

Amended

**Sri Lanka: Eco-Systems Conservation and
Management Project (ESCAMP) &
Additional Financing**

Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF)

**Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment,
Ministry of Tourism Development and Christian Religious Affairs,
Forest Department, and Department of Wildlife Conservation**

February 28, 2019

*The **Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment** has requested the World Bank to provide additional financial assistance in support of scaled-up activities related to the Project, by making available to the Recipient a grant from the **Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK**; The World Bank agreed to extend to the Recipient, on the terms and conditions set forth in the Grant Agreement, a grant in an amount equal to United States Dollars twenty two million and five hundred and fifty to assist in financing the Project focusing on forest restoration. There are no changes in the scope of work to be undertaken by the **Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment under the Eco-Systems Conservation and Management Project**. The following **Social Management Framework (SMF)** prepared for the project will remain the same and will be applicable to the implementation of all project activities. The following **Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF)** prepared for the project will remain the same and will be applicable to the implementation of all project activities.*

The Protected Areas currently supported under the parent ESCAMP do not include sites where Indigenous Peoples are located in the buffer zones. The project's framework approach allows new sites to be introduced and therefore, the IPPF will continue to be applicable.

Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework

Introduction and Background

The Eco-Systems Conservation and Management Project (ESCAMP) intends to support the Government of Sri Lanka (GOSL) in its attempts to strengthen biodiversity conservation and ensure sustainability of its development process in the landscapes dominated by protected areas. The objective of the project and its description are provided in sections below. This document is the Social Management Framework (SMF) for ESCAMP prepared in keeping with World Bank's safeguard policies and submitted in lieu of a specific project's social assessment for appraising the social aspects of the project.

The history of wildlife conservation and environmental protection in Sri Lanka dates back more than 2000 years in recorded history when Mihintale was declared a sanctuary by ancient Kings for the benefits of plants, animals and people. Fostered by the Buddhist philosophy of respect for all forms of life, subsequent rulers upheld this noble tradition and took various initiatives to protect the forests and its wildlife resources for future generations. Then came the colonial era, where exploitation of forests and its resources became the order of the day as opposed to the royal tradition of sustainable utilization. This is evident by some of the earlier government ordinances which promoted and paved the way for logging, hunting and conversion of natural areas to large plantations for economic gain. During this time and later, much of the wet zone forests, where the bio-diversity is highest, were lost. In the post-independence era, some of these exploitative trends continued, even accelerated with land settlements, large scale irrigation and agriculture, energy generation etc. becoming key priorities of successive governments. As such, today, Sri Lanka's natural resources are faced with many threats and require deliberate interventions by the state to protect and conserve whatever is left for the well-being of its present and future generations.

Conservation of bio-diversity is of special significance to Sri Lanka. The country, although small in land area, has a varied climate and topography resulting in rich biodiversity distributed in a number of different eco-systems. With the highest bio-diversity per unit area, Sri Lanka is ranked as a global bio-diversity hot spot. Yet, at present, the country is faced with a serious erosion of its eco-systems and the bio-diversity they host. The country's high population density, high levels of poverty and unemployment and widespread dependence on natural resources by some of the key economic sectors such as agriculture, mining, tourism has exerted considerable pressure on the country's precious natural resources. A recent survey has shown that 33% of the inland vertebrate fauna and 61% of its flora are nationally threatened. Around two thirds of the threatened bio-diversity is endemic to Sri Lanka. Twenty-one species of endemic amphibians have not been recorded for the last 100 years and these species are, for most purposes, considered extinct. One in every 12 species of inland indigenous vertebrates of Sri Lanka is currently facing an immediate and extremely high risk of extinction in the wild. This trend will continue, and even worsen, unless more stringent and corrective measures are not taken.

Indigenous Peoples

The Government of Sri Lanka's Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance (FFPO) identifies the veddah community as indigenous to the country and grants regulated access to PAs for the collection of non-timber products and to fish in tanks located within Sri Lanka's National Parks. However, since the exact locations of the demand-driven interventions under the project cannot be determined at this point in time, the possibility that the project may impact Indigenous Peoples (IPs) cannot be discounted.

Objectives of this report

The main objective of the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) is to ensure that the activities funded under the project do not adversely affect IPs, if present, and that they receive culturally compatible social and economic benefits. If Maduru Oya National Park or Gal Oya National Park are identified for investment, where IPs are identified to be present, the framework will ensure informed, direct participation of the IPs in the proposed activities.

Identifying the Indigenous Peoples related to the project

The two main centers of IP (*veddah*) communities found in the Uva Province are Dambana and Rathugala. The province is made of Moneragala and Badulla districts.

Dambana is accessible from Kandy – Mahiyangana – Ampara road that crosses Dambana junction at a distance of 18 Km east of Mahiyangana, on Ampara road. One has to turn left from Dambana junction and travel about 4 Km to reach Damabana village. Damabana veddah settlement consists of five hamlets at close proximity to each other. They include Dambana, Bimmanamulla, Gurukumbura, Galkadawala and Kotabakini. Together they cover an extent of about 500 acres that form part of Dambana 7A Grama Niladhari (GN) Division of Mahiyangana Divisional Secretariat (DS) Division. The veddah settlements come within Mahiyangana electorate.

Rathugala veddah settlement is located in Madulla DS Division of Moneragala District. It is part of the Galgamuwa GN Division. In terms of electoral districts, Rathugala comes within Bibila electorate. Ampara – Bibila road crosses the village between 27 km post to 31 km post. From Rathugala one has to travel 32 Km to reach Bibila and 50 Km to Madulla. It is the only veddah settlement in the district, and extends over an area of estimated 1000 acres.

In addition to Dambana, there are four other villages inhabited by veddah's in the administrative area of authority under Mahiyangana Divisional Secretariat. These include **Makulugolla** (15 households) and **Watawana** (20 households) in Thalanganumwa GN Division and Kuduwila and Dehigolla in Wevgampaha GN Division. These settlements are accessible from Mahiyangana – Dehiattakandiya road. The distance from Mahiyangana town to the village is about 7 Km. One has to turn off from the 3rd Km post on this road and travel 5 Km interior.

Process to follow in preparing Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP)

Basic Principles. To avoid or minimize adverse impacts and, at the same time, ensure benefits for IPs, the implementing agencies will apply the following basic principles in selection and design of particular activity:

- Ensure that IP communities in general and their organizations are not excluded by any means in activities selection, design and implementation processes.
- Together with IPs, carefully screen the activities for a preliminary understanding of the nature and magnitude of potential impacts and explore alternatives to avoid or minimize any adverse impacts.
- Where alternatives are infeasible and adverse impacts on IPs are unavoidable, the projects together with IPs and others knowledgeable of IP culture and concerns, will immediately make an assessment of the key impact issues.
- The project will undertake the necessary tasks in order to adopt appropriate mitigation measures. The most important in this respect is intensive consultation with the IP communities, community elders/leaders, and formal and informal IP organizations, civil society organizations like NGOs, and others who are interested in and have knowledge of IP issues.

Identifying IP Social Concerns. Impacts on IPs will vary in terms of activities and their scopes, presence and size of IP population in the locales, as well as the magnitude of potential adverse impacts and social risks. To the extent applicable for a particular activity, information on the cultural and socioeconomic characteristics and potential vulnerability will be used to identify the IP social concerns and adopt alternative mitigation measures.

Impact Mitigation & Development Measures. The project will explore, together with the IP communities, the possibilities of reinforcing any existing and promoting new culturally compatible development activities/measures that will benefit the IPs. Such measures may include providing credits where IPs are found to engage in production of marketable goods; basic water supply and sanitation facilities; and those, such as schools, that could also be used by the communities as a whole.

IP Consultation Strategy. As required for informed consultation, concerned institutes will provide IPs with all activity-related information, including that on potential adverse impacts in a language familiar to and understandable by the IPs. To facilitate consultation the institution will,

- Prepare a time-table for dialogues during activity selection, design and implementation processes, and consult them in manners so that they can express their views and preferences freely.
- In addition to the communities in general, consult IP organizations, community elders/leaders and others with adequate gender and generational representation; and civil society organizations like NGOs and groups knowledgeable of IP issues.

Consultation will include the activity objectives and scope; the likely key adverse impacts on (and benefits for) IPs; IPs' own perception of the impacts and feedback; and a preliminary assessment of economic opportunities which the implementing agency could promote – in addition to mitigation of the adverse impacts.

Consultation will in general concentrate on the adverse impacts perceived by the IPs and the probable (and feasible) mitigation measures, as well as exploring additional development activities that could be promoted under the project. The institutes will keep Minutes of these consultation meetings in the activity files and make them available for inspection by the respective Government officials, World Bank and other interested groups and persons.

If the presence of IP is identified in the sub-project area, then an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) will be prepared based on free, prior and informed consultation. This will serve as the basis for sub-project implementation and monitoring.

Preparation of IPP. The IPP should be developed as an integral part of the design of proposed investments and must include the following elements:

- (a) A summary of the social assessment.
- (b) A summary of results of the free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities that was carried out during project preparation and that led to broad community support for the project.
- (c) A framework for ensuring free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities during project implementation
- (d) An action plan of measures to ensure that the Indigenous Peoples receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate, including, if necessary, measures to enhance the capacity of the project implementing agencies.
- (e) When potential adverse effects on Indigenous Peoples are identified, an appropriate action plan of measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for these adverse effects.
- (f) The cost estimates and financing plan for the IPP.
- (g) Accessible procedures appropriate to the project to address grievances by the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities arising from project implementation. When designing the grievance procedures, the borrower takes into account the availability of judicial recourse and customary dispute settlement mechanisms among the Indigenous Peoples.
- (h) Mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to the project for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on the implementation of the IPP. The monitoring and evaluation mechanisms should include arrangements for the free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities.

Disclosure. The Social Assessment and the draft IPP shall be widely disseminated among the IP community using culturally appropriate methods and locations. Local NGOs/CBOs should be involved in the process, which should involve dissemination in local language in easily accessible locations as well as through presentations in public meetings, with facilitated discussions of the plan. The Social Assessment and IPP should be reviewed and cleared by the World Bank and then made available to the public by the PMU and the World Bank both at national and local level.