** According to the document, the project objectives are explained to improve basic service infrastructure (clean water,

---

<sup>4</sup>ibid

<sup>5</sup> AIIB: "12. Categorization. The Bank determines the Project’s category by the **category of the Project’s component presenting the highest environmental or social risk, including direct, indirect, cumulative and induced** impacts, as relevant, in the Project area." Must assess "environmental and social risks and impacts of the activities" "to physical, biological, socioeconomic and cultural resources in the Project’s area of influence; these include impacts on air and water quality, including environmental health; natural resources, including land, water and ecosystems, livelihoods; vulnerable groups; gender; worker and community health and safety; and cultural resources;" "Involuntary Resettlement that is likely to arise from such activities" "impacts on Indigenous Peoples," "working conditions, community health and safety"; "**Project area of influence includes the area likely to be affected by the Project, including** all its ancillary aspects, such as power transmission corridors, pipelines, canals, tunnels, relocation and access roads, borrow & disposal areas, & construction camps, as well as unplanned developments induced by the Project (e.g., spontaneous settlement, logging, or shifting agriculture along access roads). The area of influence may include, for example, (a) the watershed within which the Project is located; (b) any affected estuary and coastal zone; (c) off-site areas required for resettlement or compensatory tracts; (d) the airshed (e.g., where airborne pollution such as smoke or dust may enter or leave the area of influence; (e) migratory routes of humans, wildlife, or fish, particularly where they relate to public health, economic activities, or environmental conservation; and (f) areas used for livelihood activities (hunting, fishing, grazing, gathering, agriculture, etc.) or religious or ceremonial purposes of a customary nature." See, also "Associated Facilities".

drainage, roads, toilets etc.) that will benefit women in doing domestic work. But this project is only limited to making women as passive beneficiaries, and their participation is limited to the quota of female facilitators, or women presenters, whereas for women's control and participation in the project or contributions to project planning is not reflected. Nor does it reflect an analysis that uses "gender disaggregated data" which is a condition of AIIB and that is essential to meeting the World Bank's Gender Strategy.

For example, in the Project Impact Assessment data collection process, the calculation is based on a household approach, only identifying the "head of household". However, in the patriarchal culture in Indonesia, the head of the family is more interpreted with the man (father, or the oldest boy). So that the outcome of this project, which will have access and decision making will be male although often the economy of women in urban sector is highly dependent on business in residence which is also the center of sales or production economy for informal sector (herbal medicine, fish selling, etc.). If only men are recognized as "owners" of houses, assets, businesses, and / or land, then if there is compensation in the form of houses elsewhere, or compensation for loss of assets, businesses, this may cause substantial losses to women, including potentially a failure to assess the ability of new housing to support the home-based business activities; If the compensation is given in the money, it is likely that the funds will be given only to men and not to women which could have a severe impact on the economy and the fate of women. This may violate the terms of AIIB and BD that all persons - women and men - affected Projects need to be guaranteed that there will be no decrease in the income / tariff of living and the requirement that the "standard of living" of the poor, specifically vulnerable groups and women, must rise and improve as a result of the project. The AIIB and BD recognize the vulnerability of women in this regard, so it is mandatory to use gender-disaggregated data to account for all aspects of women's economy, including in the informal sector and land and housing rights, to be affected by the project, before the project begins.

- **“Voluntary” Land “Donation” or Forced Resettlement?** The Category B documents now claim that most resettlement will be “voluntary” and not forced. However, given the insecurity of land tenure, the widespread use of armed forces including military, police and armed thugs (“preman”) in impoverished urban areas of Indonesia, the fact that the majority of Indonesia’s poor have no “land certificates” proving ownership, and the fact that communities slated by this program (i.e. Makassar) have already heard that there will be mass forced evictions, there are tremendous concerns about so-called “voluntary” resettlement. The “Environmental and Social Management Framework” for the project provides a chilling example of the planned “voluntary” land acquisition process. Annex 17 (page 135) of the ESF contains a “Voluntary Land Donation” form to be signed by local residents of areas targeted for the project. The description of the “Voluntary Land Donation” process states that:

*“The land donor is not characterized as poor. ... The land donor is the legitimate owner of such lands. ...Land owners have the right to refuse the land donation.... The right of refusal is specified in the donation document the donor will sign.”<sup>6</sup>*

Questions arise: Which inhabitants (potential land donors) in an area designated as a “slum” are *not characterized as poor*? Given that most of the poor do not have any land certificates, the word “legitimate owner” seems to exclude the majority of the poor from this “voluntary land donation process”. Will they be subject to forced eviction instead?

The ESMF includes a copy of the “Voluntary Land Donation” Form which, according to the ESMF, is required, among other things to specify the “right of refusal” of the donation. However, this form:

- does not indicate anywhere that the project is funded by the World Bank and AIIB;
- does not inform the individual signing away their land rights that they have rights, including the right of refusal, the right to a meaningful consultation process, access to full project information in their language, access to WB accountability and grievance mechanisms; the right to participate in the planning process for resettlement; the rights of Indigenous Peoples to participate in the development of an IP plan, the right to ensure compensation of “land for land”, the right to improve their standard of living (certainly not to decrease

---

<sup>6</sup> ESMF, National Urban Slum Upgrading Project, SFG1777 REV, 2016

their income which would be a violation of WB and AIIB safeguards), the rights for those without land certificates to receive compensation for losses, and resettlement planning requirements of the WB and AIIB.

- appears only to recognize the rights of landowners with “land certificates” despite the fact that the majority of Indonesia’s urban and rural poor have no access to land title certificates; appears to disenfranchise the large numbers of urban poor without land certificates, removing them from resettlement discussions, options; potentially subjecting them to forced resettlement? Whereas WB and AIIB safeguards require “displaced persons without title to land or any recognizable legal rights to land, are eligible for, and receive, resettlement assistance and compensation for loss of non-land assets... and that they are included in the resettlement consultation process.” [AIIB]
- the forms will be counter-signed by powerful local officials, including District Head (Camat)/ PPAT, Local head (Lurah) and the “Community Board of Trustees”.

As a result, WB/AIIB- funded NSUP/Kotaku program has a high potential to initiate forced evictions whether by sponsoring them directly or by “offloading” them to the government-sponsored (indirect and related) portions of the project, and to violate the basic rights of affected communities, causing the poorest people to become even poorer than before. The top-down approach is likely to violate the right to access to information, consultation, secure housing, land rights, the right to work and livelihood and the right to security. Given that the target program area is 154 cities and counties in 34 provinces in Indonesia, there is significant potential for wide-spread human rights violations, increased militarization and social conflict resulting from this project. Clearly, even at this early stage, there appear to be violations of the World Bank Safeguards and AIIB ESF requirements.

- **Potential increase in conflict and Xenophobia.** Eviction not only will cause conflicts between citizens and the state, but also horizontal conflicts between citizens. Politicization of religious, ethnic and racial issues by politicians especially in regional elections, encourages the re-enforcement of xenophobia among urban communities. This is seen in the polemics against Chinese foreign workers, and Chinese investment projects in Indonesia. If not properly managed, the NSUP project in direct contact with the community will trigger racial hate speech. Such hate speech is increasingly occurring in connection with eviction processes.
- **Potential of Project Corruption.** The Kotaku program is a continuation of the Urban PNPM Program. In the Evaluation of PNPM Mandiri, the Finance and Development Audit Agency (BPKP) found 3,570 cases of financial misuse from 2007-2012, worth Rp. 63,555,297,801, but legal action during 2005-2013 was recorded only 128 cases. From these data, the number of cases completed by law, the number is very small compared to the reporting. Although GOI guarantees that the project is designed to guarantee anti-corruption policies, the World Bank and AIIB should encourage legal (criminal case) actions, and prevent corruption from the start, because corruption can be done by project facilitators.
- **Discrimination on Public Administration to People Who Do Not Agree with Project Location or Eviction.** The implementation of NSUP socialization has been implemented in various cities. In fact, there are residents who refuse to implement the transfer plan against, as happened in the city of Makassar, where residents refuse to move because it will potentially eliminate their livelihood. However, the rejection of forced evictions by community caused other consequences, because it turned out that the people who rejected the project KOTAKU appear to receive resulting discrimination in administrative services in their District.
- **Threats to NGOs.** We are seeing an increase in threats made against NGO activists monitoring the NSUP project, including after providing information on safeguards, legal rights and discussing with potentially displaced communities. Threats of personal harm are made via phone and text message on mobile phone. Threats and intimidation are received after conducting critical discussions on the NSUP project with affected groups.

#### **Weak Assessment of Country Systems, Gaps and “Gap-Filling” measures**

The Project’s Environmental and Social Management Framework (<http://www.p2kp.org/>, and <http://www.kotatanpakumuh.id/>) claims that a range Indonesian laws are equivalent to World Bank requirements or have easily-filled “gaps.” Unfortunately, these laws and rules do not provide environmental and social

protections at the level of the standards of the World Bank or the AIIB, to the substantial harm of affected communities and broader society. In addition, the so-called “gap analysis” presented in project document is poorly done and fails to include key Indonesian legislation and regulations, while citing old laws which are no longer in force and which have been long since replaced by newer legislation. Some brief examples are below and more details can be found in other analyses.<sup>7</sup> In addition, given that this project is implemented under the World Bank Safeguards, including the Country Systems Safeguard, it is required to provide a detailed analysis of equivalency between World Bank Safeguards and Indonesian legal/regulatory system. Under the Bank’s Country System Safeguard, there is a clear and detailed checklist of requirements which must be part of this analysis (CSS Table 1A) and these requirements have not been met.

**Indonesian EIA & Environmental Permit Requirements Substantially Weaker Than WB OP 4.01 and AIIB requirements.** World Bank and AIIB safeguards require Environmental Impact Assessment which covers in detail all direct, indirect, cumulative and induced environmental and social impacts in a project’s area of influence; requires draft EIA available for public comment for approximately 120 days – (prior to appraisal) before the Board of the World Bank takes a decision whether to approve or reject a project.

However, under the EIA standard in Indonesia, further weakened by recent Presidential Regulations, **project implementation often begins prior to completion of an EIA.** Indonesia does not require a completed EIA for obtaining a business permit, location permit or land acquisition permit;. There is **no requirement for meaningful consultation in the EIA process:** Decision-making on an EIA occurs on an EIA Commission where the government chooses one person to join the Commission to “represent” the interests of all affected peoples. This one government-chosen “community representative” is allowed 30 days to comment on the Terms of Reference document for the EIA and 75 days to comment on the actual EIA document, but there is **no requirement for direct input, consultation or involvement of the affected communities.**

**Even worse is the decision-making on the Environmental Permit.** For projects with significant impacts, the public is only given **10 working days** to submit suggestions, opinions, and feedback. For projects with less than “significant” impacts, the public has **3 working days** to provide comment. This advice can only be delivered through through the “representatives” of the affected communities and / or community organizations that are members of the Audit Commission of the EIA. So there is no meaningful opportunity for robust public comment on an Environmental Permit.

**Land Grabbing:** A 2015 Presidential decree now makes it possible for private enterprises to carry out land expropriation for the “public good”, acting on behalf of the state. Objections by landowners to the seizing of their lands must be made to the Governor who has a maximum of **three working days** (recently reduced from 14 days) to consider the objections. Any objection not acted upon by the Governor within 3 days is considered rejected. This demonstrates the arbitrariness of the government’s approach to citizen concerns about their land rights. A period of three days (or 14 days) is completely inadequate to fully assess an objection to the seizure of lands by affected citizens

**Rule of Law & Compensation.** If there are conflicts over land, a company may simply deposit a sum of so-called “compensation” in escrow with the District Court, even though the “compensation” is not necessarily agreed upon by the communities. Once these funds have been deposited with the Court, although no court decision has been made, the compensation is considered “paid”, and the company may move ahead, seize the land, evict the landowners, and initiate the projet, despite the fact that the landowners have not necessarily agreed to the amount or type of compensation or received the compensation.

#### **Demands:**

1. Given the flawed ESMF and violations of WB Safeguards, this project must be **completely reviewed by the World Bank and AIIB prior to implementation.** Substantial new environmental and social due diligence is required.

---

<sup>7</sup> For more details, see “The World Bank and AIIB’s National “Slum Upgrading” Project: Safeguard Violations and Weak Country Systems Analysis” by ILRC, ELSAM, WALHI, WALHI SulSel, Ecological Justice, TuK Indonesia, INDIES, Ulu Foundation.

2. The World Bank must **correct all violations of WB Safeguards prior to** implementation of the project.
3. The AIIB has co-funded this project with an agreement that the project must comply with World Bank safeguards. The **AIIB must conduct its own due diligence** to ensure that current violations of WB Safeguards are corrected and the project comes into compliance with WB Safeguard requirements and **fulfills the requirements of the AIIB's ESF**.
4. The Environmental and Social impact assessment (including ESMF) needs to be **rewritten** (including assessments of/proposals for avoiding environmental and social impacts, including impacts on Indigenous Peoples, women and vulnerable populations).
5. **These corrected impact assessments and other relevant documents must be subject to meaningful public consultation**, termasuk untuk **mencegah menguatnya xenophobia, including in each of the 20 cities planned for the first year of implementation**, prior to any decision to implement this project.
6. If implementation occurs, it must be ensured that the affected communities participate and determine the process of the "improvement" of their areas, instead of continuing the pattern of fake consultations that are in violation of World Bank Safeguards and AIIB requirements. This project must use **World Bank Safeguards, including Country System Safeguards**, and not the Bank's new ESF. Project planning began in June 2015 and was approved July 2016, under World Bank Safeguards. The project was meant to commence in September 2016.
7. Given the apparent reliance on Indonesia's "country system" for this project, the World Bank must make **public for comment a detailed Country Systems Safeguard assessment demonstrating the equivalence** or lack thereof between Indonesian "national systems" and World Bank Safeguard requirements (in accordance with WB OP 4.00 Table 1A).
8. Given the potentially significant impacts on local communities and the environment, this project must be returned to its original **Category A** status.
9. A **complete re-evaluation of the concept of "Voluntary Land Donation"** is required in the context of routine abuses by armed forces, including the military (TNI), police, satpol or armed thugs in areas designated as "slums" in Indonesia. In this context, the concept of "voluntary land donation" in an atmosphere "**free of intimidation or coercion**", as required by both AIIB and WB, is not possible.
10. World Bank and AIIB must take full **responsibility for monitoring land acquisition/evictions which are implemented by Regional/Provincial Government**, since these often involve violence and violations of safeguards and national law.
11. World Bank and AIIB must take full responsibility for monitoring to ensure that Indonesia complies with all environmental and social safeguards of the World Bank and AIIB.
12. **Gender-differentiated baseline census of all women likely to be impacted by the project, gender-disaggregated analyses and a gender-sensitive approach** to ensuring full participation and recognition of rights, including land rights, of women must be used. Otherwise, this project is likely to lead to substantial impoverishment of women in over 150 cities.
13. We note that, already, as of November 2016, civil society organizations which have voiced concerns about the NSUP project and World Bank and AIIB involvement have begun to experience **terror and intimidation** in Indonesia, including direct threats of personal harm. The World Bank and AIIB must send a clear public message to the public and to the Government of Indonesia that threats and intimidation against those raising concerns about the project must **cease immediately and not occur again** or the entire project will be called into question. Silence on this matter is unacceptable and implies complicity.
14. The May 19, 2017 WB Implementation Status & Results Report for this project indicates,= that there has been a baseline survey in 2016, which will then serve as a reference for targeting slums; And a plan to review 87 cities for the implementation of NSUP. The World Bank should encourage project implementers to announce such matters to the public, including their link to the WB and AIIB supported NSUP in order to become a reference for public and monitoring for civil society.
15. We are hearing reports that that where implementation of NSUP is rejected by the community, those voicing concerns about the proposed forced resettlement are subjected to discriminatory treatment from their local officials. There are reports important administrative functions are either denied or delayed, such obtaining or updating National Identity Cards (KTP), Family Identity Cards as well as certification of in conducting the administration of population, such as the maintenance of KTP, KK, and certificate of low income status (which entitles the holder to various subsidies, including "rice for the poor", health insurance, school costs and other subsidies). There are even reports that those

- raising concerns about the NSUP project are not being given their rations of “rice for the poor”, and that others who raise objections are presented with delays in obtaining their “rice for the poor” upon which many depend to feed their families. As a result affected communities in certain locations are becoming increasingly frightened and uncomfortable. This should be of substantial concern to the World Bank, as there are further impacts experienced by citizens who reject the NSUP;
16. Protection for activists who criticize project implementation and are subject to death threats and intimidation should be of concern to the World Bank. If this continues, it can be said that the funding of the World Bank against the implementation of projects in Indonesia threatens the freedom of citizens and activists who have voiced their basic rights;
  17. Due diligence risk assessment is needed to assess **Security Force Risk**, specifically the risk of violence from armed parties including military (TNI), police, satpol and armed thugs (preman) linked to the project. This is an **AIIB requirement**.
  18. There must be an explicit **legally-binding ban on the use of armed security forces and threats and violence against communities** with a legally binding clause that any such threats made or use of violence against communities or civil society organizations will result in the **cancellation of the project**. This is particularly important given the threats made against civil society to date in connection with this project. Full information must be provided to all project-affected people regarding the **origin of the funds** (WB/AIIB) as well as information regarding **right of refusal** to engage in “voluntary” land donation as specified in the project documents, and the right of access to WB or AIIB accountability mechanisms.
  19. **Corruption**: The World Bank and AIIB must push for legal measures (criminal cases) to be taken against every instance of abuse of project funds.