Dear Colleague,

As this year comes to an end, we are pleased to send you the latest of a series of informal, periodic updates to share information within the growing “community of practice” that includes individuals and organisations interested in the “jurisdictional approach” (JA) to transforming land use practices in Indonesia, with a particular focus on the palm oil sector. Providing support to that community is one of the objectives of a modest project supported by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation as part of the Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA) in Indonesia.

This message includes various updates from initiatives related to JA and links to useful resources that have come to our attention in the past several months, as well as a few events in 2019 relevant to our agenda.

We welcome your feedback and suggestions for items to be included in future updates.

With warm regards,

Frances Seymour
francesjseymour@gmail.com

Leony Aurora
leonyaurora@gmail.com
RECENT JA-RELATED DEVELOPMENTS

The Governors’ Climate and Forest Task Force (GCF-TF) Annual Meeting was held on 10-12 September 2018 in San Francisco, the United States. GCF-TF members approved a set of guiding principles for collaboration and partnerships between subnational governments, indigenous peoples (IPs), and forest communities to address deforestation and climate change. The principles include recognition of the rights and contributions of IPs and forest communities, as well as the importance of working with governments at all level to secure territorial and human rights as well as benefits from forest conservation. At the event, Amazonian governors also signed the San Francisco Declaration, in which they commit to working together to implement actions against climate change and deforestation in their jurisdictions.

On 13 September 2018, at the Global Climate Action Summit (GCAS) in San Francisco, Unilever and Walmart announced sustainability initiatives to promote the jurisdictional approach. Unilever will be supporting Forever Sabah, World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Malaysia and the PONGO Alliance to certify 60,000 hectares of oil palm, benefiting 200 to 300 farmers. The program will assist Sabah’s vision to be 100% certified by the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) by 2025. Walmart is collaborating with Conservation International (CI), Environmental Defense Fund, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and WWF to identify jurisdictions with deforestation risk and assist suppliers sourcing from these areas to support multi-stakeholder efforts. The collaboration is part of Walmart’s Project Gigaton, which seeks to reduce emissions by 1 Gt by 2030.

On 19 and 20 September 2018, the Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods (CSL) held a planning workshop in Medan aimed to promote collaboration for sustainability and gain inputs to shape the Coalition, which focuses on driving sustainable agriculture production in North Sumatra and Aceh provinces. About 130 representatives from government, private sector, civil society and smallholders/farmers’ organisations attended. Participants agreed on a common objective to strengthen farmer livelihoods, the importance of building solutions with government and aligning with programs such as the Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil and the National Action Plan for Sustainable Palm Oil, and to implement a two-pronged strategy of landscape-level initiatives and provincial-level dialogue and policy engagement. CSL’s initial supporting partners, namely CI, Danone, IDH, The Livelihoods Fund, Mars Wrigley Confectionary, Mondelēz International, PepsiCo, The Forest Trust, and UNDP, hosted the event. The workshop’s report is available here. A factsheet on CSL is available here and FAQ here.

On 7 to 10 October 2018, the International Conference on Biodiversity, Ecotourism, and Creative Economy (ICBE) Conference was held in Manokwari, West Papua. The conference concluded with the signing of the Manokwari Declaration (see Annex, in Indonesian) by representatives of the provincial governments of West Papua and Papua as well as civil society organisations, international development organisations, and companies. The declaration reiterated West Papua’s
commitment to revise its spatial plan to accommodate 70% of its area as protected area, and issued a special regulation on sustainable development. The governments of West Papua and Papua also signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to align their vision for sustainable development.

On 1 November 2018, Siak District Government convened a multi-stakeholder meeting attended by proponents of a jurisdictional approach to development in the district in Riau. These included representatives of Golden Agri Resources (GAR), Musim Mas, Perkumpulan Elang, Jikalahari, Winrock International, Walhi Riau chapter, Sustainable Districts Association (Lingkar Temu Kabupaten Lestari or LTKL), the Packard Foundation, and CLUA. Representatives of Neste and Unilever joined the meeting via Skype. Alfredi, Vice District Head of Siak who will assume the position of District Head in a few months, presented the green vision of the district. It was agreed that the stakeholders would provide inputs on the roadmap for Green Siak, currently being developed and expected to be finalised in March. Once final, the roadmap will be incorporated into the district’s revised Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD), in time for the change of leadership in the district.

At the sidelines of the annual meeting of the RSPO in November, LTKL held a discussion on JA attended by representatives from Musi Banyuasin, Siak, Rokan Hulu, and Sintang districts in Indonesia, Sabah from Malaysia, and Papua New Guinea. Participants in the meeting included representatives of the RSPO, the European Palm Oil Alliance (EPOA), GAR, Musim Mas, Neste, Winrock and CI. Vice Bupati of Musi Banyuasin Beni Hernedi representing LTKL said there were about 1 million palm oil smallholders in member districts, and a major challenge was to ensure that the districts’ green visions could survive political cycles. RSPO’s CEO Darrel Webber saw JA as an opportunity for the organisation to make greater impact and has formed a Working Group to develop jurisdictional certification.

The RSPO Annual Meeting on 15 November 2018 also featured a plenary session on Building Support for Jurisdictional Approaches. Speakers included representatives from Unilever, who highlighted their investment to support JA in Central Kalimantan, Sabah, North Sumatra, and Aceh; WWF Singapore on the opportunities for the banking sector to engage and be supportive of JA; and Robeco Asset Management, who provided an investor’s perspective and expectations on JA and how investors can support the approach.

On 15 November 2018 in Utrecht, the Netherlands, IDH Sustainable Trade Initiative launched the Verified Sourcing Area (VSA) concept, which is intended to help companies and other stakeholders track progress toward sustainability targets at jurisdictional scale. The first readiness pilot under VSA is in Mato Grosso state in Brazil while another pilot is being developed in Aceh. The VSA Global Steering Committee, comprising industry leaders, civil society, experts, and government representatives, held its first in-person meeting, and is providing guidance on development of the concept.

On 31 October and 29 November 2018, the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation held a series of workshops to develop Theories of Change (ToC) for JA related to the sourcing of commodities by companies with commitments to no deforestation. The first workshop used the development of JA with cocoa in West Africa as an entry point for identifying key factors. Representatives of various organisations implementing JA and related activities in Indonesia, including CI, Earth Innovation Institute, IDH, Rainforest Alliance, and TNC participated in one or both of the meetings, as did representatives of other donor organisations,
ProForest, and Mars, which is also co-chairing a relevant task force for the Consumer Goods Forum. A summary of the discussions in the meeting in October and the draft ToCs developed then are in the Annex.

In November 2018, the Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA) 2020 in partnership with the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) launched a research project that aims to understand where and how supply chain companies can constructively engage to drive transformational impact on reducing deforestation. The research, supported by AlphaBeta, focuses on key subnational production regions for deforestation-related commodities, including palm oil, timber, cattle, soybean, cacao and coffee. It will then examine the overlap of these production centres with current jurisdictional programmes and identify priority regions where companies could engage to reduce deforestation. The study will highlight both high-risk regions within companies’ supply chains and new regions to engage, and how to best create sustainable supply chain interventions in these regions. The research findings are expected to be finalised in March 2019. For further information on the study or to provide input, please contact Konstantin Matthies at konstantin.matthies@alphabeta.com.

On 11 December 2018, the Government of Indonesia launched the One Map Policy Geoportal to be used as reference for land use planning by all ministries, state agencies, and local governments. About 98% of the thematic maps have been compiled, except the maps for marine area spatial plans and village borders. The process to integrate these maps onto the basic topographic map has reached 80-95% across various major islands, according to a report from the Coordinating Ministry for Economy at the launch. The last phase of One Map Policy, i.e. the “synchronization” to provide the definitive “clean and clear” boundaries, will require the government to resolve overlapping claims in an estimated 10.4 million hectares in Kalimantan and 6.5 million hectares in Sumatra. Guidelines have been issued to assist ministries and local governments to address and resolve these claims. Access to the geoportal will be limited to relevant government agencies.

**PUBLICATIONS, VIDEOS, AND OTHER RESOURCES**

- **The Landscape Standard: A Global Framework to Drive Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability in Productive Landscapes,** May 2018 (see Annex). The brief document highlights the idea to develop a global framework to measure progress of landscape-level sustainability over time. The Landscape Standard is being developed and managed collaboratively by Verra, Rainforest Alliance and the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) in partnership with the International Union for Conservation of Nature, Nature Conservation and Research Center, Proforest, and Solidaridad, with input from a broad range of stakeholders.

- **Enhancing Accessibility of Information on Jurisdictional Approaches to Reducing Deforestation and Sustainable Development,** Durbin, J., CCBA, May 2018 (see Annex). The document provides a summary of JA as a way to start developing shared understanding on what information is needed for investment in the approach. The document also includes
annexes that include comprehensive lists of existing global platforms and other resources providing information related to JA.

- **Summary Report: Exploring the Reality of the Jurisdictional Approach as a Tool to Achieve Sustainability Commitments in Palm Oil and Soy Supply Chains**, Conservation International (CI), July 2018. The study confirms that JA has significant potential to increase government engagement and leadership, particularly in a small number of commodity-producing jurisdictions. However, the current reward is not sufficient to balance the risk of halting deforestation. The research concludes, among others, that to ensure that JA can reduce deforestation, sustainability needs to be made more relevant and meaningful to all producing jurisdictions. A full report of the study, which is based on interviews with private sector, government, and civil society stakeholders, will be published in early 2019.

- **The State of Jurisdictional Sustainability: Synthesis for Practitioners and Policymakers**, Stickler, C.M., et al., September 2018. This is a full report of a study conducted by Earth Innovation Institute, Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), and the Governors’ Climate and Forests Task Force (GCF-TF) that looked into 39 states and provinces in 12 tropical countries, including seven provinces in Indonesia. About half of the jurisdictions studied had reduced deforestation below their official projected Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL). These include Aceh, Central Kalimantan, East Kalimantan, and Papua provinces in Indonesia. The study concluded that “Jurisdiction-wide zero net deforestation is the most likely scenario for achieving the New York Declaration on Forests 2030 goal of ending tropical deforestation”. However, it also found that only five jurisdictions have entered into formal commodity sourcing agreements with companies, and even as more than USD10 million climate finance has come in to more than half of the jurisdictions studied, most has not been linked to performance in reducing deforestation. For a summary of the study, read this [blog](#).

- **Final Report: Understanding Urban Youth’s Perception on Forests in Indonesia and Discovering the Right Narratives to Engage Them on Forest Protection**, Eye to Eye and Communication for Change, November 2018 (see Annex). The qualitative study focused on urbanites between the age of 15 and 40 years old in Indonesia based on focus group discussions convened in six cities across the archipelago. The study found that residents of cities closer to forests have a deeper connection and understanding on how forests benefit
them. Significant divergences across different cities, influenced by the perceived scale of the deforestation problem, sense of agency to be able to do something about it, and desire to act, suggest that tailored communications strategies will need to be developed for specific jurisdictions for effective public engagement.

- **Terpercaya Study Second Brief: Bridging Indonesian Laws, the SDGs and Commodity Certification Criteria for Defining District Sustainability.** Institute Penelitian Inovasi Bumi (INOBU) and the European Forest Institute, November 2018. The Terpercaya study aims to track sustainable palm oil and define jurisdictional sustainability at scale. The brief highlights the potential of the Sustainable Development Goals’ (SDGs) targets and indicators to be used to define and measure jurisdictional sustainability. Such an approach would utilise the similarities and overlaps between SDGs, the principles and criteria of commodity certification schemes, and Indonesian laws and regulations.

- **Development of a Landscape Programme in Siak and Pelalawan, Indonesia: Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration to Achieve Sustainable Land Use.** Proforest and Daemeter Consulting, November 2018 (see Annex). The brief highlights a landscape programme for sustainable palm oil in Siak and Pelalawan districts in Riau involving Cargill, Danone, Golden Agri-Resources, Musim Mas, Neste, PepsiCo, and Unilever. The programme aims to transition large parts of both districts towards producing deforestation and exploitation free palm oil. It will build on existing initiatives, such as Siak Green with Sedagho Siak and LTKL, the Forum on Sustainable Palm Oil (Foksbi) platform in Pelalawan, and other private and donor-facilitated projects. Phase 1 of the programme, to be completed in April 2019, will produce (1) a map of the production base, key stakeholders, and existing initiatives; (2) clear boundaries of priority areas; (3) identification of gaps to address root causes of the main challenges; and (4) agreement on goals and objectives of the intervention.

**LOOKING AHEAD**

- Marking the end of the current phase of a program to develop a community of practice for JA under a grant from Packard Foundation, a convening to take stock of JA progress in Indonesia and discussion of next steps is expected to take place in Jakarta in February 2019. The small 1.5-day workshop will bring together selected JA thought leaders and practitioners from among Packard/CLUA grantees and commodity supply chain companies.

- Sustainable Districts Association LTKL plans to hold its Annual Meeting in Jakarta in February 2019. In the meeting, member districts of LTKL as well as partner organisations will decide on strategic programs for 2019 and may welcome new members and/or partners.
Enhancing accessibility of information on jurisdictional approaches to reducing deforestation and sustainable development

1. What are jurisdictional approaches and why make information on them more accessible

Going beyond supply chains to reduce deforestation

There is growing agreement on the importance of reducing deforestation to combat climate change and to maintain all the other ecosystem services and benefits that derive from forests. Recognising that agriculture is responsible for the majority of tropical deforestation, in large part driven by a few commodities (palm oil, soy, wood products and beef), many companies are showing leadership. Around 470 of the 800 companies tracked by supplychange.org have made commitments to address deforestation in their supply chains.

Despite these commitments and associated efforts from many companies to reduce deforestation in their supply chains, results are patchy and forest clearance continues apace. It is increasingly clear that deforestation cannot be addressed only through supply chain commitments and certification. There needs to be a broader integrated landscape approach addressing the interests of all stakeholders, identifying and managing tradeoffs through agreed landscape-level goals, strategies and land use plans.

Promoting and supporting jurisdictional approaches

While involvement of all stakeholders who can influence or are affected by deforestation and land use change is important, government commitment is key. Governments can play a critical role as a convener, coordinator, legislator and enforcer. There is growing awareness of the value of ‘jurisdictional approaches’ involving government leadership at sub-national level. Examples of such initiatives are emerging, where governments and their partners are actively seeking investment and partnerships to advance their goals, and where companies are starting to engage in jurisdictional approaches. Partnership and engagement in jurisdictional approaches can take many forms, supporting the goals and plans of the jurisdictional approach in different ways.

While there may be growing interest in jurisdictional approaches, companies are not always clear on how or where to engage. They need information about what progress is being made where on jurisdictional approaches, how they can engage, and who they can contact to find out more. On the other hand, much information exists about ongoing jurisdictional approaches but can be hard to find on different websites in different formats using different terminology.

Making information on jurisdictional approaches more accessible

This document summarises discussions and analysis conducted as part of an initiative that aims to make information about jurisdictional approaches to reducing deforestation and sustainable development accessible to companies and institutions to facilitate their partnership and investment.

A group of organizations have started to collaborate including the Climate Community & Biodiversity Alliance, Conservation International, Proforest, Earth Innovation Institute, Governor’s Climate and Forests Task Force, United States State Department, World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, Global Canopy Programme, World Wildlife Fund, The Nature Conservancy, CDP, CIFOR, World Resources Institute and the European Forestry Institute. Members of this group met at Conservation International’s office in Arlington, Virginia, USA on 16 February 2018 to share information about
platforms they are involved in related to jurisdictional approaches and to start developing the following shared understanding of information needed for investment in jurisdictional approaches as a start towards greater accessibility.

Clarifying ‘jurisdictional approaches’ in the context of this initiative

The Little Sustainable Landscapes Book provides a commonly used conceptual framework for landscape approaches and integrated land management that involves collaboration among multiple stakeholders, with the purpose of reconciling competing social, economic and environmental objectives to achieve sustainable landscapes. These landscape approaches seek to move away from the often-unsustainable sectoral approach to land management and aim to support local level needs and action while also considering goals and outcomes important to stakeholders outside the landscape.

Jurisdictional approaches are widely understood to be a type of landscape approach that uses government administrative boundaries, primarily sub-national, to define the scope of action and involvement of stakeholders. They involve active government engagement for example through policies, regulations, fiscal incentives, land use and action planning, enforcement and/or monitoring. See Annex 1 for a list of resource materials about jurisdictional approaches.

Key characteristics of a jurisdictional approach

- Integrated landscape approach
  - Participation from multiple stakeholders or sectors across sectors and levels
  - To reconcile competing social, economic and environmental objectives
  - In pursuit of agreed sustainable landscape goals
- Administrative boundary
- Active government engagement (policies, regulations, land use and action planning, enforcement, monitoring, etc.)

Elements of a jurisdictional approach

Five key elements of integrated landscape management identified in the Little Sustainable Landscapes Book provide a useful framework to understand the potential entry points for partners or investors in a jurisdictional approach (Figure 1).

The process and the elements will differ in each place, recognizing that jurisdictional approaches build on existing elements through an iterative process of analysis, consultations and adaptive management. These elements are rarely developed sequentially. Several sub-elements are likely to be in various stages of development and implementation at any one time.

---

2. Why and how should companies/investors engage in jurisdictional approaches

**Why should companies/investors engage in jurisdictional approaches**

Jurisdictional approaches can provide a variety of benefits to companies and investors including:

- Addressing landscape-level issues beyond the reach of existing supply chain approaches and farm-level certification
- Improving environmental and social performance in the supply chain and reducing reputational risks related to deforestation, biodiversity, social conflicts and human rights
- Reducing costs and enhancing coverage of certification, for example by building capacity of smallholders and other producers
- Sharing costs of credible monitoring, potentially including third-party verification
- Providing government support for difficult issues that a company cannot address on their own
- Creating a pre-competitive space for companies to collaborate on common interests
-Maintaining quantity and quality of supply of critical resources not easily sourced elsewhere
- Building longer term relationships and trust with stakeholders in the area

Table 1. summarises potential motivations to engage in jurisdictional approaches for companies that:

- ‘source from’ a region, those further downstream in the supply chain, including those sourcing agricultural commodities, forest products, oil and gas and other export commodities;

---

• ‘produce in’ the area, further upstream in the supply chain, including any business with fixed assets in an area that depend on land and resources including agribusiness, hydroelectric or ecotourism companies;
• private sector finance organisations such as impact investors looking for returns that also bring demonstrable social and/or environmental benefits;
• commercial banks looking for returns; and
• international public sector finance organisations including development finance institutions and bilateral aid agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of company/institution</th>
<th>Private sector commodity supply chains</th>
<th>Private sector finance</th>
<th>International public sector finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source from</td>
<td>Produce in</td>
<td>Impact investors</td>
<td>Commercial banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential benefits of a jurisdictional approach</td>
<td>Maintain quantity/quality of supply - Reduce costs of meeting sustainability commitments - Reduce reputational risks - Enhance social and environmental impacts</td>
<td>- Reduce costs of production and sustainability commitments - Reduce costs of monitoring benefits and impacts - Market differentiation - Reduce reputational and production risks - License to operate and improved relations with local stakeholders</td>
<td>- Increase opportunities for investment in sustainable practices - Enhance social and environmental impacts, direct and indirect - Reduce costs of monitoring investment impact - Reduce financial and reputational risks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of potential benefits for companies/investors from engaging in a jurisdictional approach

How can companies/investors support a jurisdictional approach
Companies and financial institutions can participate in jurisdictional approaches in many different ways, for example by incentivizing, advocating for, aligning with, participating in, facilitating, or financing of different elements of a jurisdictional approach. Table 2 provides a summary of some ways that different types of company may potentially engage depending on their role in the landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of company/institution</th>
<th>Source from</th>
<th>Produce in</th>
<th>Impact investors</th>
<th>Commercial banks</th>
<th>Development finance institutions, bilateral aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of engagement</td>
<td>Preferential sourcing - Offtake agreement - Signals/advocacy - Finance</td>
<td>Advocacy - Alignment - Participation - Facilitation - Finance</td>
<td>Signals/advocacy - Align investments - Finance (debt or equity) for sustainable production and ecosystem services</td>
<td>Finance (debt) for sustainable production (e.g. at reduced interest rates)</td>
<td>Finance (grants or loans) for enabling conditions - Finance to reduce risk for private sector (e.g. guarantees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of ways that companies/investors may engage with a jurisdictional approach
Jurisdictional approaches that are already showing results may be recognized and rewarded through preferential sourcing and offtake agreements from sourcing companies and/or easier access to credit from commercial banks. However, changing sourcing patterns is very slow, which may reduce the effectiveness of future preferential sourcing as an incentive for earlier phases of jurisdictional approaches. Therefore, jurisdictional approaches that are not yet showing results but are taking promising steps in development and implementation should also be recognized and supported. Recognition of interim steps in adoption and implementation of a jurisdictional approach can provide important support and incentives for actors within the landscape to continue investing in the process. Companies should consider other forms of engagement rather than waiting for results before initiating preferential sourcing or other investments. In particular, companies that produce in the jurisdiction or public finance institutions can support or collaborate on design elements of a jurisdictional approach, and impact investors can invest in implementation of strategies and actions that contribute to shifting towards greater landscape sustainability. Sourcing companies can also get involved in supporting design and implementation of jurisdictional approaches, noting that it will not be helpful if responsible companies flee from poorer performing jurisdictions.

3. What information can facilitate engagement in jurisdictional approaches

**Key information for companies/investors to engage with jurisdictional approaches**

Companies and institutions need synthesized information to assess risks and opportunities and to make the business case for engaging in a jurisdictional approach. The following types of information were identified as potentially important by participants in the meeting on 16 February.

**Deforestation (and/or conversion of other priority ecosystem)**
- Annual deforestation rate, trend and comparison against 10-year historical average or other approved reference level
- Ranking of commodity production/sector as a driver of deforestation
- Credibility of deforestation monitoring in terms of accuracy, credibility of source, regularly updated, independently verified

**Commodities**
- Status and trends of
  - Price
  - Quality
  - Quantity produced in the jurisdiction
  - Yield and comparison with national/global
  - Standards used – total/proportion of jurisdictional production under each standard

**Government engagement**
- Level of endorsement/ownership of jurisdictional approach by government
- Institutional roles and responsibilities for jurisdictional approach

**Policies, laws, plans**
- Goals and strategies of the jurisdictional approach
- Policies, laws and plans that support or conflict with the jurisdictional approach
Stakeholders
- Main buyers – commodities, volumes, sustainability commitments
- Main producers, including smallholders – commodities, volumes, sustainability commitments
- Mapping of stakeholders affected by or with influence on jurisdictional approach
- Stakeholder platforms/engagement mechanisms
- Initiatives related to jurisdictional approach – activities, time frame, geographic coverage, organization, contact details, reputation

Legality/rights
- Level of illegality/corruption in commodity production/sector
- Existence of forced/child labor in commodity production/sector
- Land conflicts
- Land tenure clarity and maps. Presence/prevalence of overlapping rights
- Grievance mechanisms
- Gender-differentiated impacts, inclusion of women

Opportunities for engagement
- Investment opportunities
- Sourcing opportunities
- Infrastructure – access, ports, roads
- Public/private finance/incentives/technical support available for producers

4. Where can information about jurisdictional approaches be found

Addressing accessibility challenges for information on jurisdictional approaches
Quite a lot of information already exists about ongoing jurisdictional approaches on different platforms, but companies may not know where to look. This paper starts to address that issue by listing below some of the places where information can be found. Further, Annex 2 provides a summary to help identify which platform is most relevant, by listing objectives, information provided, geographical coverage, data sources and quality control and plans for further development.

This does not address other accessibility challenges, including the fact that information provided is not consistent and does not use the same terminology, sometimes using inaccessible language and jargon. In addition, much relevant information is hidden in documents and not easy to search for. Another complicating factor is that information in developing countries may not be public or accessible on internet and, in some cases, governments are not used to or comfortable with sharing information. Beyond listing below the places where information can currently be found, this group plans to explore other ways to make the information more accessible.

Feedback and participation
Companies and investors that are interested in using information about jurisdictional approaches and other interested parties are invited to provide feedback on this document, in particular on the list of key information that will help them to engage with jurisdictional approaches. This will be used for a gap analysis of existing information and to explore options to improve accessibility. Please send comments and get in touch with Joanna Durbin, CCBA jdurbin@climate-standards.org if you would like to participate in further work on this topic or stay informed of further outputs from this initiative.
Platforms that provide information about ongoing jurisdictional approaches

- GCF Impact Platform
- EII Produce-Protect Platform
- GCF Knowledge Database
- Commodities-Jurisdictions Database
- FCPF Carbon Fund
- Biocarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes
- CI Landscape Assessment Framework
- WWF Landscape Finance Lab
- IDH Landscape Initiatives
- &green Fund
- Map of Global Integrated Landscape Initiative Survey Data
- CIFOR Global Comparative Study on REDD+
- The Landscape Standard
- International database on REDD+ projects and programs (ID-RECCO)

Related initiatives that could link to information on jurisdictional approaches

The following platforms provide related information that could link to information on jurisdictional approaches. Links to the platform, contact details and information on their objectives, information provided, geographical coverage, how it relates to jurisdictional approaches and plans for further development are provided in Annex 3.

- Trase
- Global Forest Watch Pro
- TFA Mapping of Partner Initiatives
- New York Declaration on Forests Global Platform
- Forest 500
- CDP Forests
- Supply-change.org
- Global Map of Environmental and Social Risks in Agro-commodity Production (GMAP)

Annex 1. Resources on jurisdictional approaches
Annex 2. Platforms providing information about jurisdictional approaches
Annex 3. Platforms providing information relevant to jurisdictional approaches
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Information on jurisdictional approaches

Annex 1. Resources on jurisdictional approaches

The full document is available here. Please contact Joanna Durbin jdurbin@climate-standards.org with comments or suggestions of resources to add to this list.

- **Jurisdictional Sustainability: A primer for practitioners.** Forest, Farm and Finance Initiative (FFFI) led by Earth Innovation Institute (EII) (2016).
- **Fostering Low-Emission Rural Development from the Ground Up.** Sustainable Tropics Alliance (STA) led by EII (2012)
- **Introduction to landscape or jurisdictional initiatives in commodity agriculture.** Proforest (2016).
- **Implementing responsible sourcing – using landscape or jurisdictional initiatives.** Proforest (2016).
- **Supporting jurisdictional leadership in net zero deforestation through sustainable value chains: Opportunities for TFA 2020.** Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA) (2017).
- **Jurisdictional Approaches to Reducing Palm Oil Driven Deforestation in Indonesia: Scoping study of design considerations and geographic priorities.** Daemeter (2016).
- **Engaging the Private Sector in Results-based Landscape Programs: Early Lessons from the World Bank’s Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and Landscapes Climate Finance Funds.** World Bank (2017).
- **Business for Sustainable Landscapes: An action agenda for sustainable development.** Landscapes for People, Food and Nature (2017).
- Zero deforestation and low emissions development: public and private institutional arrangements under jurisdictional approaches. CIFOR and Wageningen University and Research (WUR) (2017).
Information on jurisdictional approaches

Annex 2. Platforms providing information about jurisdictional approaches

The following platforms have been identified that provide information on existing or planned jurisdictional approaches. Links to the platforms, contact details and information on their objectives, information provided, geographical coverage, data sources and quality control and plans for further development are provided below.

- GCF Impact Platform
- EII Produce-Protect Platform
- GCF Knowledge Database
- Commodities-Jurisdictions Database
- FCPF Carbon Fund
- Biocarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes
- CI Landscape Assessment Framework
- WWF Landscape Finance Lab
- IDH Landscape Initiatives
- &green Fund
- Map of Global Integrated Landscape Initiative Survey Data
- CIFOR Global Comparative Study on REDD+
- The Landscape Standard
- International database on REDD+ projects and programs (ID-RECCO)

If you are responsible for one of the platforms included in this document, please go ahead and edit this document to keep it up to date. The full document is available here. Please contact Joanna Durbin jdurbin@climate-standards.org with comments or suggestions of additional platforms to add to this list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Information included</th>
<th>Geographical coverage</th>
<th>Data source &amp; quality control</th>
<th>Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation &amp; Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| GCF Impact Platform  
http://gcfimpact.org/  
Earth Innovation Institute (EII)  
Juan Ardila  
jardila@earthinnovation.org | Help GCF States find Markets for their Products and investors for their Enterprises.  
Provide interactive functionality to find jurisdictions, find products and find sustainable projects. Users can identify investment opportunities based on defined criteria.  
Data on production and land area of 60+ tropical agricultural products (2000-2016)  
Social and forest governance indicators, demographics, human development index, life expectancy, education, GDP, GINI, indigenous territories, protected areas, rural and urban population.  
Forestry indicators: forest cover, deforestation, carbon stocks, carbon emissions, reference base lines, avoided deforestation, land cover areas  
Data available in the form of jurisdictional profiles and interactive country maps. | 55 second order jurisdictions (departments/states in Brazil, Peru, Mexico, Colombia, Indonesia, Ecuador).  
1500+ third order jurisdictions (districts/municipalities). Nested within departments above. | Official data from national monitoring systems, ministries of agriculture, forestry, economy, national statistical offices.  
Integrate Mexico to the platform. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produce Protect Platform - Jurisdictional Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://produceprotectplatform.com">http://produceprotectplatform.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Ardila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jardila@earthinnovation.org">jardila@earthinnovation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bottom-up approach to create tailored jurisdictional monitoring platforms covering statewide initiatives in Mato Grosso, Acre, San Martin and Ucayali.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A monitoring platform for the jurisdictions - tracks transition towards a green economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators contrasted with jurisdictional policies and goals. Dashboards on progress towards policy targets (environmental, production, social, governance) by municipality/department;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Jurisdictional profiles with data and interactive maps on environment (forest cover, deforestation rates and emissions reductions), production (production and land area for main agricultural and livestock), social (demographics, human development index, life expectancy, education, GDP, GINI) and governance (indigenous populations and territories, protected areas)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 jurisdictions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Mato Grosso, Brazil (PCI strategy, Soja Plus program)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Acre, Brazil (Live-Produce-ConservE Strategy, State Incentives for Ecosystem Services - SISA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- San Martin, Peru</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Ucayali, Peru</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official data from PRODES, IBGE, Ministry of Environment (Peru and Brazil), SEMA, Sojaplus, CAR,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add new investment opportunities to the current territorial initiatives.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Looking into developing/adjusting for specific platforms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors’ Climate and Forest (GCF) Knowledge Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.gcftaskforce-database.org/">http://www.gcftaskforce-database.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

. Promote transparency and information/knowledge exchange on legal/policy/institutional architecture of jurisdictional programs. Track progress on 150+ initiatives submitted to the Balikpapan Challenge as they move to implementation.

Aims to increase transparency within the network, track progress of jurisdictional programs within the network, improve knowledge management and exchange

-Current status and trends on land use and deforestation;
-forest carbon accounting efforts and methodologies;
-Structure of REDD/LED policy and institutional framework; and
-Individual Partnerships and ongoing initiatives within jurisdictional program

GCF member jurisdictions:
8 States in Brazil
7 Provinces in Indonesia
6 States in Mexico
7 Regions in Peru
1 State in Colombia
2 States in Ivory Coast
1 State in Nigeria

32 in total - Will increase to 35 in 2018, including 1 province in Ecuador

Information provided by jurisdictional governments and vetted by GCF Secretariat.
| Commodities-Jurisdictions Database | Facilitate preferential commodity sourcing by companies from jurisdictions effectively implementing programs that reduce deforestation and associated emissions. | Information on jurisdictions that meet eligibility criteria (emissions reductions, deforestation rates, stakeholder engagement, safeguards etc), and the commodities they produce (quality criteria, production info, commodity-specific contacts.) | Global, once jurisdictions meet the specified criteria. (First qualifying jurisdictions expected early 2018.) | Summarised information and links to jurisdictional program documentation, verified to a standard approved through independent assessment to meet the eligibility criteria (so far FCPF Carbon Fund Methodological Framework and Verified Carbon Standard Jurisdictional and Nested REDD+). Independent assessment process for jurisdictions not working with approved standards. In all cases, deforestation and emissions reductions analysis is verified by independent 3rd party. | 19 jurisdictions in pipeline for FCPF CF in Cameroon Chile Costa Rica Cote d’Ivoire Dominican Republic DRC Fiji Ghana Guatemala Indonesia Lao PDR Madagascar Mexico Mozambique Nepal Nicaragua Peru Republic of Congo Vietnam. Additional programs working with VCS, bilateral partnerships, other multilateral partnerships. |
| https://commoditiesjurisdictions.wordpress.com/ | Marks & Spencer, Unilever, independent brain trust of experts | Chris Dragisic draisiccd@state.gov | | | |
| Forest Carbon Partnership Facility - Carbon Fund |
| https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/redd-countries-1 |
| World Bank |
| Tracy Johns |
| tjohns@worldbank.org |

Support the development of jurisdictional REDD+ programs. Assess and approve eligibility of jurisdictional emissions reductions (REDD+) program for results-based finance from FCPF Carbon Fund (CF). Pay for, and transfer, emissions reductions from accepted programs.

Detailed information in Emissions Reductions Program Documents (ERPDs) and monitoring reports on all criteria of the CF methodological framework including on:
- Forest cover, deforestation rates and emissions reductions
- Safeguards and non-carbon benefits
- Strategies to reduce deforestation
- Land tenure
- Legal and institutional frameworks
- Monitoring and MRV
- Budget and financing plan

ERPDs for 19 jurisdictions in pipeline for FCPF CF of which 8 have been approved for negotiation of emissions reductions purchase agreements.

Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cote d’Ivoire, Dominican Republic, DRC, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Mexico, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Peru, Republic of Congo, Vietnam

Jurisdictional program information is assessed by World Bank and independent Technical Advisory Panel prior to approval by CF participants.

Plans - country page in a redesigned website has covered, ER expected etc. and less detailed ERPIN info. Also planning to take most information most interesting for private sector to create separate documents - working on a template.
<p>| BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes | Share plans and progress on jurisdictional integrated landscape programs that reduce emissions from the land sector, from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD+), and from sustainable agriculture, as well as smarter land-use planning, policies and practices. Provide up-front grants to support the development of enabling environments. Support private sector partnerships consistent with jurisdictional land use and emission reduction objectives. Pay for, and transfer, emissions reductions from accepted programs. | Various program documents including (once available) - documentation for World Bank support (project document, appraisal, integrated safeguards data sheet etc) - news on private sector partnerships - brochures - monitoring and accounting can go beyond forest sector to include agriculture | 5 jurisdictions in development: - Eastern Province, Zambia - Oromia, Ethiopia - Orinoquia, Colombia - Jambi, Indonesia - several provinces, Mexico | Information prepared by the World Bank, jurisdictional and national governments, and their partners | 5 jurisdictions: Colombia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Mexico, Zambia |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Assessment Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.conservation.org/projects/Pages/Landscape-Assessment-Framework">https://www.conservation.org/projects/Pages/Landscape-Assessment-Framework</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact: Fabiano Godoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:fgodoy@conservation.org">fgodoy@conservation.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Communicate progress towards tailored landscape sustainability goals for adaptive management by stakeholders in the landscape and to facilitate partnerships and investment in support of the goals.

- Information varies according to goals and strategies defined by stakeholders across:
  - natural capital (eg. forest cover, deforestation rates, fragmentation, fires),
  - production (eg. yields of key crops),
  - human well-being (eg. household income, human development index, progress out of poverty) and
  - governance (eg. Sustainable Landscapes Rating Tool on land use planning, land tenure, stakeholder participation etc.)

- 6 landscape initiatives:
  - Alto Mayo, San Martin, Peru
  - North Sumatra, Indonesia
  - Mandailing Natal, Indonesia
  - Jinotega, Nicaragua
  - Octepeque, Honduras
  - Rupununi, Guyana

- Published national and sub-national data

- Additional in 2018 to include:
  - West Papua, Indonesia
  - Bogota, Colombia
  - Northwest Liberia
  - CAZ and COFAV, Madagascar
| **Landscape Finance Lab**<br>http://www.landscapefinancelab.org/home/ | Support WWF teams in designing and securing investment and partnerships for large-scale landscape programmes using innovative finance mechanisms | Landscape initiative vision, goals, strategies, resources needs and investment opportunities | 15 landscape initiatives in:<br>- Brazil<br>- Tanzania<br>- Malaysia<br>- Sumatra, Indonesia<br>- Fiji<br>- Georgia<br>- Paraguay<br>- Nepal<br>- Myanmar<br>- DRC<br>- Madagascar<br>- Cameroon/Gabon/Republic of Congo 23 landscapes in the pipeline in 17 countries | Information developed by WWF staff and partners, and reviewed by WWF experts | Lab will be launched for public access in 2018 |
| WWF | Paul Chatterton | pc@wwf.at | | | |
| IDH Landscape Initiatives | Share plans and progress on the joint design, co-funding and prototyping of new economically viable approaches to realize green & inclusive growth at scale in commodity sectors and sourcing areas | Various information including (where available):  
- areas under different land use  
- goals and strategy of the initiative  
- fact sheets  
- progress reports | 12 landscape/jurisdictional initiatives:  
- SW Mau Forest, Kenya  
- Mato Grosso, Brazil  
- Wider Tai Forest Area, Cote d'Ivoire  
- West Kalimantan, Indonesia  
- South Sumatra, Indonesia  
- Aceh, Indonesia  
- Jambi, Indonesia  
- Central Highlands, Vietnam  
- Central Rift Valley, Ethiopia  
- South Eastern Liberia  
- Western Liberia  
- Nimba, Liberia | Information developed by IDH, government and their partners |
| **&green Fund Jurisdictional Assessments** | Demonstrate that jurisdictions meet &green Fund’s Jurisdictional Eligibility Criteria showing that local authorities are committed to reducing deforestation, and are actively taking steps to work with the private sector, communities and civil society to protect forest and peatlands. | - Scope: amount and quality of forest and/or peatland potential of the jurisdiction is globally significant  
- Ambition and strategy: quantitative target against historic rates of gross deforestation, and a feasible strategy to reduce deforestation adopted and approved for the jurisdiction. Developed through an inclusive multi-stakeholder consultation process – Progress reports towards milestones of the strategy, including transparent monitoring, reporting and verification of deforestation  
- Social and environmental safeguards | 4 approved jurisdictions:  
- Mato Grosso, Brazil  
- Jambi, Indonesia  
- South Sumatra, Indonesia  
- Liberia | Assessments are approved by &green Fund Advisory Board. Deforestation information is independently verified. |
| **Map of Global Integrated Landscape Initiative Survey Data**  
Landscapes for People, Food and Nature - includes many partners  
Secretariat - EcoAgriculture Partners | Enable governments, donors, and international NGOs to identify potential knowledge partners for scaling up or designing integrated landscape approaches in particular places, or to recruit participants for regional or global knowledge sharing activities | Details about who is participating, what investments the initiative has made, and what outcomes initiative leaders report, as well as biophysical data like the approximate size and population of the landscape, and its primary ecosystem and production system types, are all available by sorting and clicking points on the map. | More than 360 integrated landscape initiatives across Asia, Latin America and Africa | Studies undertaken by Landscapes for People, Food and Nature Initiative Partners from 2013 to 2015 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Global Comparative Study on REDD+**  
[https://www.cifor.org/gcs/about-gcs-redd/](https://www.cifor.org/gcs/about-gcs-redd/)  
CIFOR  
Amy Duchelle; a.duchelle@cgiar.org | Share assessments and analysis of the performance of subnational REDD+ initiatives | Information, analysis and tools available from global comparative and site-level research. | Impact evaluation at 22 subnational REDD+ initiative sites in Brazil, Cameroon, Indonesia, Peru, Tanzania and Vietnam  
Collaboration between CIFOR, EII, GCF Task Force and CCBA to assess progress towards jurisdictional sustainability in GCF Task Force member states and provinces in Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, Cote d’Ivoire, Nigeria, and Indonesia | Impact evaluation combines remotely-sensed data (2000-2014) with longitudinal socioeconomic surveys (2010 and 2014) in 150 communities and with nearly 4,000 households through a ‘Before-After-Control-Intervention’ approach  
Ongoing implementation of jurisdictional profile survey and Sustainable Landscapes Rating Tool in GCF Task Force member jurisdictions. Validation of results through workshops with local stakeholders. | 3rd round of data collection in 2018 planned at 8 of the 22 sites in Brazil, Indonesia and Peru to assess longer-term impacts of REDD+ interventions |
| **Landscape Standard**  
http://verra.org/project/landscape-standard/  
Verra, Rainforest Alliance, CCBA  
Naomi Swickard  
nswickard@verra.org | A framework that helps companies, governments, financiers, and donors credibly assess and report on progress towards environmental, social and economic sustainability in productive landscapes. | Covers all sustainability dimensions (environmental, social, economic). Will link corporate/financier/government commitments and goals to concrete metrics and indicators | Global (but still under development) | TBD - a combination of data sources to report on landscape-scale outcomes  
LS framework development and pilots in Ghana, Costa Rica, Guatemala and Peru are underway |
| **International Database on REDD+ projects and programs (ID-RECCO)**  
http://www.reddprojectsdatabase.org/  
Climate Economics Chair (Paris-Dauphine Univ.), CIRAD, IFRI, CIFOR  
Contact: Gabriela Simonet (CIFOR):  
gabriela.simonet@gmail.com | Aims at improving knowledge on REDD+ projects and programs by centralizing data on subnational REDD+ initiatives, and organizing these data in a format adapted to research purposes and global analyses | Up to 110 variables per initiative | As of September 2016, the ID-RECCO database contained 454 REDD+ projects and programs across the global tropics (of which 344 were identified as active, 67 were completed before 2016 and 43 have not been implemented yet or have been discontinued), located in 56 countries | Data sources listed:  
http://www.reddprojectsdatabase.org/view/sources.php |
|  |  |  | As of Feb. 2018, this platform is hosted by CIFOR, with researchers in the process of updating the information and separating information on projects versus jurisdictional programs, which are currently lumped together |
Information on jurisdictional approaches

Annex 3. Platforms providing information related to jurisdictional approaches

The following platforms have been identified that provide related information that could link to information on jurisdictional approaches. Links to the platform, contact details and information on their objectives, information provided, geographical coverage, how it relates to jurisdictional approaches and plans for further development is provided in Annex 3.

- Trase
- Global Forest Watch Pro
- TFA Mapping of Partner Initiatives
- New York Declaration on Forests Global Platform
- Forest 500
- CDP Forests
- Supply-change.org
- Global Map of Environmental and Social Risks in Agro-commodity Production (GMAP)

If you are responsible for one of the platforms included in this document, please go ahead and edit this document to keep it up to date. The full document is available here. Please contact Joanna Durbin jdurbin@climate-standards.org with comments or suggestions of additional platforms to add to this list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Organisation &amp; Contact</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What information</th>
<th>Relationship to juridictional approaches</th>
<th>Geographical/sector coverage</th>
<th>Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trase</td>
<td><a href="https://trase.earth/">https://trase.earth/</a></td>
<td>supply chain transparency initiative that empowers companies, governments and others to address sustainability risks and opportunities by linking supply chain actors to production landscapes across the world</td>
<td>- supply chains of internationally traded agricultural commodities from the countries where they are produced to the countries that import them, identifying the key supply chain companies along the way. Currently for Brazilian soy exports. - environmental and social indicators in producer jurisdictions (e.g. deforestation and related impacts, including water, biodiversity, greenhouse gas emissions, rural development and livelihoods). - economic value of exports</td>
<td>Links consumers and traders in key commodities to the jurisdictions where they are produced. Plan to develop ‘Trase for jurisdictions’ as entry point for governments that creates simple dashboards e.g. information on major buying companies linked to jurisdictions and their commitments</td>
<td>soy exports from Brazil and Paraguay, traceable to the level of producer municipalities in Brazil and departments in Paraguay, as well as national level soy and cattle exports from Brazil, Paraguay and Argentina, and Indonesian palm oil.</td>
<td>In 2018 - map the supply chains back to sub-national regions of production. Coffee in Colombia in 2018. Indonesia palm oil end 2018 Sub-national data for Argentina soy and Paraguay, beef sub-national for Paraguay and Brazil. Over the next five years, Trase aims to cover over 70% of the total traded volume in major forest risk commodities, including soy, beef, palm oil, timber, pulp and paper, coffee, cocoa and aquaculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Canopy Programme, Stockholm Environment Institute, European Forestry Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Lake, <a href="mailto:s.lake@globalcanopy.org">s.lake@globalcanopy.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Forest Watch Pro</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://commodities.globalforestwatch.org/#v=home">http://commodities.globalforestwatch.org/#v=home</a></td>
<td>Identify deforestation risk in commodity supply chains. Companies and banks will be able to integrate forest monitoring into their core business strategy the same way they track commodity prices or stock markets.</td>
<td>Based on GFW online forest monitoring and alert system providing high-resolution maps of tree cover loss, primary or intact forest areas, protected areas, legal classification of land, near-real-time deforestation and fire alerts. Enables custom analysis of area of interest, such as a commodity concession, a jurisdiction, the sourcing area around a palm mill.</td>
<td>Identifies deforestation risk in commodity production areas and provides some additional spatial information such as legal land classification</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Resources Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Sarsfield&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:RSarsfield@wri.org">RSarsfield@wri.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TFA Mapping of Partner Initiatives</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://my.gfw-mapbuilder.org/v1.latest/?appid=0ac126d8caef4232806f75d315782ec8">http://my.gfw-mapbuilder.org/v1.latest/?appid=0ac126d8caef4232806f75d315782ec8</a></td>
<td>Foster cross-sector collaboration, stimulate further partnerships, scaling of on going efforts and knowledge exchange of sustainable models for deforestation-free supply chains.</td>
<td>- Base map of tree cover change, fires, intact forest areas&lt;br&gt;- information on partner initiatives (supplied by the initiative) on organisations involved, commodities targeted, objectives</td>
<td>Includes some information on jurisdictional approaches depending on the type of initiative</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA) 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York Declaration on Forests Global Platform</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://nydfglobalplatform.org/">https://nydfglobalplatform.org/</a></td>
<td>Increase ambition, forge new partnerships and accelerate progress on the NYDF goals, re-invigorate political endorsement of the NYDF, facilitate coordination and communication, share best practices, resources and lessons, and support ongoing monitoring of progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP, Meridian Institute and Climate Advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Forest 500**  
https://forest500.org/  
Global Canopy Programme  
Sarah Rogerson  
s.rogerson@globalcanopy.org | Identify and rank the most influential companies, financial institutions, and governments in forest risk commodity supply chains to hold them accountable for their actions. | Annual rankings based on policy commitments to reduce deforestation, including commitment type, for which commodities, in which part of supply chain (for company). | Ranks 50 jurisdictions based on policy commitments to reduce deforestation and on monitoring implementation of those commitments. This includes 25 trading jurisdictions, 15 national forest jurisdictions and 10 subnational jurisdictions. | Global. Includes assessment of 250 companies, 150 investors and lenders, 50 jurisdictions, and 50 other powerbrokers, each selected based on their exposure to forest risk commodity supply chains. | Continue annual assessments up to 2020. From 2018 we will not assess jurisdictions (we will identify these jurisdictions and will also provide policy info relevant to key biomes e.g. Cerrado/soy/forest code) |
| **CDP Forests**  
https://www.cdp.net/en/forests  
CDP  
Morgan Gillespy  
morgan.gillespy@cdp.net | Enable companies, cities, states and regions to measure and manage their environmental impacts. Provide a reporting framework and detailed reporting guidance for companies to measure, manage and report on deforestation risk in commodity supply chains. | Self-reported information from companies in response to annual questionnaire on exposure, commitments and action related to deforestation through the lens of the four agricultural commodities responsible for most deforestation: timber, palm oil, cattle and soy. Will be adding a deforestation questionnaire for the metals & mining sector in 2019. | Information requested from companies on their risk assessment and actions related to deforestation beyond their supply chains. | In 2017, 272 companies responded to CDP Forest questionnaire at the request of 380 institutional investor signatories. Currently ask for information on timber, palm oil, cattle and soy. In 2019 CDP will add metals & mining companies. |
| **Supplies-change.org**  
http://www.supply-change.org  
Forest Trends, WWF, CDP | Provides information on the extent and value of commitment-driven commodity production for businesses, investors, governments, and the civil society organizations that support and hold them accountable. | Analysis of the composition of commitments and companies' progress toward their targets; the influential role of civil society and certifications; and prospects for success. Supply Change is built upon public data sources including CDP's significant global collection of corporate environmental data; and information gleaned by WWF from commodity roundtable annual member reports, individual company websites, sustainability reports, and related announcements. | Does not currently link to sub-national jurisdictions | Palm (283 entities profiled), soy (86 entities profiled) timber and pulp (251 entities profiled), cattle (51 entities profiled) |

| **Global Map of Environmental and Social Risks in Agro-Commodity Production (GMAP)**  
http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/topics_ext_content/ifc_external_corporate_site/sustainability-at-ifc/company-resources/gmap  
International Finance Corporation | Help users conduct systematic, high-level environmental and social due diligence associated with trade finance and short-term finance. In the case of direct investments (project or corporate finance) or other non-trade/STF investments through financial intermediaries, the GMAP can provide a first-level assessment of agro-commodity risks | GMAP is an online tool which provides public information on supply chain risk management criteria for each agro-commodity-country combination consistent with the supply chain requirements of the 2012 IFC Performance Standards. Identifies and scores risks for commodity-related investments in producer countries focusing on child/forced labor and biodiversity at national level | Does not currently link to sub-national jurisdictions | 248 country-commodity combinations as of April 2017 (e.g. Brazil/soy, Ghana/cocoa, Vietnam/coffee) |
DEKLARASI MANOKWARI

PEMBANGUNAN BERKELANJUTAN BERBASIS WILAYAH ADAT
DI TANAH PAPUA

Berdasarkan hasil Konferensi Internasional tentang Keanekaragaman Hayati, Ekowisata dan Ekonomi Kreatif (ICBE 2018) dan merujuk pada Nota Kesepakatan antara Provinsi Papua dan Papua Barat yang ditandatangani pada tanggal 7 Oktober 2018 tentang Pembangunan Berkelanjutan Berbasis Wilayah Adat di Tanah Papua, Pemerintah Provinsi Papua dan Papua Barat menyatakan Visi Bersama Tanah Papua yaitu:

Tanah Papua Damai, Berkelanjutan, Lestari dan Bermartabat

Sebagai implementasi visi bersama tersebut, hasil-hasil konferensi ICBE2018 menyatakan:

PERTAMA, menegaskan kembali komitmen pengarusutamaan pembangunan berkelanjutan dan menuangkannya melalui Peraturan Daerah Khusus di Provinsi Papua Barat, revisi atau peninjauan RTRWP Papua dan RTRWP Papua Barat yang mengakomodir minimal 70% luas daratan sebagai kawasan lindung, RZWP3K dan revisi serta kajian paruh waktu RPJMD Provinsi Papua Barat dengan mengintegrasikan wilayah masyarakat adat, penguatan implementasi Visi 2100 Provinsi Papua dan penyusunan RPJMD 2019-2023 Provinsi Papua yang berkelanjutan dan kontekstual Papua,

KEDUA, berkomitmen untuk melindungi hak dan memperkuat peran masyarakat adat melalui Perdasus Provinsi dan Perda Kabupaten yang mengakui keberadaan masyarakat adat, nilai budayanya, wilayah adat dan tata kelola dan kelembagaannya, termasuk di dalamnya wilayah hutan dan perairan adat berdasarkan kearifan lokal dan pemanfaatan berkelanjutan. Pembiayaan pemetaan wilayah adat dan mendorong pembentukan tata layanan pendaftaran tanah-tanah masyarakat adat dan mekanisme penyelesaian sengketa dalam penggunaan dan pemanfaatan tanah adat,

KETIGA, berkomitmen kuat untuk menjunjung tinggi penegakan hukum dan peraturan terkait sumber daya alam dalam pengelolaan pembangunan berkelanjutan, menerapkan moratorium izin-izin baru perkebunan skala besar, pertambangan dan industri berbasis lahan, serta meninjau ulang izin-izin yang telah terbit dengan membentuk tim kerja khusus untuk itu.
**KEEMPAT**, bersama dengan pemerintah pusat berkomitmen untuk mengatur skema pendanaan berkelanjutan dan insentif fiskal ekologis, yang ditegaskan melalui peraturan perundang-undangan, kepada pemerintah provinsi dan kabupaten/kota baik melalui DAU, DAK, DID, Dana Otsus, dan/atau Bantuan Keuangan kepada Provinsi/Kabupaten/Kota, serta mempercepat Peraturan Daerah Khusus tentang Dana Bagi Hasil (DBH) dan implementasinya.

**KELIMA**, berkomitmen untuk segera membentuk Komisi Informasi Provinsi Papua Barat guna meningkatkan transparansi dan akuntabilitas data dan informasi melalui peningkatan sistem informasi yang terintegrasi, baik secara lokal maupun lintas sektor termasuk dengan pusat.

**KEENAM**, berkomitmen untuk mengembangkan Museum Sejarah Alam dan Kebun Raya di Tanah Papua yang menunjang upaya konservasi dan penampungan koleksi, penelitian dan peningkatan pemahaman dan apresiasi tentang keanekaragaman hayati dan alam dan budaya Papua.

**KETUJUH**, berkomitmen untuk mendorong peningkatan kapasitas sumber daya manusia dalam Pembangunan Berkelanjutan, termasuk masyarakat adat dalam berbagai bidang pengetahuan dan keterampilan penting untuk mendukung proses perencanaan, partisipasi masyarakat dalam pengelolaan sumber daya alam, manajemen kawasan lindung, ekowisata dan perikanan berkelanjutan. Mengarusutamakan pembangunan berkelanjutan dalam kurikulum pendidikan serta mengembangkan sistem manajemen informasi keanekaragaman hayati dan pembangunan berkelanjutan.

**KEDELAPAN**, mendukung dan memfasilitasi masyarakat adat untuk menemukan pilihan produk-produk bernilai ekonomis tinggi untuk kemudian dikelola oleh masyarakat adat dengan dukungan akses pasar dan pendanaan atau pembiayaan yang sesuai.


**KESEPULUH**, berkomitmen untuk menetapkan kawasan dan/atau koridor konservasi daratan, perairan baru di Tanah Papua, kawasan konservasi esensial, pengelolaan mangrove, rawa gambut, rawa sagu, penetapan kawasan strategis setempat, perlindungan sumber daya genetik dan spesies endemik dan terancam punah dan perlindungan kawasan karst serta meningkatkan efektivitas pengelolaan kawasan yang memiliki legalitas agar dapat memberikan manfaat bagi masyarakat.
KESEBELAS, berkomitmen untuk melakukan evaluasi dampak lingkungan terhadap infrastruktur yang sudah terbangun dan memfokuskan pembangunan infrastruktur yang ramah lingkungan antara kampung, distrik dan kabupaten yang mendekatkan Orang Asli Papua (OAP) dengan layanan dasar dan pasar lokal.

KEDUA BELAS, berkomitmen untuk mendorong dan memfasilitasi percepatan peraturan gubernur terkait ketahanan pangan di Tanah Papua dengan pelibatan penuh pemerintah, DPR, MRP dan Masyarakat Adat.

KETIGA BELAS, mendorong kemitraan global, nasional dan lokal serta membentuk platform multipihak untuk mendorong terbangunnya model-model investasi/pembiayaan yang mendukung tercapainya pertumbuhan ekonomi yang bertujuan bagi pembangunan berkelanjutan di Tanah Papua.

KEEMPAT BELAS, melanjutkan kerja sama yang sudah terbangun antara masyarakat sipil, lembaga keagamaan, lembaga adat, lembaga pendidikan, dan pihak lainnya dalam pelaksanaan pembangunan berkelanjutan. Kedua provinsi berkomitmen untuk meningkatkan peran dan pengembangan kapasitas perempuan dalam diskusi dan kerja-kerja tentang hak-hak masyarakat adat dan pengelolaan sumber daya alam yang berkelanjutan di Tanah Papua.

Demikian deklarasi ini kami buat untuk memandu kita semua dalam bekerja bersama dalam mewujutkan visi “Tanah Papua Damai, Berkelanjutan, Lestari dan Bermartabat”.

Manokwari, 10 Oktober 2018

PEMERINTAH PROVINSI PAPUA,

LUKAS ENEMBE, S.IP., MH
Gubernur

PEMERINTAH PROVINSI PAPUA BARAT,

Drs. DOMINGGUS MANDACAN
Gubernur
DEKLARASI MANOKWARI
PEMBANGUNAN BERKELANJUTAN BERBASIS WILAYAH ADAT
DI TANAH PAPUA

Manokwari, 10 Oktober 2018
A global framework to drive environmental, social and economic sustainability in productive landscapes

SUSTAINABLE COMMODITY PRODUCTION AT THE LANDSCAPE SCALE

The global demand for food, fuel, fiber and other essential goods is growing rapidly. These products are sourced from landscapes – large areas where commodity production needs to be balanced with local and national environmental, social and economic priorities. Sustainable landscape production models – for agricultural, forest and extractive goods – can meet global commodity needs while generating tangible benefits for people and the planet. To support the development of these models, there is a need for a global framework that can measure progress over time, and drive incentives and finance towards sustainable landscapes.

THE LANDSCAPE STANDARD – SCALING UP INCENTIVES FOR SUSTAINABLE LANDSCAPES

The Landscape Standard (LS) is an emerging tool to help drive landscape-scale sustainability. The LS will provide measurable indicators of the state and trajectory of sustainability at the landscape level across environmental, social, and economic dimensions. This landscape-level application sets the LS apart from other sustainability standards, complementing sustainability efforts that target individual production sites, activities or sectors.

Goals and indicators at the global level will support targets and criteria tailored to the specific landscape context. Relative progress and absolute threshold indicators will enable reporting on both continuous improvement and compliance with sustainability commitments. This framework will provide data-based performance results to help generate incentives and finance that advance landscape sustainability actions.

THE LANDSCAPE STANDARD IN ACTION

LS pilots are underway in landscapes producing a range of commodities in Africa (Ghana) and Latin America (Peru, Guatemala, and Costa Rica). For example, the LS supports the implementation of the groundbreaking Cocoa & Forest Initiative (CFI) in Ghana. The LS framework will support compliance with zero deforestation and other environmental, social and governance (ESG) commitments made by cocoa-sourcing companies, thus demonstrating sustainable landscape-scale cocoa production and smallholder community benefits.
THE LANDSCAPE STANDARD RESPONDS TO THE DIVERSE NEEDS OF KEY PLAYERS IN LANDSCAPE PRODUCTION

A PARTNERSHIP TO DEVELOP THE LANDSCAPE STANDARD

The LS is developed and managed collaboratively by Verra, Rainforest Alliance and the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance in partnership with the International Union for Conservation of Nature, Nature Conservation & Research Center, Proforest and Solidaridad, with input from a broad range of stakeholders.

We welcome new collaborations

Contact us at LandscapeStandard@verra.org and visit http://verra.org/project/landscape-standard/
Jurisdictional & Related Commodity Sourcing Approaches

*Theories of Change*

Draft Version: 19 November 2018

Please send comments to Sabine Miltner (sabine.miltner@moore.org)
The first part of this slide deck contains draft Theory of Change diagrams for a *Jurisdictional Approach* (JA) to ending ecosystem conversion as well as related *Commodity Sourcing Approaches*:

- Slide #3 is a ‘conceptual model’ showing the current situation in a typical jurisdiction
- Slide #5 is a ‘results chain’ showing the global JA theory of change
- Slide #6 is a more detailed ‘results chain’ showing a theory of change for a ‘generic’ (aka typical) jurisdiction
- Slide #7 shows an application of this theory of change to a specific example of cocoa production in Ivory Coast and Ghana

Use Slide Show Mode to ‘Animate’ Diagrams
JA Global Theory of Change

7a. Global Jurisdictional Approach
Theory of Change - v 24 Sept 2018

- Pilot tests make the case / prove the concept / lead to principles
- Global mechanisms in place to provide awareness / incentives / capacity
- Approach implemented in key jurisdictions globally
- Critical mass / scale of jurisdictional approach
- Ecosystem conversion reduced or eliminated at scale

Virtuous cycle stokes "race to the top"

See Local JD Approach Chain

Natural Ecosystems Globally
- Forest ecosystems
  - Associated ecosystems

Key to Shapes in Results Chains
- Conservation Target
- Threat Reduction Result
- Intermediate Result
- Action (Strategy)
- Other Results Chain

Use Slide Show Mode to ‘Animate’ Diagrams
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JA Theory of Change for “Generic” Jurisdiction

7b. Generic Jurisdictional Approach
Theory of Change - v 24 Sept 2018

Global Mechanisms In Place Provide Awareness / Incentives / Capacity
1. Supply Chain Management TsC
2. Capital Markets TsC
3. Demand Shift TsC
4. Pro Parent Narrative TsC
5. Carbon Markets/REDD TsC
6. Reduced Dependency TsC

Enabling Conditions for JA
- Key stakeholders aware of benefits of JA
- Key stakeholders have incentives to adopt JA
- Key stakeholders have capacity to adopt JA

Key to Shapes in Results Chains
- Green boxes show conservation targets
- Blue boxes show intermediate results
- Yellow boxes are complementary results chains
- Blue text indicates enabling conditions
- Other boxes represent other results chains

Use Slide Show Mode to ‘Animate’ Diagrams
JA Theory of Change for “West African Cocoa” Example

7. Generic Jurisdictional Approach ToC
W. Africa Cocoa Example - v 31 Oct 2018

Global Mechanisms in Place Provide Awareness / Incentives / Capacity
- Key local cocoa producers see problem
- Clear supply interest since 70% of world cocoa
- Existence of common umbrella - Cocoa Action
- Decade of REDD provided financial incentives to go

Enabling Conditions for JA
- Key stakeholders have capacity to adopt JA
- Stakeholder value proportion favors JA
- Help organize jurisdiction

Enabling Conditions for JA (cont.)
- Key jurisdiction stakeholders “support” JA
- Inevitable opposing voices neutralized
- Ability to meet needs of other stakeholders

Jurisdictions Enact, Implement & Enforce DF Agreement & Plan
- Key jurisdiction stakeholders “support” JA
- Irresistible opposing voices neutralized
- Key stakeholders have capacity to adopt JA
- Stakeholder value proportion favors JA
- Help organize jurisdiction

Jurisdictions Enact, Implement & Enforce DF Agreement & Plan (cont.)
- Ability to meet needs of other stakeholders
- Key jurisdiction stakeholders “support” JA
- Irresistible opposing voices neutralized
- Key stakeholders have capacity to adopt JA
- Stakeholder value proportion favors JA
- Help organize jurisdiction

Conversions Free Commodity Production
- Land conversion happens only in Zone 1 areas
- Producers employ BMPs reducing inefficiencies & boosting yields

Ecosystem Conversion Reduced or Eliminated
- Deforestation eliminated in Zone 2 & 3 and restoration in Zone 2
- Promote restoration degraded lands

Key to Shapes in Results Chains
- Blue Text = Enabling Condition
- Other Results Chain

Created with Miradi Software
Free trial at www.miradi.org
About This Slide Deck, Part 2

The second part of this slide deck contains draft Theory of Change (TOC) diagrams for three variants of a Commodity Sourcing Approach:

• Slide #8 is the Generic Commodity Sourcing TOC
• Slide #9 is the Producer / Product Certification TOC and Slide #10 shows a schematic model of this TOC
• Slides #11 & #12 are the Sectoral Sourcing TOC and schematic model
• Slides #13 & #14 are the Jurisdictional Sourcing TOC and schematic model
• Slide #15 shows where the Jurisdictional Sourcing TOC fits in the Jurisdictional Approach TOC

Use Slide Show Mode to ‘Animate' Diagrams
#0. Generic Commodity Sourcing Approach

**Specific Commodity Sourcing Approaches**

- Producer / product certification
- Sectoral sourcing
- Jurisdictional sourcing

**Key Shapes in Results Chains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Target</th>
<th>Threat Reduction Result</th>
<th>Intermediate Result</th>
<th>Action (Strategy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Text = Positive Case</td>
<td>Purple Text = Moderate Target</td>
<td>Blue Text = Intermediate Result</td>
<td>Yellow Text = Action (Strategy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use Slide Show Mode to ‘Animate’ Diagrams**
Schematic of 3 Models: #1. Product / Producer Certification

Even one producer may split lands

Product certification

Easy to certify producers far from the frontier
#2. Sectoral Sourcing Approach

2. Sectoral Sourcing Approach TOC

- Other companies follow peers stoking virtuous cycle w/ other commodities &/or geographies
- Key* midstream actors commit to sourcing ZD from supply chain in given geography
- Midstream actors pressure their trade association
- Commodities preferentially sourced from ZD certified producers in geography
- Producers have incentives to improve production
- Ecosystem conversion reduces on ZD producer lands (focal commodity)
- Most production goes on as usual (leakage)
- Lack of impact over time sinks entire system

Financial institution approach
- Other commodities sources as usual

Corporate engagement
- Develop ZD standards
- TA & $$ to help producers get to ZD

Traceability & verification systems ensure compliance
- Investment in T&V systems

Companies get certified supply / meet commitments

Sectoral sourcing approach

Key to Shapes in Results Chains

Conservation Target
Threat Reduction Result
Intermediate Result
Action (Strategy)

Green Text = Positive Case
Red Text = Negative Case

Use Slide Show Mode to 'Animate' Diagrams
Schematic of 3 Models: #2. Sectoral Sourcing

Not able to convert producers in other sectors

Displacement can still leak to other geographies

Key midstream actors ZD sourcing in geography
#3. Jurisdictional Sourcing Approach

3. Jurisdictional Sourcing Approach TOC

Other companies follow peers stoking virtuous cycle

Companies get certified supply / meet commitments

Traceability & verification systems ensure compliance

A few enlightened companies make sustainability commitment

Companies 'transmit' interest via supply chain

Commodities preferentially sourced from ZD* jurisdictions

Jurisdiction stakeholders have incentives to improve production

Most production goes on as usual (leakage w/in & between JDs)

Minimal conservation happens

Financial institution approach

Jurisdictional Sourcing Approach

Hard to get 'good' jurisdiction production going

Companies get flack for not meeting commitments & go elsewhere

Lack of impact over time sinks entire system

Jurisdictions not rewarded for efforts thus decreasing political will

* certified or in 'transition'

Use Slide Show Mode to 'Animate' Diagrams
Schematic of 3 Models: #3. Jurisdictional Sourcing

If one producer fails, does the whole JD fail?
JA Theory of Change for “Generic” Jurisdiction

7b. Generic Jurisdictional Approach
Theory of Change - v 24 Sept 2018

Global Mechanisms In Place Provide Awareness / Incentives / Capacity

6. Reduced Dependency ToC
4. Pro Parent Narrative ToC
3. Demand Shift ToC
2. Capital Markets ToC
1. Supply Chain Management ToC

Enabling Conditions for JA

Key stakeholders aware of benefits
Key stakeholders have incentives to adopt JA
Key stakeholders value proposition favors JA
Key stakeholders have capacity to adopt JA
Help organize jurisdiction
Build capacity

Conduct

Supportive policy & institutional environment
Land tenure supports JA

JA Traceability & Verification Systems

Key stakeholders identify, convene & able to collaborate
Develop systems for JA

Operational

Jurisdictions Enact, Implement & Enforce “Good” Agreement & Land-Use Plan

Jurisdiction develops “good” agreement, land-use plan & commitments
Jurisdiction makes formal decision to implement agreement & land-use plan
Jurisdiction implements agreements & land-use plan
Jurisdiction enforces land-use plan

Conversion Free Commodity Production

Production only takes place in “approved” areas
Producers employ BMPs reducing inefficiencies & boosting yields
Market rewards JA

Ecosystem Conversion Reduced or Eliminated

Net ecosystem conversion reduced or eliminated
Increased production mitigates conversion leakage

Natural Ecosystems in Jurisdictions

Forest ecosystems
Associated ecosystems

Approach #3 is this section of overall chain

Key to Shapes in Results Chains

- Conservation Target
- Threat Reduction Result
- Intermediate Result
- Action (Strategy)
- Blue Text = Enabling Condition
- Other Results Chain

Created with Miradi Software
Free trial at www.miradi.org
Summary Points
Jurisdictional Approach Theory of Change

Working Group Meeting
31 October 2018

Mars Headquarters
6885 Elm Street, McLean VA 22101

How would you use a common mental model in your work?
The group expressed interest in having a common mental model for the situation analysis and theory of change for a jurisdictional approach (JA) for the following reasons:

- working effectively with others – showing how we might coordinate our efforts;
- using a more standardized approach to lower the intellectual barriers to entry;
- helping to keep implementers focused on a holistic approach, not only focusing on one aspect;
- helping us keep in mind that different jurisdictions are at different places – some more “ready” than others - in their implementation (e.g., along the theory of change);
- understanding how different approaches are linked together (e.g., carbon financing and supply chains to make change at a jurisdictional level);
- having a framework to show how jurisdictional approaches are working, not working, and why;
- showing how a jurisdictional approach may add momentum where needed to other strategies (e.g., supply chain approaches, policy reform);
- having a common framework/language/measures for monitoring, evaluating, learning, and sharing experience by different actors.

Key lessons from cocoa experience:

- Conditions of agreement were not clear from the start; industry and NGOs needed to understand motivation for the government.
- Ultimate “catalyst” for agreement at end of last year was not industry or NGOs, but peer pressure from European governments.
- Different issues are sorted out at different scales – some national policy and some local; having both national policy and experience at local level increases the potential for replicability at scale.

Comments of Global JA TOC:

- Chain is agnostic of scale of JA – can be national, regional, local.
- We don’t need more pilots, but shining examples where subnational governments can have jobs with forest standing, so that becomes replicable and scalable.
- We need to build understanding that JA is not panacea and not fast; JA takes a long time and change happens over time.
• We need to focus on the “macro levers” for change within any given jurisdiction – a “generic” approach to reducing deforestation that can be customized within any given jurisdiction.

Comments on Jurisdiction-level TOC:
• There may be various stakeholder groups influencing land use decisions within the jurisdiction (e.g., farmers, landowners, migrant farmers, government) – not always clear and straightforward.
• Important condition is that the incentive for governments (decision makers) is still unclear to them – still need to make the value proposition work for them; e.g., incentives may not be financial at first, but becoming a better place to invest because of transparency and efficiencies.
• JA is used because we need to work on policy and law enforcement – disincentives as well as incentives.
• We should focus on identifying the larger enabling condition, and leave the “good” agreement part of the chain to be defined at the jurisdiction level.
• We should develop the concept of “readiness” of jurisdictions in key forest sites – e.g., conceptual framework for status of conditions for jurisdiction to reduce threats to forest; should work at different jurisdictional levels and different types of commodities and markets.
• Each jurisdiction has a different context and status of conditions; we should identify the external levers (both carrots and sticks) for getting them to where they need to be.
• Need the concept (especially among NGOs) of not only “good”, but also “less bad”, because it takes jurisdictions time to improve (achieve “cleaner” supplies) and industry needs a safe space for working with jurisdiction on improvements or they will only supply from available “good” actors and there will not be improvement of “bad” actors.
• We don’t want any jurisdiction in key area to “fail”, need whole jurisdiction to “move up the ladder”.

Next steps:
• More urgent:
  o Continue to define the key conditions that define “readiness” of a jurisdiction based on our draft Situation Analysis and Theory of Change.
  o Compile the various lists of jurisdictions in key areas (high threat to forests) that are in some state of engagement and “readiness”
  o Think about how to create a “safe space” for companies to make commitments while jurisdictions work on “readiness”.
• Longer term:
  o Based on conditions for “readiness”, develop a common framework for MEL standards to facilitate sharing and learning across different groups working on jurisdictional approaches.
Development of a Landscape Programme in Siak and Pelalawan, Indonesia

Multi-stakeholder collaboration to achieve sustainable land use

01

Why collaborate in a landscape?

Companies purchasing palm oil from the Siak and Pelalawan districts of the Riau province in Indonesia worked extensively with their suppliers to implement supply chain traceability and map their exposure to environmental and social risks on the ground. However, they quickly appreciated that few sustainability problems were unique to one mill; indeed most are shared by many mills. And that their engagement with mills was only the first step to effect change towards responsible production practices. The landscape approach these companies are taking as part of this project has the potential to drive meaningful change with tangible impact – but this will take collaboration amongst multiple parties such as local government, local NGOs, producers and smallholders, as well as their fellow purchasing companies.

To date, more than 170 palm oil companies have made commitments to produce and source palm oil which is deforestation and exploitation free, and not produced on peatlands (NDPE). This type of collaborative action at a landscape level has the potential to help companies meet those commitments at scale.
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What is the objective of the Siak-Pelalawan Landscape Programme and who is involved?

Seven palm oil purchasing and consumer goods companies (the Coalition) are coming together to pursue a landscape programme for sustainable palm oil in Siak and Pelalawan - Cargill, Danone, Golden Agri-Resources, Musim Mas, Neste, PepsiCo and Unilever.

The goal of the programme is to transition large parts of both districts towards sustainable landscapes: which produce deforestation and exploitation free palm oil and maintain or enhance key conservation areas by building upon existing local efforts and multi-stakeholder platforms to advance a shared vision of sustainable, inclusive production.

Recognising that initiatives already exist in both districts, the Coalition will endeavour to build on and support these efforts to promote local ownership and greater collaboration among stakeholders with a shared interest. This will build on initiatives such as the Green District Initiative in Siak with Sedagho Siak and LTKL (the National Sustainable District) Platform, the FOKSB/UNDP ISPO platform in Pelalawan, private sector (pilot) projects in both districts, and donor facilitated programmes like CLUA, UNDP and WWF in Tesso Nilo, amongst others.

Specifically, the programme will:

a. Develop scalable solutions for common problems
b. Pilot multi-stakeholder approaches to sustainable supply sheds
c. Support and empower local organisations
d. Develop scalable tools and approaches to improve smallholder livelihoods
e. Coordinate and share lessons learned with other landscape initiatives
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Why focus on Siak and Pelalawan?

Siak and Pelalawan districts are long established palm oil production areas, with more than 20% of Riau’s 260 mills (see figure 1 below). Both regions have significant environmental values, including large areas of peatland and protected areas, and in Pelalawan there remain large areas of intact forest at risk of conversion under the business-as-usual model. Both regions also carry significant environmental and social risks – nearly one third of Riau’s ‘high-priority’ mills (Global Forest Watch)¹ are here, there is a high rate of historic deforestation and chronic fires, and social issues relating to workers’ health and safety, land conflicts and smallholder rights.

Importantly, both regions already host several sustainable development initiatives too, which the landscape programme intends to build on to increase impact. As an example, Siak district is championing the Green District Initiative through ‘Head of District (Bupati) Regulation number 22, year 2018’, which paves the way to enable responsible management of natural resources. Since September 2017, development partners in Siak District have also built a coalition, entitled ‘Sedagho Siak’, to support the Green District Initiative, together with national and local stakeholders. Siak is also among the founders and Secretary General of Lingkar Temu Kabupaten Lestari (LTKL), a collaborative partnership among districts to move towards sustainable jurisdictions focusing on landuse. Moreover, Siak and Pelalawan have both been selected to pilot the implementation of the Indonesian National Action Plan (NAP) for sustainable palm oil production at district level, in collaboration with UNDP.

¹ See also Global Forest Watch Analysis at http://commodities.globalforestwatch.org

---

Oil Palm Mills | Siak & Pelalawan

Figure 1: Distribution of oil palm mills and environmental values in Siak and Pelalawan
What will the programme do?

The programme has three phases to 1) design the intervention, 2) define the partnership and then 3) implement the intervention. It is currently in Phase 1, Intervention Design. When complete this will deliver:

1. A comprehensive map of the production base, key stakeholders and existing initiatives
2. Clear boundaries of priority areas
3. Clear identification of gaps to address root causes of the main challenges

4. Agreement on goals and objectives of the intervention

This will be done through: mapping stakeholders, stakeholder interviews, mill group discussions, mill rapid assessments, baseline analysis of conservation opportunities, and engagement with local government and existing platforms.

Timeline and expected outputs

The intervention design phase has already started and aims for completion by April 2019. The partnership development phase and implementation and monitoring phase will start in the second quarter of 2019 and are linked to the outputs of the design phase. Figure 2 gives an overview of the process and anticipated outputs.

3-Phase process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 – Intervention design</th>
<th>Phase 2 – Partnership development</th>
<th>Phase 3 – Implementation and Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Understanding of the production landscape and actors</td>
<td>• Partnerships Agreement delineating roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>• Implementation of agreed activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agreed goals, objectives and KPIs by partners involved</td>
<td>• Concept and financial structure as well as financial commitments</td>
<td>• Capacity of local organisation built and available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agreed ‘boundaries’ of the landscape</td>
<td>• Platform to exchange information</td>
<td>• Empowerment of local organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action Plan to achieve KPIs</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring of progress against set KPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delivering on agreed goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Overview of the 3-phase process
Understanding urban youth’s perception on forests in Indonesia and discovering the right narratives to engage them on forest protection
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This document details findings from a qualitative study by Eye to Eye to understand urban youth perception on forests in Indonesia and how they respond to narratives promoting forest protection developed by Communication for Change.
Executive Summary
This study tries to explore how urban youth in Indonesia view forests and deforestation, and how we can get them to care.

This was a qualitative research conducted under a grant provided to the Windward Fund by The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, a member of the Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA) Indonesia Initiative.

The grant has made possible a two-year program to gain understanding on narratives and perception around land use and forest protection in Indonesia. The Program Director is Frances Seymour and the lead consultant for the work in Indonesia is Leony Aurora.

The objectives of this research were:

• To understand the perception of Indonesian urban youth (age 15-40yo) of forests and deforestation, and emotions attached to them;

• To explore what issues or problems they have heard about forests and their impacts, if any, on their daily lives; and

• Using sequential recycling approach (see slide 16), to explore the most relevant narrative to engage them to support forest protection
**Methodologies and tools used in the qualitative study to explore perception and test narratives**

We conducted a qualitative research utilizing focus group discussions (FGDs) with six participants in each group, with a total of 24 groups in the study. Each discussion lasted 1.5-2 hours, of which half was used to explore participants’ perception of forests and deforestation and the remaining to evaluate the narratives.

The study was conducted in six cities: Jakarta, Medan (North Sumatra), Pekanbaru (Riau), Pontianak (West Kalimantan), Manokwari (West Papua), and Banyuwangi (East Java). There are four groups (senior high school students of 15-17yo, university students of 18-22yo, first jobbers of 23-30yo, and young parents of 31-40yo) per location.

Methodologies employed in the study include providing participants with a homework prior to the discussion, FGDs that include StoryWorks – a visual system to explore associated emotional meaning (see Annex 1), and sequential recycling to fine tune the narratives (see slide 22).
There are three major findings from the study.

1 Among urban youth in Indonesia, knowledge about forests and deforestation exists, but it does not come out spontaneously – they need to be triggered and probed to start talking about forests.

**Implication:** Emotionally engaging narratives are needed to bring forests into their consciousness and act to support forest protection.

2 Emotions that came out when participants in the six areas included in this study were STIMULATED with the issues of deforestation can be divided into three ‘clusters’:

- **Angry and frustrated:** Manokwari and Pontianak
- **Ignorant, but when provoked, angry:** Jakarta, Medan, and to some extent Banyuwangi
  - Banyuwangi is also unique because although they recognise that deforestation is a problem, they don’t see massive deforestation in their area, have strong trust to local government (unlike others), and are very proud of their local economic growth.
- **Resignation:** Pekanbaru

**Implication:** Because emotions play a key part in triggering actions, an emotive campaign is needed.
We identified two potential emotional routes and narratives to be the strongest, as detailed in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential emotional routes</th>
<th>ACCEPTED ACROSS ALL AREAS</th>
<th>ACCEPTED IN CERTAIN AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Loss aversion – triggering the fear of losing the nation’s status and pride              | PRIDE – triggering the worry of losing Indonesia’s position as the country with the third largest tropical forest in the world | LIVELIHOOD – talking about how forests contribute to local livelihoods and economy. Recommended for Banyuwangi and Manokwari with slightly different angles:  
  - Banyuwangi: forests as travel and education destination that contribute to local income  
  - Manokwari – forests provide food and daily needs |
| A feeling of being cheated because selected few have unfairly benefited from converting forests into other uses | CHEATED – triggering the feeling that they are being screwed over, thus losing the benefits of intact forests and having to deal with negative impacts of forest loss. | IDENTITY – to trigger a sense of nationalism: forest is a nation’s identity and needs to be protected. Recommended for Pekanbaru, Medan and Jakarta |
Based on these findings, we have several recommendations.

1. National campaigns should be developed using the narratives that are well-received across all areas.

**PRIDE**

As Indonesians, we are very proud for having the third largest forests in the world that are rich in flora and fauna and a source of clean water and air. Yet, every minute, our forests get reduced by the size of five football fields. We must act to protect our forests.

(See Indonesian version on slide 107)

**CHEATED**

As Indonesians, we enjoy the benefits of lush forests, such as clean water, fresh air, and protection against floods and landslides. Yet, some have cut down forests to enrich themselves. Therefore, we need to keep the forests intact, so that all of us can continue enjoying the benefits.

(See Indonesian version on slide 108)
2. Aside from national campaigns, local campaigns are also important to trigger the targeted emotions, strengthen the messages of the national campaigns, and create real actions. The narratives that can be used and the relevant areas are as follows:

LIVELIHOOD – for Banyuwangi and Manokwari. Each has a slightly different angle:

**Banyuwangi will use the angle of local welfare.**
As the people of Banyuwangi, we are proud for having vast forests that serve as destinations for tourism and education. They make a great contribution to our regional income. Therefore, destroying forests is the same as threatening our prosperity. (Indonesian version on slide 109)

**While for Manokwari, it is about their daily livelihood.**
As Papuans, we are proud for having forests that provide us with food and daily income. Therefore, destroying forests means threatening our lives. We must unite to stop the destruction of Papua’s forests. (Indonesian version on slide 110)

IDENTITY – for Pekanbaru, Medan and Jakarta, areas that are not close to the forests

Forests are an inseparable part of Indonesia’s identity that is diverse, rich, and fertile, because forests are sources of water, culture, and rich in natural resources. Therefore, protecting forests is the same as protecting the identity of our nation. (Indonesian version on slide 111)
3. The challenge is making well-orchestrated and collective action/campaigns, in which NGOs collaborate and work together so as to increase the likelihood that the messages get embedded in public’s minds.

FGD participants in this study were not familiar of environmental NGOs. Media analysis done as part of work under the same grant shows that very few of CSOs supportive of sustainable land use are quoted in the media, while industry-based CSOs have more prominence. Edelman’s Trust Barometer Study (2018) shows that Indonesians trust government and business before NGOs.

Therefore, it is clear that NGOs need to work together to push these messages. We need to ensure that sufficient number of NGOs pick up the narratives and the campaign plans, and commit to run with them.

We need a solution for providing people with tangible/actionable calls for action. Currently, there are no real avenues for the public to push for change, and they are not even familiar with NGOs that can serve as a medium to channel action.

4. A quantitative baseline survey is needed to measure public’s perception of forests and deforestation to be used to measure changes post campaigns.
Disclaimer
Limitations of a qualitative study: Findings cannot be generalised across all Indonesian population.

This is a report based on a qualitative research, that is designed to uncover perceptions and drivers of perceptions on forests and deforestation of a certain public segment. It is also designed to find a direction for subsequent campaigns by testing several narratives developed for the study and noting the respondents’ responses.

The sample is not meant to represent Indonesian population at large and the study does not seek to assign percentages to the perspectives.

A robust sample quantitative research with a representative sample will need to be conducted to validate the perceptions captured in this study and serve as a baseline to measure change of perception post campaigns.
Project Background
To achieve emissions reduction from land use sectors, Indonesians need to support forest and peatland protection.

The David and Lucile Packard Foundation and Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA) Indonesia Initiative, which Packard is part of, are working to support a shift in Indonesia towards low-emission development that enhances local livelihoods while reducing greenhouse gas emissions from forests and peatlands.

The need to win “the hearts and minds” of Indonesians to support sustainable land use has been identified as a priority in current CLUA Indonesia Initiative strategy, with similar objective for well-informed decision making envisioned in Packard’s strategy. However, limited evidence that exists on perceptions of forests and forest conversion in Indonesia suggests that the public feels little attachment to forests, and does not view deforestation for plantation development negatively (Daemeter and RSPO, 2015). An information gap remains to be addressed regarding public perceptions of forest values and effective approaches to shift those perceptions in ways that would generate support for forest and peatland protection.
A modest initiative is formed to increase understanding on the narratives around forests, land use, and sustainability promoted by various stakeholders.

A grant from Packard has been provided to Windward Fund to help fill this gap and develop more understanding on how to move forward with this strategy. The Project Director of this program is Frances Seymour, while the lead consultant on the work in Indonesia is Leony Aurora.

The first phase of the program (April 2017-April 2018) aims to gain understanding of the dominant narratives around economic development that may be hindering sustainable land use and, with CLUA grantee networks, identify common narratives supportive of sustainable land use to build together.
In the second phase, the program is directing its focus on young urbanites in Indonesia.

Urban youth are future leaders and voters in Indonesia and they are an important segment to engage. Deforestation (and its impacts) and forest protection need to be their top issues for Indonesia to have sustainable land use.

As such, the second phase of the program (May 2018 - March 2019) under this grant is dedicated to increasing understanding on the perception of urban youth on forests and what narratives resonate with them, as well as how to use social media to share such narratives effectively.

Under this program, Windward Fund commissions and supervises a qualitative research that aims to (1) understand urban youth (defined to be 15-40yo) perspectives towards forests and deforestation; and (2) explore and fine tune possible narratives that might get them to care about these issues.

This work will help provide empirical data to assist stakeholders working on forestry and environmental campaigns in Indonesia.
A consortium of Eye to Eye and Communication for Change was commissioned to conduct the study.

A consortium between Eye to Eye and Communication for Change (C4C) is formed to offer this service to Windward Fund.

Eye to Eye is in charge for the qualitative study’s design and execution, while C4C is responsible for exploring and finetuning narratives around forest protection and develop a campaign plan for a selected narrative, in consultation with NGOs. This report is limited to the findings of the study – a separate document will be provided for the campaign plan.

For further information on both firms, see Annex 2.
Research Design
Through this study, we aim to understand what young urbanites in Indonesia think and feel of forests and deforestation and how to make them care about these issues.

To understand the perception of Indonesian urban youth (age 15-40 yo) of forests and deforestation, and emotions attached to them.

To explore what issues or problems they have heard about forests and their impacts, if any, on their daily lives.

Using sequential recycling approach (see slide 22), to explore the most relevant narrative to engage them to support forest protection.
The study used FGD method, enriched with some visual tools and pre-assignments.

Focus group discussions (FGD)
6 participants in each group

Duration: 1.5 – 2 hours
(50% to explore perception on forest and deforestation;
50% to evaluate narratives)

StoryWorks™ was used to explore deeper emotional meaning of the forest and the chosen narratives (see Annex 1)

Prior to attending the FGDs, participants were asked to explain what forests mean to them using pictures, songs, videos, photographs or other media.
To evaluate and refine the narratives, we used the sequential recycling method.

1. **Group 1**
   - Observe and understand participants’ reactions

2. Get a feel of the most potential narratives

3. Get participants’ feedback on how to improve them

4. Improve the potential narratives

5. Next group
Three cities were selected to represent CLUA’s priority areas; they are geographically the closest to forest and deforestation.

**PEKANBARU**
Forest and peatland fires; palm oil plantations as well as pulp and paper industry

**PONTIANAK**
Forest and peatland fires; palm plantations being the backbone of local economy; indigenous Dayak people still living in the forest

**MANOKWARI**
Capital city of West Papua, which consists of 90% forest area; local people owns customary rights
Two other cities were selected to represent the largest cities in Indonesia.

**JAKARTA**
Cosmopolitan and modern; far from forest (closest one in West Java)

**MEDAN**
Palm oil plantations; low trust to government
We added Banyuwangi in East Java considering its unique characteristics.
In total, we conducted 24 FGDs: four groups in each city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>representing cities</th>
<th>the main focus for deforestation issue as assigned by CLUA</th>
<th>Additional city given its uniqueness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15–17 yo (SMA students)</td>
<td>Jakarta (JKT)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medan (KNO)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pekanbaru (PKU)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pontianak (PNK)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makassar (MKW)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banyuwangi (BWX)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–22 yo (college students)</td>
<td>Jakarta (JKT)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medan (KNO)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pekanbaru (PKU)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pontianak (PNK)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makassar (MKW)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banyuwangi (BWX)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23–30 yo (first jobbers or early career. Mix of single and married)</td>
<td>Jakarta (JKT)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female) – mix of workers and stay at home mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medan (KNO)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pekanbaru (PKU)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pontianak (PNK)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makassar (MKW)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banyuwangi (BWX)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40 yo (experienced workers, stay at home mothers also in female groups. Mix of those having smaller and older kids)</td>
<td>Jakarta (JKT)</td>
<td>1 group (female) – mix of workers and stay at home mothers</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medan (KNO)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female) – mix of workers and stay at home mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pekanbaru (PKU)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pontianak (PNK)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makassar (MKW)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banyuwangi (BWX)</td>
<td>1 group (female)</td>
<td>1 group (male)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 24 groups
Findings

What do forests and deforestation mean to them?
Participants have knowledge about the forests and deforestation, but they don’t discuss these issues spontaneously.

Discussion on forests was an intellectual exercise, meaning it had to be prompted and guided and will not happen spontaneously.

Their homeworks to describe what they think of forests were the result of consulting Google, and even textbooks, not their spontaneous perceptions and knowledge about the forest.
At spontaneous level, forests are associated with an ecosystem of plants and animals that has many functions.
Forests are associated most often with clean water and clean air.

Forests are our life support! They make sure that we have clean water and clean air – basic life requirements – for everyone to enjoy. Forests take care of us.

“I want to still be able to breathe freely when I’m old. Forests give us clean air.”
Maunya masih bisa nafas bebas sampai tua. Hutan bisa kasih kita udara bersih itu.
(Banyuwangi, married male)

“Forests give us clean water and air. Imagine if it’s no longer there, where we will get that? We can die!”
Hutan memberikan kita udara dan air bersih. Kalau sudah tidak ada hutan, wah, kita dapat dari mana itu? Kita bisa mati!
(Pontianak, male student)
Forests are highly associated with the feeling of calmness and relief; as a place to travel to or spend leisure time.

Forests are the perfect places for urbanites to destress and relax.

“When you go to forests, you feel relaxed. The air is clean, the green will soothe your eyes.”
Kalau ke hutan, kita tu rileks. Udara bersih. Lihat yang hijau-hijau juga seger di mata.
(Jakarta, married female)

“I go to forests to relax and get fresh air. There is no hustle and bustle.”
Ke hutan buat rileks, santai, dapat udara segar. Tidak hiruk pikuk.
(Manokwari, male student)
In some areas, forest are still seen as the source of life necessities and local economy as well.

Forests have economic value to people living in and around it—natural resources that people can sell for a living (though when not done responsibly, it can cause deforestation).

“We can get food and woods from the forest.”
Dari hutan kita bisa dapat makanan, kayu juga buat bikin rumah.
(Pontianak, female student)

“The forest can provide you with many things. You can sell the wood, though it can create other problems. Or people who live around it also have plantations under the forest’s trees, that they can take and eat. They can also get fruits and other plants from the forest, and sell them to the city.”
(Manokwari, male student)
Some participants also mention that forests have educational and scientific benefits.

**Learning, knowledge**—the forest is very rich with flora and fauna, some are even yet discovered.

“It is a place of education. You can learn about various plants and animals.”
*Tempat belajar. Bisa belajar tentang macam-macam tanaman dan binatang.*
(Medan, female adult, single)

“I study pharmacy, so knowing what various plants that can be used to make a certain medicine is useful. And I can learn that from the plants in the forest.”
*Saya belajar untuk jadi apoteker, jadi termasuk belajar apa saja tanaman yang bisa dipakai untuk obat. Saya juga belajar tanaman apa saja itu yang ada di hutan.*
(Pontianak, female student)
We also discovered perspectives unique to particular cities.

**MANOKWARI**

People still consume fruits/vegetables from the forests.

- life support (*penopang hidup*), home (*rumah*), life needs provider (*menyediakan kebutuhan hidup*)

For other cities/locations, this is only for those living in and around the forests.

**PONTIANAK**

The only city that mentions biodiversity

**BANYUWANGI**

High association to Javanese’s belief that there are spiritual beings that take care of the forests, e.g. in Alas Purwo
In further discussions using StoryWork as a tool, we found rich MEANING and VALUES attached to forests.
From StoryWorks: Looking at the intrinsic meaning of each visual related to the archetypes, to a large extent, forests mean...

- Power and bravery
- Freedom to explore and learn
- Hope and optimism
- Unpretentiousness; be who you are
- Joy and cheerfulness
- Nurture and support
Forests also represent ...

Intelligence, knowledge

Control, safety (of life) yet also fragile

Transformation--life evolves by itself, undisturbed
These associations imply that **IF THEY ARE GIVEN THE RIGHT STIMULUS** that can touch these deeper emotions, **THEY WILL CARE** about what happens to forests.

Thus, **it is CRITICAL to build narratives that CAN EVOKE these emotions**, so that they are willing to take action.
During the discussions, we gave participants a statement about deforestation.

**Deforestation stimulus:**
“Every minute, we lose forests the size of five soccer fields.”

- Shocking news for the participant.
- Many believed this statement to be a fact, some doubted it.
- Created IMMEDIATE concerns for participants.

Note: Most of the participants did not understand the word “deforestasi/deforestation” so we used “penebangan hutan” or forest clearing.
Participants also associated deforestation (penebangan hutan) with disasters.
Participants were familiar with “climate change” as a jargon. However, most of them did not understand what it means.

A few spontaneously mentioned climate change in the perspective of change in weather (perubahan cuaca) and described it as unpredictable weather, how areas that used to be cool are now warm (e.g. Manokwari).

When prompted, ALL OF THEM CLAIMED to know what “climate change” is, but often misattributed it to:

- The loss of ozone layer; a hole on the ozone layer;
- Pollution due to smoke from vehicles, factories;

This is in line with findings from the previous media analysis that show how various stakeholders use “climate change” in the media to describe overall environmental problems/issues, including plastic waste etc..
Deforestation is associated with chaos, discomfort, confusion, sadness.

“All animals will no longer have a place to live. We will not be able to see them anymore.” / Binatang nggak punya rumah lagi. Kita nggak bisa lihat mereka lagi.

“Intense heat, uncomfortable.” / Jadi panas, gersang, nggak nyaman.

“Don’t know what to do, we may die.” / Nggak tahu harus apa, kita mati mungkin.

And if not tackled, it may drive a forced discovery that is quite uncomfortable.

“Living in Mars may become a reality.” / Mungkin beneran nanti satu saat kita harus tinggal di Mars.

“Our earth will be so dry and hot and dusty. That is the future if we don’t do anything from now.” / Bumi jadi kering, kotor, gersang, berdebu. Itu nanti yang harus kita hadapi di masa depan kalau nggak berbuat apa-apa dari sekarang.
We asked participants about what they think caused deforestation, then we asked them to rank those causes.

**Most mentioned**

- Plantations (mostly palm, then rubber)
- Housing to accommodate population growth
- Logging, legal and illegal (except in Jakarta)
- Mining (only mentioned by a few in Manokwari, Pontianak, Banyuwangi)
- In Jakarta: logging (legal and illegal)
- Small-scale plantations (ladang rakyat)

**Least mentioned**

- Infrastructure (only when prompted and mostly viewed positively because it’s for the good of many and only done once.)
Although participants in Pontianak, Medan, and Pekanbaru recognized palm plantations as the main cause of deforestations, they are internally conflicted about taking opposing actions.

Participants realized that palm plantations are the main culprit, however the plantations are owned by people they know.

There are positive and negative sides to palm plantations:
- **POSITIVE**: bringing income to the area.
- **NEGATIVE**: bad impacts for the environment.

This point created a strong UNEASINESS among the participants, because they would have to fight against their own social circle. In the end, the three cities reacted differently to the dilemma.

Pekanbaru chose to RESIGN to the situation. Meanwhile, Medan and Pontianak showed strong FRUSTRATIONS.
Palm plantation is viewed as contributing the most damage by far.

All males in Jakarta and those in all areas, have very good knowledge about the impact of plant plantation.

One of the positives is locals can get jobs in the plantation. But, majority know that:
- The soil will no longer be fertile
- The water around the area will be polluted by the fertilizer.

Those in Manokwari, Pontianak and Banyuwangi know that palm takes up a lot of water, which means enormous reduction in the water sources around it.

Participants in Pontianak and Manokwari perceive corporates tricked local people to use their land, but after 10 – 15 years when the palms are no longer productive, the local people will suffer left with unfertile land.
The development of housing complexes caused by rapid population growth was mentioned as the second biggest cause of deforestation.

In Manokwari, the existence of Dana Desa (Village Fund) is also mentioned as the main reason for land clearing for housing. And since there is customary rights, a certain ‘tribe’ has the right to do what they want with their land. They can open up a new village as they please.

In Pontianak and Pekanbaru, developers from in and outside the area, are seen as responsible to open up to housing complexes.
The next contributor mentioned by participants was logging—whether legal or illegal.

Jakartans see this as the major culprit; they seem to be less exposed to news about palm plantations. However, this is no longer seen as the major contributor in the other cities.

In Pontianak and Manokwari, though illegal logging may still exist, but they know the government is now monitoring the traffic of woods more closely. However, they question whether the legal ones, are really monitored. There is perception that the legal ones cut down uncontrollably as much as the illegal ones.

Banyuwangi is used to industrial forests, so logging is seen to be well regulated by the local government. However, commoners actually also cut down trees for their personal use, without doing anything after that e.g. re-planting. This suggests that Banyuwangi people actually do not do much about preserving their forest.
Smallholder plantations are perceived as taking up only small lands, thus much less damaging than the corporation-owned ones.

Mainly mentioned in Manokwari, Pontianak, Medan and Pekanbaru; these plantations are seen as the traditional way that local people do. It is usually done using traditional tools, so they usually do not cut down the very big trees.

And this is usually nomadic—thus the land that they leave will regrow itself in time.

However, in Pontianak and Pekanbaru, the major issue attached to this is the fire that they do to either clear the land, or to fertilise the soil by burning.
Mining was not mentioned greatly in Manokwari and Pontianak—most likely due to less exposure or experience of witnessing this in their area.

Those in Banyuwangi were the most disturbed about this due what they have observed in Tumpang Pitu.

This is seen not only as a damage to the forest, but also ruins much larger environment due to polluted water.
The development of infrastructure is not perceived to be damaging because of three reasons.

First, it is useful for EVERYONE. Especially those Manokwari view infrastructure as necessary to support further development of Papua and a big help to people in remote areas of Papua.

Second, infrastructure development is done only once, not continuously unlike those who clear up lands for plantations and housing complexes.

Third, it doesn’t cause continuous pollution, unlike plantations or even housing complexes (with its garbage problems).
Participants named corporations and government as the parties that are the most responsible for deforestation.

People with power and money.
Corrupt government officials. Those who know there are rules but choose to close their eyes.

Those who are responsible should be put in jail for what they have done.

However, in Pekanbaru, there is a very strong feeling of HELPLESSNESS: “What can we do against them?”
This helplessness turned into RESIGNATION.
ANGER is expressed among some youths (high school and university students) in Jakarta and Pontianak when talking about these culprits.
Majority thought Reforestation is the solution to deforestation, except in Pontianak.

This card appears consistently in all cities to represent what they feel they can do, which is planting trees. However, in Pontianak, this card represents irrereplaceability: It takes time for a seed to grow—impossible to replace huge forest areas.

Thus, to those in Pontianak, reforestation is not an answer to deforestation!
Some participants across all areas also feel there should be a collaborative effort to combat deforestation.

This card was chosen by some participants across all areas, representing COLLABORATION of the people and/or communities or organisations who care about the environment.

Collaboration is also necessary to push companies and the government to start doing something about the damaged forests.
We also observed several consistent patterns across all areas.

Very few respondents know any environmental NGOs. Walhi, WWF, TNC, Greenpeace were mentioned separately by one or two people in different research locations. There was even a mention of UNICEF.

Hiking clubs (pecinta alam) and boy/girl scouts (Pramuka) are more often referred to as organisations working on environmental issues. Being in hiking clubs does not necessarily make them more knowledgeable on forests.

Outside Jakarta, Gerakan 1000 pohon (1000 trees movement) was often mentioned as an effort by local government to create a greener environment. But many question its effectiveness—where are the trees now?

There were a few students of the faculty of forestry in the groups outside Jakarta—even they do not seem to have that much knowledge about how to preserve natural resource in the forest.

Participants’ literacy levels are not very high. They are not familiar with jargons, even one that seems to be quite familiar like ‘agraris’. This applies to all areas, including Jakarta. Specifically in Manokwari, communication should be straightforward and simple. Paragraphs with many sentences seem to confuse them.
Social media use varies across cities and age groups, but generally Facebook and Instagram are the most popular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BANYUWANGI</th>
<th>PONTIANAK</th>
<th>MANOKWARI</th>
<th>PEKANBARU</th>
<th>MEDAN</th>
<th>JAKARTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get news from local news accounts, as well as to post pictures and see other people’s posts</td>
<td>Just to see what others post – but seem to be distant with this channel</td>
<td>To get news from local news accounts, as well as to post pictures and see other people’s posts</td>
<td>To get news from local news accounts, as well as to post pictures and see other people’s posts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reconnect with friends</td>
<td>To get news</td>
<td>To buy and sell stuff (Manokwari, Pontianak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only 1–2 people have this account in every group, and tend to be those who have a certain activity e.g. active in a political discussion group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JAKARTA**

- **23-40 y.o** – same like other cities
- **15–22 y.o** – almost never, oldies
- To self-post and see others’, to shop—mainly as a platform for fun
- 23–40 y.o—to get news, to reconnect with friends
- 15–22 y.o. rarely use it
- Somewhat active, to get news and current affairs
- For the latest news, get jokes
By examining various indicators, we can learn about participants’ attitude to forest-related issues and deforestation.

We looked at several attributes to map out the six cities studied:

- Geographical closeness to the forest
- Perceived problems caused by deforestation
- Perceived scale of deforestation
- Perception that close social circle benefits from land-use conversion
- Perception that only elite few (i.e. corporations and certain actors within the government, i.e. ‘oknum pemerintah’) benefit from land used conversion
- Level of irritation with the problem
- Sense of agency – feeling whether they can do anything about it or not
- Desire to take action
- Trust to local government
By examining the map below, we can draw some conclusions about each city’s unique state of mind and heart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Banyuwangi</th>
<th>Pontianak</th>
<th>Manokwari</th>
<th>Pekanbaru</th>
<th>Medan</th>
<th>Jakarta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical closeness to the forest</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of problems caused by deforestation</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of scale of deforestation</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of social circle benefits from it</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that elite few benefit from it</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of irritation with the problem</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of agency</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to take action</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust to local government</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Very proud of its local economy achievement and development—high trust to local government in creating opportunities FOR ALL.

High appreciation to its rich nature—forest should be respected as it is a place of high spirits.

Especially among the males—more outdoorsy, thus, more aware of their natural resources.

They know in other areas deforestation is bad especially for palm plantations. But in Banyuwangi, they only see what is happening in Tumpang Pitu. And, it is not seen as very dire, yet.

**GOOD** side of deforestation:
Trust that it contributes to local income and further development
Not a large scale

**BAD** side of deforestation:
Pollution, loss of forest equals hotter weather, and maybe (unforeseen) disasters

IF they have to take action they are confident that they will be listened to by the local government. But currently, they are only focused on Banyuwangi, making them seem to be myopic and only focus on themselves. However, this may change if they are given the right context of deforestation issues nationally.

Banyuwangi is a small town that strongly feels empowered, proud of themselves, yet, not perceiving any serious issue with its forest.
Used to be surrounded by forests, much of which have been converted to palm plantations and housing complexes.

Annual haze problem—believed to be caused by new land clearing, as well as the old ones being burned as a way to fertilize it. Also flood at some areas, drier and hotter weather. Very angry at this situation, yet, also face a dilemma.

**GOOD** side of deforestation:
Population grows, means houses are needed. Local people also benefit from plantations (i.e. friends and family own some of these).

**BAD** side of deforestation:
Loss of forest equals environmental issue, loss of biodiversity. Corporations, local and multinational, own MOST of these and trick local people.

Willingness to take action is high due to not wanting to deal with future disasters. But, they think changes will not happen easily, driven by the dilemma that taking actions might mean fighting their own social circle.

They are very liberal and national-oriented—change should happen to all areas. If Kalimantan becomes the only region with well-preserved forests, people will "rob" it anyway after the others have gone.

There is some trust to the local government—they have seen some rules have been applied to reduce haze, and there are channels to directly talk to local government.
Manokwari has strong emotional ties with the forest—they have strong motivations to protect their livelihood.

High attachment to the forest – the males still go into the woods from time to time, married females buy food items from ‘Mama-mama’ who go into the forest to take those. Have experienced issues due to deforestation – flood at some areas, hotter weather to the usually cool Manokwari, difficulty to find fruits and animals unique to Manokwari. Attribute all the problems to the high scale of deforestation, and realise that all that can happen due to the customary rights – the land owners are free to do whatever they want with it.

But different from those in Pontianak and Pekanbaru, this does not create a dilemma to Manokwarians. Rather, it empowers them—feeling that with such right, they can actually do something to fight off temptation given to land owners to open up their part of the forest. They believe that there are MORE CORPORATIONS THAN PEOPLE that benefit from land use conversion.

Trust to local government is low – believe that they are very much a part of the corruption that causes companies able to operate as they wish to persuade local people to use their rights to open up lands.
No attachment to the forest, but, smoke and hotter and drier weather in the city are realized as dire issues caused by deforestation.

However, similar like Pontianak, there is a social dilemma since they know many of the plantation owners, are from their own social circles.

Corporations and the government also create such a system so they can also get the benefit from the land used conversion.

Thus, fighting against those means fighting their own kind AND a corrupt system.

They choose ‘let it be’ – feeling powerless to change the situation, and there is also strong doubt that taking an action will result in anything.

Their aspired area is West Sumatra—still green, with well developed city, this is where they would love to escape to. Thus, there is also a strong feel of wanting to get away rather than taking actions.

The local government, is seen as so much a part of the scheme with the plantations.

---

**Pekanbaru showed a strong resignation to their conditions—feeling powerless, somewhat giving up.**

| Perception of problems caused by deforestation | LOW |
| Geographical closeness to the forest | LOW |
| Perception of scale of deforestation | LOW |
| Perception of social circle benefits from it | LOW |
| Perception that elite few benefit from it | HIGH |
| Level of irritation with the problem | LOW |
| Sense of agency | LOW |
| Desire to take action | LOW |
| Trust to local government | LOW |
They are too far from the forest areas to really see the impact of deforestation. But, they can guess somewhat that it is quite serious.

At the same time, they realise that their social circle benefits from it too (logging, plantations)—as much as the government and corporations.

They are very irritated WHEN GIVEN STIMULUS TO DISCUSS, otherwise, they seem to be distant with these issues. And when irritated, they want to take action against BOTH corporations and the government whom they think also take part in the whole scheme.

The issue is too far from Medan to make them feel ownership and the need to take action.
Similar to Medan, Jakarta is too far from the forest areas to really see the impact of deforestation. But, when they ARE MADE AWARE OF IT, they can relate to the urgency of the situation. Being the capital of the country, none in their social circle is perceived to benefit from land clearing. This creates high sense of irritation because all those natural resources are used by corporations to benefit themselves. Driven by recent happenings, they believe that if actions are taken, change can be made. But they will need a very strong reason to take action. Jakartans have little trust to the government in general—driven by perceived high frequency of corruption.

**We have to raise Jakartans’ awareness first. Once aware, they are quite willing to take action and feel they can make a change.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jakarta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical closeness to the forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of problems caused by deforestation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of scale of deforestation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of social circle benefits from it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that elite few benefit from it</td>
<td><strong>HIGH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of irritation with the problem</td>
<td><strong>HIGH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of agency</td>
<td><strong>HIGH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to take action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust to local government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do they respond to narratives?
We used the moral foundation theory to craft the narratives presented in the FGDs.

Moral foundations were combined with angles/entry points suggested and concluded from the first phase of the AN work:

- Focus on water supply
- Disaster prevention
- Not focused on climate change/carbon
We showed 6 to 7 narratives per FGD depending on age groups and areas.

Some narratives were only shown to specific age groups and/or areas:
- DADDY (males only) and MOM (females only) in the 23-30yo (first jobbers) and 31-40yo groups
- YOUTH only to high school students, university students, and first jobbers
- SACRED and LIVELIHOOD (living off forests) only in Manokwari and Pontianak
- A revised LIVELIHOOD (forests attracting tourists) was shown in Banyuwangi.

All the narratives were evaluated using the sequential recycling method (see slide 22 on this).
As Indonesians, we are proud to own one of the largest forests in the world which helps protect the Earth from polluted air and warming temperatures. Therefore, we must protect the source of that pride.

PROTECT FORESTS, THE SOURCE OF OUR PRIDE.

Forests are an inseparable part of our diverse, rich, and agrarian national identity, because forests are a source of water, culture, and rich in natural resources. Therefore, we must protect the forests.

FORESTS ARE INDONESIA, PROTECT OUR IDENTITY.

We, the youth, are fed up of witnessing the greed of the previous generations damage the forest. We must stop the exploitation of forests so that we do not suffer the adverse consequences of the previous generations' greed.

PROTECT FORESTS, FIGHT GREED.

As citizens, we have the right to enjoy the wealth of our forests, yet we don’t know who have been enjoying it all this time. Therefore, we must keep an eye on the use of forest, the treasure we share, so that its wealth doesn’t go to those who don’t deserve it.

KEEP AN EYE ON THE USE OF FOREST, THE WEALTH WE SHARE.
As a father/leader of the family, I am responsible for the safety of my family. If forests are destroyed, my family will face the risks of floods, landslides, and lack of clean water.

SAVE FORESTS, SAVE OUR FAMILIES.

As faithful people, we must show our gratitude to God, one of which is by caring for the purity of His gifts. However, all this time we have allowed forests, one of the greatest gifts of God, to be polluted and fully exploited.

TAKE CARE OF FORESTS, PROVE OUR GRATITUDE.

As a mother, the health of my family is my priority. I don’t want my family to suffer from lack of clean water or disasters like flood and landslide caused by the destruction of forests.

KEEP FORESTS HEALTHY FOR THE SAKE OF OUR FAMILY’S HEALTH.
Narratives originally developed to be tested in FGDs (3)

**SACRED**
For Manokwari and Pontianak
As Papuans/Borneo people, forests are a sacred place with spiritual values to me. Therefore, damaging forests is the same as tarnishing its sanctity and insulting my beliefs. We must unite to stop the desecration of forests.

**LIVELIHOOD**
For Manokwari and Pontianak
As Papuans/Borneo people, we are proud for having forests that are our source of food and daily livelihood. Therefore, destroying forests is the same as disturbing our lives. Let’s unite to stop the clearing of Papua’s/Borneo’s forests.

**LIVELIHOOD-B**
For Banyuwangi
As people of Banyuwangi, we are proud for having forests that are the destinations for tourism and education. They make a great contribution to our regional income. Therefore, destroying forests is the same as threatening our prosperity.
After the first two groups in Jakarta, we decided to drop the call-to-action sentences from the narratives.

Each narrative had a call to action, written in the capital letter as in the example below:

As Indonesians, we are proud to own one of the largest forests in the world which helps protect the Earth from polluted air and warming temperatures. Therefore, we must protect the source of that pride.

PROTECT FORESTS, THE SOURCE OF OUR PRIDE.

However, after the first two groups in Jakarta, we learned that participants tended to evaluate a narrative only based on how strong or persuasive the call-to-action is according to them, rather than paying attention to the whole narrative. Based on this learning, we decided to delete all the call to actions so we can explore reactions to the complete narratives.
To explain how sequential recycling method works, we are going to show the evolution process of the PRIDE narrative.

PRIDE was a narrative that went through the most change across the cities. The whole journey of this narrative and reaction to each revision in each city are detailed in this section, to give a feel of how sequential recycling was done.

For the other narratives, we will only show the FINAL version and the reactions towards it.
As Indonesians, we are proud for having one of the largest forests in the world that help protect the Earth from polluted air and warming temperatures. Therefore, we must protect the source of that pride.

PROTECT FORESTS, THE SOURCE OF OUR PRIDE.
After the first two groups in Jakarta, we dropped the call-to-action and changed the narrative a little.

As Indonesians, we are proud to own one of the largest forests in the world which helps protect the Earth from polluted air and warming temperatures. Therefore, we need to take care of the protector of the world.

Still no emotional connection—largest forest that protects the earth still lack relevance.

For the next rounds: add the ranking of Indonesia’s forests because Indonesians like rankings.

In Indonesian: Sebagai orang Indonesia, kita bangga memiliki salah satu hutan terluas di dunia yang ikut melindungi seluruh bumi dari udara kotor dan suhu yang memanas. Karena itu, kita perlu ikut merawat pelindung dunia
As Indonesians, we are proud for having the third largest forests in the world that help protect the Earth from polluted air and warming temperatures. Therefore, we need to take care of the protector of the world.

In Medan, we discovered that the ranking increased the sense of pride in participants. However, they didn’t care about protecting Earth.

Protecting Earth still lacks relevance. For the next rounds, we (1) took out protecting Earth, (2) added information on how much we’re losing forests, and (3) changed the last statement to “We have to protect OUR POSITION.”

In Indonesian: Sebagai orang Indonesia, kita bangga memiliki hutan terluas ketiga di dunia yang ikut melindungi seluruh bumi dari udara kotor dan suhu yang memanas. Karena itu, kita perlu ikut merawat pelindung dunia.
As Indonesians, we are proud for having the third largest forests in the world. Yet, every minute our forests get reduced by the size of five football fields. We have to start acting to maintain our position in the world.

In Pekanbaru, we added the statistic from the stimulus statement. This created a sense of urgency in participants.

Disappearing forests is taken for granted in Pekanbaru. They felt RESIGNATION (nothing they can do to change things), thus the call to maintain ranking did not resonate.

For the next rounds, we (1) added relevance of vast forests; (2) changed maintaining ranking to forest protection in general.

In Indonesian: Sebagai orang Indonesia, kita bangga memiliki hutan terluas ketiga di dunia. Namun, setiap menit luas hutan kita berkurang sebesar lima lapangan sepak bola. Kita harus mulai bergerak untuk mempertahankan posisi kita di dunia.
In Manokwari, we discovered that mentioning biodiversity and clean water and air helped strengthening the pride participants felt from knowing the rank.

As Indonesians, we are proud for having the third largest forests in the world that are rich in flora and fauna and a source of clean water and air. Yet every minute our forests get reduced by the size of five football fields. We must act to protect our forests.

In Indonesian: Sebagai orang Indonesia, kita bangga memiliki hutan terluas ketiga di dunia yang kaya flora dan fauna serta menjadi sumber air dan udara bersih. Namun, setiap menit luas hutan kita berkurang sebesar lima lapangan sepak bola. Kita harus mulai bergerak untuk melindungi hutan kita.

Red = to be changed in the next round.
Green = changed or added from the last round

The shock caused by realizing how fast the forests are disappearing created an urgency to act (“let’s do something!”).

Ranking of Indonesia’s forests still brought pride. For the next rounds, we added “sangat bangga” (“very proud”) to the first sentence to try to elicit more response.
The narrative did not change anymore in Pontianak and Banyuwangi. The emotional response was apparent and participants no longer had issues with the narrative.

As Indonesians, we are very proud for having the third largest forests in the world that are rich in flora and fauna and a source of clean water and air. Yet every minute our forests get reduced by the size of five football fields. We must act to protect our forests.

In Indonesian: Sebagai orang Indonesia, kita sangat bangga memiliki hutan terluas ketiga di dunia yang kaya flora dan fauna serta menjadi sumber air dan udara bersih. Namun, setiap menit luas hutan kita berkurang sebesar lima lapangan sepak bola. Kita harus mulai bergerak untuk melindungi hutan kita.

Red = to be changed in the next round.
Green = changed or added from the last round

Participants in Pontianak were concerned about losing biodiversity endemic to Borneo, as well as other parts in Indonesia (Papua was mentioned).
The following slides contain the FINAL version of other narratives and a general overview of participants’ reaction throughout the sequential recycling process.
FINAL NARRATIVE:

**CITIZEN** is a strong narrative in terms of triggering anger due to a sense of being cheated on.

As citizens, **we enjoy the benefits given by lush forests. Yet, some have been cutting down forests for their own profit.** Therefore, we need to keep the forests intact, so that all of us may continue enjoying their benefits.

In Indonesian: Sebagai warga negara, kita ikut menikmati manfaat hutan yang rimbun. Namun, ada yang membabat hutan untuk memperkaya diri sendiri. Karena itu, kita harus menjaga hutan agar tetap rimbun, supaya kita semua bisa terus menikmati manfaatnya.
FINAL NARRATIVE:

DADDY: All male participants agreed that it is a responsible man’s job to keep their family safe. Even among those who are still single, DADDY narrative rang true.

As a father/leader of the family, I am responsible for the safety of my family. If forests are destroyed, my family will face the risks of floods, landslides, and lack of clean water.

In Indonesian: Sebagai seorang ayah/pemimpin keluarga, saya memiliki tugas untuk melindungi keselamatan keluarga. Jika hutan rusak, keluarga saya akan terancam bencana banjir, tanah longsor, dan kekurangan air bersih.
FINAL NARRATIVE:
MOM is an undisputed narrative about every woman’s responsibility.
Water is always the main concern.

As a mother, **the health of my family** is my priority. I don’t want my family to suffer from **lack of clean water** or disasters like floods and landslides caused by the destruction of forests.

**In Indonesian:** Sebagai seorang ibu, kesehatan keluarga saya adalah yang utama. Saya tidak ingin keluarga saya menderita karena kekurangan air bersih atau bencana banjir dan tanah longsor yang diakibatkan kerusakan hutan.
**FINAL NARRATIVE:**

**Youth** was received very well across all younger groups in Jakarta, Pekanbaru, Medan, and Banyuwangi. However, Pontianak and Manokwari felt that the current generation is also responsible for deforestation.

---

We, the youth, are fed up of witnessing the greed of the previous generations damage the forests. We must stop forest clearing so that we do not suffer disasters like landsides, floods, and droughts as a result of the previous generations’ greed.

**RISK AVOIDANCE:** participants do not want to deal with all these bad impacts.

In Indonesian: Kita anak muda sudah muak melihat keserakahan generasi sebelumnya yang merusak hutan. Kita harus menghentikan pembabatan hutan agar kita tidak menanggung bencana seperti tanah longsor, banjir, dan kekeringan gara-gara keserakahan generasi sebelumnya.
FINAL NARRATIVE:
SACRED received mixed reaction in Manokwari. It was well received by males, but not so much by females, as it may be perceived as contradicting religious beliefs.

As Pauans, forests are a sacred place that hold a spiritual value for me. Therefore, destroying the forest is the same as tarnishing its sanctity and insulting my beliefs. We must unite to stop the desecration of forests.

In Indonesian: Sebagai orang Papua, hutan adalah tempat yang sakral dan bernilai spiritual untuk saya. Jadi, merusak hutan sama saja dengan menodai kesakralannya sekaligus melecehkan keyakinan saya. Kita harus bersatu untuk menghentikan penodaan hutan.
**FINAL NARRATIVE:**

*SACRED* was finetuned and as such was well received across the board in Pontianak, because the context is their local customs and traditions, not spirituality.

However, they felt that this narrative is immediately relevant only to those living around the forest, not to urban people.

As Borneo people, **forests are a sacred place in my traditions**. Therefore, destroying the forest is the same as insulting my traditions. We need to unite to stop the destruction of forests.

In Indonesian: Sebagai orang Kalimantan, hutan adalah tempat yang sakral dalam adat istiadat saya. Jadi, merusak hutan sama saja dengan melecehkan adat istiadat saya. Kita harus bersatu untuk menghentikan perusakan hutan.
FINAL NARRATIVE:

LIVELIHOOD was well received in both Manokwari and Pontianak, but much stronger in Manokwari. Pontianak doesn’t like this narrative for being “Borneo-centric”, they prefer narratives that embrace and apply to Indonesia as a whole.

As Papuans/Borneo people, we are proud to own forests that provide us with food and daily livelihood. Therefore, destroying forests is as good as disturbing our livelihood. Let us unite to stop the destruction of forests of Papua/Borneo.

In Indonesian: Sebagai orang Papua/Kalimantan, kami bangga memiliki hutan yang menjadi sumber makanan dan penghasilan sehari-hari. Jadi, merusak hutan sama saja dengan mengganggu kehidupan kami. Mari bersatu menghentikan pembabatan hutan Papua/Kalimantan.
**FINAL NARRATIVE:**

Banyuwangi felt that deforestation is a threat to their welfare and prosperity. Thus, LIVELIHOOD is strong and fits their psyche well: very local thinking, proud of their area, high trust for the local government.

As the people of Banyuwangi, we are proud for having forests that serve as destinations for tourism and education. Thy make a great contribution to our regional income. Therefore, destroying forests is the same as threatening our prosperity.

In Indonesian: Sebagai orang Banyuwangi, kami bangga memiliki hutan yang menjadi tempat wisata dan edukasi. Ini memberi sumbangan besar pada pendapatan daerah kami. Jadi merusak hutan sama saja dengan mengancam kemakmuran kami.

Their forests have to be protected. If they stay in good condition and continue to benefit locals, other areas will praise Banyuwangi and use it as an example.
**FINAL NARRATIVE:**

IDENTITY was generally liked across all cities. It was the most popular narrative in Jakarta and third most popular in Pekanbaru.

Forests are **an inseparable part of the Indonesian identity, which is diverse, rich, and fertile**, because forests are a **source of water**, culture, and **rich in natural resources**. Therefore, protecting forests is the same as protecting our national identity.

This was changed from ‘agraris’ (agrarian) that MANY did not understand, including in Jakarta.

Relevant especially for the adults. If **not protected, it can endanger our lives**.

In Indonesian: Hutan adalah bagian yang tak terpisahkan dari identitas Indonesia yang bhineka, kaya, dan subur. Sebab, hutan adalah sumber air, sumber budaya, dan kaya sumber daya alam. Jadi, melindungi hutan sama dengan melindungi identitas bangsa.
FINAL NARRATIVE:

RELIGION was well received in Jakarta, Pekanbaru and Medan; not so much in other areas. Most balked at “pushing the government” as they feel what they say won’t make a difference.

As religious people, we must show our gratitude to God by protecting and taking care of His gifts, including forests. Yet, forests have been utterly polluted and cleared. Therefore, we need to establish a social movement to urge the government to stop the pollution and clearing.

In Indonesian: Sebagai umat beragama, kita harus menunjukkan rasa syukur pada Tuhan dengan cara menjaga dan merawat anugerah-Nya, termasuk hutan. Namun, selama ini hutan dicemari dan dibabat habis-habisan. Jadi, kita harus membuat gerakan masyarakat untuk mendesak pemerintah agar menghentikan pencemaran dan pembabatan itu.
We can map the popularity of all narratives as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narratives shown to all</th>
<th>Narratives shown to specific groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIDE – Medan, Pontianak, Banyuwangi, Manokwari</td>
<td>DADDY and MOM across all adults, males and females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN – Medan, Pontianak, Manokwari, older adults</td>
<td>YOUTH – across all youths in Jakarta, Medan, Pekanbaru, Banyuwangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTITY – Jakarta and Pekanbaru</td>
<td>LIVELIHOOD – Banyuwangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION – Medan, Pekanbaru, Jakarta</td>
<td>LIVELIHOOD - Manokwari (version Alt 1 but only among males)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Their chosen narratives are consistently associated with TOGETHERNESS.

Across all the chosen narratives, this picture consistently came out—it represents a SPIRIT OF TOGETHERNESS to protect the forest.

Additionally, it also means differently for these narratives:

- For IDENTITY, it refers to diversity (bineka).
- For YOUTH, it refers to care, no longer ignoring the issue.
PRIDE is very strongly associated to the feeling of PROTECTING A GREAT GIFT.

IDENTITY is about diversity, working together towards one goal, which is protecting what we stand for: rich natural resources.

LIVELIHOOD is about the protection of our needs (and income).

In Banyuwangi, it is also about protecting their PRIDE of what they have locally.
CITIZEN is about protecting the forest for the benefit of everyone—especially the children, they should not be screwed over from the possible brighter future.

YOUTH is about taking a stand against those selected few. And that it is not going to be easy, but, at least they have to do something NOW.
Having seen all the reactions, there are two themes coming through quite strongly.

Narratives that create **LOSS AVERSION** are able to generate strong emotional reactions.

PRIDE emphasizes the risk of losing our position as the country with the third largest forest in the world. *This is relevant to all areas.*

LIVELIHOOD underlines the risk of losing the source of local income. *This is relevant for areas close to the forest like Banyuwangi, Pontianak and Manokwari.*

IDENTITY brings the risk of losing part of our nation’s identity and rich natural resources. *This is relevant for areas that are not that close to the forest like Jakarta and Pekanbaru.*

YOUTH and CITIZEN are both about being **CHEATED** on or screwed over. This is quite effective to trigger anger that drive willingness to take action.
Conclusions
CONCLUSION #1

They have some knowledge on forest and deforestation-related issues – just not on top of their mind.

Knowledge about the forest, and to some extent deforestation, exists in their mind. However, it is still at the level of an intellectual discussion.

Although, in areas like Manokwari and Pontianak, such a discussion happens easier than in others. Still, it is not a topic that is discussed at a spontaneous level. 

Thus we need narratives that are emotionally engaging.
CONCLUSION #2

We can classify the cities based on apparent sense of urgency and how difficult it would be to move them.

Based on the analysis of their differences in various attributes, we then conclude that there are three clusters of areas that are determined by:

- their perception of the urgency of the issue of deforestation, and
- the likelihood of mobilizing them: difficult vs easier.
More difficult to engage

Strong sense of urgency

Easier to engage

Weak sense of urgency

Must break their RESIGNATION. Must be made aware that THEY CAN (AND SHOULD) DO SOMETHING about their situation.
Manokwari and Pontianak are feeling **FRUSTRATED**. Pontianak is concerned about biodiversity endemic to Borneo. Manokwari thinks of forests as their home.

Jakarta, **WHEN MADE AWARE**, feel the urgency to act. But getting their attention may be a challenge.

We need to **make Medan OWN their problem** to engage them.

Banyuwangi **do not feel the URGENCY** to take action; they don’t think there’s a big issue in their area. But they feel a strong sense of ownership to their forests.
CONCLUSION #3

Based on those clusters, we need to consider coming up with different local activities to complement a national campaign.

The national campaign should first be able to create awareness and emotional reaction to the issue.

The local campaigns are needed to cater to the three unique emotions related to deforestation; which implies that different approach is needed in each cluster to establish compelling call-to-actions.

Anger and frustration in areas like Manokwari, Pontianak.

Rather ignorant, but if triggered, angry—in Jakarta, Medan, and to some extent Banyuwangi.

Resignation in Pekanbaru.
CONCLUSION #4

In terms of utilizing the narratives, there are to emotional routes that work well.

Create **loss aversion**—the feeling of not wanting to lose a gift (ranking/PRIDE, nation’s identity/IDENTITY, economy value/LIVELIHOOD).

Create awareness that they are **being shortcharged (CHEATED)**—which is a combination of YOUTH and CITIZEN.
**CONCLUSION #5**

*Common Indonesians are not familiar with—or even outright distrust—NGOs.*

Awareness of any NGO, is minimal, if not non-existent. Edelman’s Trust Barometer Study (2018) reveals that Indonesians trust government and business before NGOs.

This then poses a challenge on who should put these narratives forward—or maybe even how should NGOs make themselves more known so that they can have the credibility to be the narrators (if it has to be the NGOs).
Recommendations
We need to have narratives that are EMOTIONALLY RELEVANT AND ENGAGING, have the URGENCY that creates OUTER DIRECTED CALL TO ACTION.

**GREEN** = national
**ORANGE** = for local communications/activations
**RED** = NO GO

**PRIDE** is SHOCKING, thus has the right urgency by stating out WHERE WE ARE NOW and WHAT WE ARE FACING.

**CHEATED** uses the angle that only selected few benefit forest clearing, while all of us suffer the negative impacts. The narrative can be used across demographic groups.

The narrative can be used across demographic groups.

Creates stronger urgency
We also need narratives that can be accepted **LOCALLY** to create local engagement or activations.

- **IDENTITY**: Triggering the thought around the risk of losing rich natural resources, as part of our national identity.
  - May work in Pekanbaru. It was also received well by Jakartans, who are more used to complex concepts.

- **LIVELIHOOD**: For Banyuwangi and Manokwari. This creates a tension around the risk of losing resources that can support their life.

**GREEN** = national  
**ORANGE** = for local communications/activations  
**RED** = NO GO
RELIGION and DADDY/MOM are not recommended because they do not inspire real actions.

Too inner directed—not for doing real actions. Tend to be chosen because these are easier choices—no one can say no.
There are two national narratives and two narratives for certain areas.

The potential narratives could be developed into campaign plans and content, involving various NGOs in the process.

PRIDE and CHEATED (which is a combination of YOUTH and CITIZEN) are recommended as national narratives.

For local campaigns:

LIVELIHOOD – for Banyuwangi and Manokwari. But each, will use a slightly different angle.

IDENTITY – for Pekanbaru, Medan and Jakarta, areas that are not close to the forests.

The final narratives are detailed overleaf.
Final version of PRIDE

As Indonesians, we are very proud for having the third largest forests in the world that are rich in flora and fauna and a source of clean water and air. Yet, every minute, our forests get reduced by the size of five football fields. We must act to protect our forests.

In Indonesian:
As Indonesians, we enjoy the benefits of lush forests, such as clean water, fresh air, and protection against floods and landslides. Yet, some have cut down forests to enrich themselves. Therefore, we need to keep the forests intact, so that all of us can continue enjoying the benefits.

From YOUTH, we added ‘protection against floods and landslides.

The word ‘rimbun’ (literally ‘lush’, meant for ‘intact’) needs to be in the narrative to create an understanding that forests can only benefit us if they stay intact.

This narrative, can potentially be used for youth across the areas because there is no longer reference to certain generations responsible for the destruction, while still being very clear that only selected few benefit from the forest clearing/land use conversion.

In Indonesian:
Sebagai orang Indonesia, kita ikut menikmati manfaat hutan yang rimbun, seperti air bersih, udara segar, serta perlindungan dari banjir dan tanah longsor. Namun, ada yang membabat hutan untuk memperkaya diri sendiri. Jadi, kita harus menjaga hutan agar tetap rimbun, supaya kita semua bisa terus menikmati manfaatnya.
As the people of Banyuwangi, we are proud for having vast forests that serve as destinations for tourism and education. They make a great contribution to our regional income. Therefore, destroying forests is the same as threatening our prosperity.

Adding the word “vast” so that they do not think it is OK for forests to be somewhat damaged as long as they can still serve as travel and education destinations.

This should prompt those in Banyuwangi to think that they need to protect the whole forests, if they want them to continue supporting local economy.

In Indonesian:
Sebagai orang Banyuwangi, kami bangga memiliki hutan yang luas, yang menjadi tempat wisata dan edukasi. Ini memberi sumbangan besar pada pendapatan daerah kami. Jadi merusak hutan sama saja dengan mengancam kemakmuran kami.
As Pauans, we are proud for having forests that provide us with food and daily income. Therefore, destroying forests means threatening our lives. We must unite to stop the destruction of Papua’s forests.

“Disturbing” is replaced with “threatening” to initiate stronger emotional response.

The phrase “let us” was replaced with “we must” to not confuse it with the call to-action that might be added later.

In Indonesian:
Sebagai orang Papua, kami bangga memiliki hutan yang menjadi sumber makanan dan penghasilan sehari-hari. Jadi, merusak hutan sama saja dengan mengancam kehidupan kami. Kita harus bersatu menghentikan pembabatan hutan Papua.
Forests are an inseparable part of Indonesia’s identity that is diverse, rich, and fertile, because forests are sources of water, culture, and rich in natural resources. Therefore, protecting forests is the same as protecting the identity of our nation.

In Indonesian:
Hutan adalah bagian yang tak terpisahkan dari identitas Indonesia yang bhineka, kaya, dan subur. Sebab, hutan adalah sumber air, sumber budaya, dan kaya sumber daya alam. Jadi, melindungi hutan sama dengan melindungi identitas bangsa.
The challenge for this program is making a well-orchestrated and collective action/campaign, and not a one-off thing.

We need a solution for providing people with tangible/actionable call for action for forest protection. Currently, there are no real avenues for the public to push for change, and they are not even familiar with environmental organizations.

We also need to ensure that sufficient number of organisations pick up the narratives and the campaign plan, and commit to run with them.
A quantitative baseline survey will be needed to validate the results of this research.

Conduct a quantitative baseline survey to measure the perception on forests and deforestation in a more robust manner to be able to measure changes post campaigns.

The baseline survey could also try to measure people’s trust to NGOs as an entity and their level of awareness towards local NGOs that may take part in doing the campaigns.

This should help to determine who should be the key narrator for this campaign, who is most credible, and whether any image building for NGOs is needed.
Thank you.

For more information on this report and the program to understand narratives and perception around sustainable land use, contact Leony Aurora, lead consultant, at leonyaurora@gmail.com
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About Storyworks
Our steps for identifying the underlying emotion using Storyworks:

- Every card represents a certain emotion/needs/motivation.
- We look at what participants explain about what the card means to them, as well as the unsaid – what archetype do they represent and what they mean in that particular archetype.
**Brief explanation of each archetype in Storyworks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Motto</th>
<th>Core Desire</th>
<th>Helps people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTIST</td>
<td>If it can be imagined, it can be created</td>
<td>Create something of enduring value</td>
<td>Craft something new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREGIVER</td>
<td>Love your neighbor as yourself</td>
<td>Protect people from harm</td>
<td>Care for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULER</td>
<td>Power isn’t everything. It’s the only thing</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Exert control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOKER</td>
<td>If I can’t dance, I don’t want to be involved</td>
<td>To live in the moment</td>
<td>Have a good time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVERYMAN</td>
<td>All men and women are created equal</td>
<td>Connection with others</td>
<td>Be OK just as they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDUCER</td>
<td>I only have eyes for you</td>
<td>Attain intimacy and experience sexual pleasure</td>
<td>Find and give love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRIOR</td>
<td>Where there’s a will, there’s a way</td>
<td>To prove worth with courage</td>
<td>Act courageously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTLAW</td>
<td>Rules are meant to be broken</td>
<td>Revenge or revolution</td>
<td>Break the rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATALYST</td>
<td>It can happen!</td>
<td>Know the laws of the universe</td>
<td>Affect transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEALIST</td>
<td>Don’t worry, be happy</td>
<td>To experience paradise</td>
<td>Retain or renew faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLORER</td>
<td>Don’t fence me in</td>
<td>Freedom to explore</td>
<td>Maintain independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GURU</td>
<td>The truth will set you free</td>
<td>The discovery of truth</td>
<td>Understand their world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference to read the Storyworks slides

Detailed explanation of the cards

“The forest is our life support—it cares for us!”
(The explanation of the cards.)

The intrinsic meanings of the cards

The size of the card indicates how many chose those. The bigger it is, the more people chose them.

- Hope and optimism
- Nurture and support
Annex 2

About the consortium 
(Eye to Eye and C4C)
Eye to Eye
www.eyetoeye.co.id

Eye to Eye is a virtual based market research agency founded in 2011 by one of the most experienced market researchers in Indonesia, Miriam Rustam.

Miriam has over 20 years of experience in market research and strongly believes in understanding local culture and belief to be able to develop relevant programs for Indonesians.

Eye to Eye’s core expertise is in qualitative research, and we have started doing quantitative research in the past 2 years.

Our experience spans from doing social research —where we worked closely with UNICEF on exploratory as well as evaluative research (on malaria, radio advertising about child abuse, educational material for teenagers to create awareness about the impact of premarital sexual and early marriage— to various consumer goods.

We have also worked closely with C4C on several social research projects in and outside Jakarta.
Founded in 2016 by two advertising veterans, Paramita Mohamad and Misty Diansharira, who believe skills and practices in branding, marketing, and communication from the commercial world can be applied to benefit those who want to make Indonesia suck less.

- We offer evidence-based knowledge on human behavior and how communication works.
- Strong knowledge of various media channels, including social media.
- We have created material related to various social issues in Indonesia, addressing different types of audience: from the presidential office, donors, GoI’s ministers (such as Bappenas, Ministry of Education), CSOs, think-tanks, legal aid organisations, and direct to community members.
- We have worked with various CSOs and think-tanks to help them influence policy-making process or change behavior, for example World Food Programme Indonesia (on nutrition and food diversity), The Asia Foundation (critical thinking for youth and for LULUCF governance), Conservation International Indonesia (on multi-use forest management system).
Annex 3

Discussion guide
1. Introduction and Warm up  
   Project NATURE

   - Welcome and thank respondents
   - Explain briefly about market research
   - Explain nature of group discussion:
     - No right or wrong answers.
     - Explain to the moderator that the responses gathered will be treated confidential.
     - Explain that use of the viewing/recording facilities will be used as assistance to the moderator in making the report.

   - **Individual Introduction. Name, Age, Occupation, Hobbies, Marital Status**

2. Understanding their perceptions of forest and deforestation

1. Talking about current issue  
   **Objective**: to understand what is the most current issue they are familiar with.

I want to know more about you, can you describe your daily life/activities including activities during the weekend.

- What would you do on the weekend or free time? **Note on extracurricular or community they join**
- Any outdoor activities you do/extracurricular/community you joined in?
- Why did you choose that?
- When did you first join the extracurricular/community?
- Do you attend regularly?
  - How often?

- Do you always carry around your mobile phone?
  - Why is that so? If not mentioned, ask them their social media usage

- What about social media?
  - Do you have social media? What is it? **Note if they have more than one**
  - Do you usually do with your social media?
    - Who do you follow the most, apart from you friends?
    - What content interests you? Why?
    - What do you usually post?
    - What topic do you usually like to comment on?

- **PROBE IF NOT MENTIONED**: What about reading news or current issues?

- How often you read news or current issue?
- At what times/occasions?
- With whom? Alone or with others (family member/friends/eta)?
- What issue interests you?
- Do you also talk about this issue with your friend?
- Why do you choose that issue to talk about?

2. Understanding their perceptions of forest and deforestation

- Do you talk about environment to your friends/community/family member?
- What do you talk about?
- What about forest, deforestation, and climate change?
  - Are you aware of any of this issue?
  - Do you care about this issue?
  - Have you ever done something about the issue?
  - What do you do to show that you care?
  - What motivate you to do something about the issue?
  - Do you know which effects the issue has?
    - Please explain
  - What is your opinion about the issue?
  - What do you think will happen if we don’t stop the issue? How the world looks like in 10 years?
  - Do you think the issue will be stopped at one point? Why and why not?
  - What do you think of forest economic value?
    - Does it have economic value? What is it?
  - What other topics you usually talk about? Do you also talk about politics?
    - If yes, what do you think of current political situation?
    - What did you notice of current political situation?
    - Do you think current political situation contributes much to environment/forest and deforestation?
    - Why/Why not?
  - Do you think your political choices affect government policy about environment?
    - What makes you think so?
    - Any example?

**USING THEIR PRETASKS**

Before we go further, all of you have done the pretask, right? Now, let’s discuss about that. Every participant takes turn and explain about his/her task
- What is it that you want to tell us?
- Why did you choose that?

Using Story Works**: we have sets of pictures and I will ask each of you to select 3 pictures that best represent what forest means to you

(For this first activity, allow people up to five minutes to familiarize themselves with the cards. Make sure that they look through all the cards before making their first choice)
• After all done choosing, what comes into your mind or what are the immediate association when seeing those cards?
• What do those cards mean to you?
  o Secondly, please choose 3 cards that best describe deforestation
    • After all done choosing, what comes into your mind or what are the immediate association when seeing those cards?
    • What do those cards mean to you?

[Moderator: please take a photo of images selected by each participant]

3. Exploring and recycling/improving potential narratives 40’, total 120’

Introduce the narratives:
"Now, I am going to show you an idea. It is not a final output, just what we call a concept stage. We just want your opinions on the IDEAS, So, sit back and relax."

SHOW THE IDEA ONCE - ROTATE IDEAS FOR EACH GROUP

Spontaneous reaction
• What do you think of the idea?

Comprehension
• What is this idea trying to tell you? What is it trying to communicate?
• What do you think the message of the idea? What does it trying to say?

Relevance
• Is this something you find relevant to forest and deforestation? How so?
• Do you feel like this? Does this reflect what you feel? In what way does it fit/unfit?
• Is it appealing or relevant for you? Why and why not?
• How does this idea influence you? will you take an action having read this? why/why not?

Improvements
• Is there any unnecessary part?
• Are there any important parts that missing from this idea? How would you re-write this story/idea? Why?
• What elements that should be improved to convince you to give higher score?

[REPEAT FOR OTHER IDEA]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mom &amp; Working Mom</th>
<th>High School Students</th>
<th>Papua and Pontianak Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td>CTZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with</td>
<td>Who do you think are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this idea?</td>
<td>the unentitled people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you think</td>
<td>refer to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia’s forest is one of our pride?</td>
<td>- How do you imagine the experience of benefiting from the forest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why or why not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How would you feel if someone tarnish Indonesia’s forest?</td>
<td>- Do you agree with this idea? At what parts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderator: note on how strong is pride of identity vs. tarnish pride</td>
<td>- Do you agree with this idea?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td>YO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you agree with this, that it contributes to the world against all these things?</td>
<td>- Do you agree with this idea?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderator: probe on awareness on Indonesia’s forest role to the world (as world’s lungs), on the pride of the contribution it has to the world</td>
<td>- What are implication of those wrong doings? How concerning is it for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How do you expect to protect it? Do you expect contribution from other part of the world to sustain the forest? Why? In what way?</td>
<td>- Do you think forest is one of the biggest assets of Indonesia? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How do you see your role in preserving the forest? What actions are required to fill your role? What are the implications of those actions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Moderator: note whether it has implication to wellbeing of the nation, if not, PROBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narratives Code</td>
<td>Probes</td>
<td>Narratives Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>- Are you aware that these disasters occur because of deforestation?</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What do you think we can do to save our forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How will those acts play a role in your family's well-being?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Moderator: Note if future generations is mentioned, if not, probe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What would create call for action for your better, the well-being of your family now (not experiencing water scarcity etc) or preserve the forest for your next generations, your children's children? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>- Apart from being grateful, do you think as religious people, we have such duty to conserve our nature?</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Why or why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If yes, what do you think are those responsibilities? Is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mom & Working Mom | protecting forest’s usage from just a group of people part of that responsibility? Who should it be protected from? Why do you think that?  
- **Moderator:** note on how strong is feeling being grateful and conserving vs. being responsible and protecting from the wrong doers | High School Students | **Probes**                                                      | Papua and Pontianak Only | **Probes**                                                      |
| CTZ             | - Who do you think are the unentitled people refer to?  
- How do you imagine the experience of benefiting from the forest?  
- Have you reported your tax? How do you feel when you know unentitled people take benefits from the forest? |               | **of the contribution it has to the world**  
- How do you expect to protect it? Do you expect contribution from other part of the world to sustain the forest? Why? In what way? |               | **Probes**                                                      |
<p>| DK             |               |                 |                 |               | <strong>Probes</strong>                                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Jobbers</th>
<th>College Students</th>
<th>Dads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Probes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>- Do you agree with this, that it contributes to the world against all these things? – <strong>Moderator:</strong> probe on awareness on Indonesia’s forest role to the world (as world’s lungs), on the pride of the contribution it has to the world - How do you expect to protect it? Do you expect contribution from other part of the world to sustain the forest? Why? In what way?</td>
<td>- Do you agree with this idea? - What are implication of those wrong doings? How concerning is it for you? - Do you think forest is one of the biggest assets of Indonesia? Why? - How do you see your role in preserving the forest? What actions are required to fill your role? What are the implications of those actions? – <strong>Moderator:</strong> note whether it has implication to wellbeing of the nation, if not, PROBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>- Apart from being grateful, do you think as religious people, we have such duty to conserve our nature? - Why or why not? - If yes, what do you think are those responsibilities? Is protecting forest’s usage from just a group of people part of that responsibility? Who should it be protected from? Why do think that? - <strong>Moderator:</strong> note on how strong is feeling being grateful and conserving vs. being responsible and protecting from the wrong does</td>
<td>- Do you agree with this idea? - Do you think Indonesia’s forest is one of our pride? Why or why not? - How would you feel if someone tarnish Indonesia’s forest? – <strong>Moderator:</strong> note on how strong is pride of identity vs. tarnish pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Probes</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTZ</td>
<td>- Who do you think are the unentitled people refer to?</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How do you imagine the experience of benefiting from the forest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have you reported your tax? How do you feel when you know unentitled people takes benefits from the forest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YO</td>
<td>- Do you agree with this idea?</td>
<td>CTZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What are implication of those wrong doings? How concerning is it for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do you think forest is one of the biggest assets of Indonesia? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How do you see your role in preserving the forest? What actions are required to fill your role? What are the implications of those actions? - Moderator: note whether it has implication to wellbeing of the nation, if not, PROBE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>- Do you agree with this idea?</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Jobbers</td>
<td>College Students</td>
<td>Dads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Probes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Code</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>- Do you think Indonesia’s forest is one of our pride? Why or why not?</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>- How would you feel if someone tarnish Indonesia’s forest? – <strong>Moderator: note on how strong is pride of identity vs. tarnish pride</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Which idea most resonates with you to talk about forest and deforestation? Could you please rank from the most to the least? Why so?

Using Story Works®: Now I want you to select 3 pictures for the best idea that you preferred among all ideas

After the choose 3 pictures, ask

• What does this picture mean?
• Is there a single idea or ideas that all your images represent? Or do you have a story that can help me to understand the connection between the different images?
  [Please take a photo of images selected by each participant]

• If you can mix and match elements from each idea to make a new one, how will you do it? - SEPARATE THEM INTO PAIRS TO TRY WORKING OUT IF THERE IS ANYTHING THEY WOULD CHANGE/REWRITE INTO A NEW ONE. ASK THEM TO PRESENT
• Get each group to present the idea and explain how that is better; and how will that create actions to protect the forest

CLOSE & THANK YOU
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MARITAL</th>
<th>AGE OF KIDS</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Narrative Test</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monday, 3 September 2018</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>3 Working mom</td>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2 Elementary 2 Junior high 2 Senior high</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F1, PD, MO, DK, CTZ</td>
<td>Jl. HOS. Cokroaminoto No.26, RT.3/RW.4, Gondangdia, Menteng, Kota Jakarta Pusat, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 10350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Highschool student</td>
<td>15 – 17</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2 Upper 1 2 Upper 2 1 Middle 1 1 Middle 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>CTZ, YO, FI, PD, DK</td>
<td>QPA Venue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>College students</td>
<td>18 – 22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2 Upper 1 2 Upper 2 1 Middle 1 1 Middle 2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PD, DK, FI, CTZ R, YO</td>
<td>QPA Venue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jl. HOS. Cokroaminoto No.26, RT.3/RW.4, Gondangdia, Menteng, Kota Jakarta Pusat, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 10350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Medan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MARITAL</th>
<th>AGE OF KIDS</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Narrative Test</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thursday, 6 September 2018</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Experienced Worker</td>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2 Elementary 2 Junior high 2 Senior high</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F1 R, CTZ R1, PD R1, DK R, DD</td>
<td>Beranda Medan Jabunta Room Ruko Citra Garden Blok A5, Jalan Jamin Ginting Kelurahan Padang Bulan Medan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Highschool student</td>
<td>15 – 17</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2 Upper 1 2 Upper 2 1 Middle 1 1 Middle 2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PD R1, FI R, CTZ R1, DK R, YO</td>
<td>Beranda Medan Jabunta Room Ruko Citra Garden Blok A5, Jalan Jamin Ginting Kelurahan Padang Bulan Medan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friday, 7 September 2018</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>First Jobbers</td>
<td>23 – 30</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>CTZ R1, FI R, MO, DK R, YO, PD R1</td>
<td>Beranda Medan Jabunta Room Ruko Citra Garden Blok A5, Jalan Jamin Ginting Kelurahan Padang Bulan Medan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>College students</td>
<td>18 – 22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2 Upper 1 2 Upper 2 1 Middle 1 1 Middle 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>FI R, CTZ R1, YO, DK R, PD R1,</td>
<td>Beranda Medan Jabunta Room Ruko Citra Garden Blok A5, Jalan Jamin Ginting Kelurahan Padang Bulan Medan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pekanbaru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MARITAL</th>
<th>AGE OF KIDS</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Narrative Test</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wednesday, 12 September 2018</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3 Working mom 3 Housewife</td>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2 Elementary 2 Junior high 2 Senior high</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PD, CTZ R, MO, DK, FI</td>
<td>Hotel Grand Zuri Pekanbaru Jl. Teuku Umar No.7, Rintis, Pekan Baru, Riau, 28141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Highschool student</td>
<td>15 – 17</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FI, PD, CTZ R, YO, DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thursday, 13 September 2018</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>First Jobbers</td>
<td>23 – 30</td>
<td>3 Married 3 Single</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>CTZ R, PD, DK, YO, FI, DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>College students</td>
<td>18 – 22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PD, FI, YO, DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manokwari

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MARITAL</th>
<th>AGE OF KIDS</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Narrative Test</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monday, 17 September 2018</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>3 Working mom 3 Housewife</td>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2 Elementary 2 Junior high 2 Senior high</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>CTZ R2, FP, PD R4, MO, DK R1, FI R1</td>
<td>Swiss Belhotel Manokwari I. Yos Sudarso Manokwari No.8, Manokwari Bar., Kabupaten Manokwari, Papua Bar. 98312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Highschool student</td>
<td>15 – 17</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FI R1, CTZ R2, YO R, PD R4, FP, DK R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tuesday, 18 September 2018</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>First Jobbers</td>
<td>23 – 30</td>
<td>3 Married 3 Single</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>CTZ R2, YO R, FI R1, DD, PD R4, DK R1, FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>College students</td>
<td>18 – 22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>DK R1, FI R1, YO R, CTZ R2, PD R4 FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Pontianak**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MARITAL</th>
<th>AGE OF KIDS</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Narrative Test</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wednesday, 3 October 2018</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Experienced Worker</td>
<td>31–40</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2 Elementary 2 Junior high 2 Senior high</td>
<td>2 Upper 1 2 Upper 2 1 Middle 1 1 Middle 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>DK R2, Fl R1, DD, Fl K/Fl K1, CTZ R2, PD R5</td>
<td>Jalan Jenderal Ahmad Yani No.91, Bangka Belitung Laut, South Pontianak, Bansir Laut,Pontianak Tenggara, Kota Pontianak, Kalimantan Barat 78124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wednesday, 3 October 2018</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Highschool student</td>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1 Middle 1 1 Middle 2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FP K/FP K1, CTZ R2, Fl R1, DK R2, PD R5, YO R1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thursday, 4 October 2018</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3 Working mom 3 Housewife</td>
<td>23–30</td>
<td>3 Married 3 Single</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Fl R1, CTZ R2, YO R1, DK R2, MO, PD R5, Fl K/F K1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thursday, 4 October 2018</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>College students</td>
<td>18–22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>CTZ R2, Fl R1, Fl K/Fl K1, YO R1, PD R5, DK R2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Banyuwangi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MARITAL</th>
<th>AGE OF KIDS</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Narrative Test</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wednesday, 3 October 2018</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Experienced Worker</td>
<td>31–40</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2 Elementary 2 Junior high 2 Senior high</td>
<td>2 Upper 1 2 Upper 2 1 Middle 1 1 Middle 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>CTZ R, Fl, PD, DK, DD</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wednesday, 3 October 2018</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Highschool student</td>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1 Middle 1 1 Middle 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Fl, PD, YO, CTZ R, DK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thursday, 4 October 2018</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3 First Jobbers 3 Housewife</td>
<td>23–30</td>
<td>3 Married 3 Single</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PD, Fl, CTZ R, YO, DK, MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thursday, 4 October 2018</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>College students</td>
<td>18–22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Fl, CTZ R, DK, YO, PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>