

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**
(interim, January 12, 2011, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

Guidelines for Reviewers:

- 1) *FCPF REDD Country Participant R-PPs will be reviewed and assessed by the FCPF Participants Committee, the FCPF's governing body, taking TAP comments into account. External (Technical Advisory Panel or other) and Bank reviewers may provide recommendations on how a draft R-PP could be enhanced, using this template on a pilot basis until a process is approved by the PC.*
- 2) *One set of criteria should be used for review: specific standards each of the current 6 components of an R-PP should be met.*
- 3) *Your comments will be merged with other reviewer comments (without individual attribution) into a synthesis document that will be made public, in general, so bear this in mind when commenting.*
- 4) *Please provide thoughtful, fair assessment of the draft R-PP, in the form of actionable recommendations for the potential enhancement of the R-PP by the submitting country. A REDD Country Participant would be allowed three submissions of an R-PP to the PC for consideration.*

Objectives of a Readiness Preparation Proposal (condensed directly from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3)

The purpose of the R-PP is to build and elaborate on the previous Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) or a country's relevant comparable work, to assist a country in laying out and organizing the steps needed to achieve 'Readiness' to undertake activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), in the specific country context. The R-PP provides a framework for a country to set a clear roadmap, budget, and schedule to achieve REDD Readiness. The FCPF does not expect that the activities identified in the R-PP and its Terms of Reference (ToR) would actually occur at the R-PP stage, although countries may decide to begin pilot activities for which they have capacity and stakeholder support. Instead, the R-PP consists of a summary of the current policy and governance context, what study and other preparatory activities would occur under each major R-PP component, how they would be undertaken in the R-PP execution phase, and then a ToR or work plan for each component. The activities would generally be performed in the next, R-PP execution phase, not as part of the R-PP formulation process.

**TAP Synthesis Review of R-PP of (fill in country name):
Thailand**

Reviewers (fill in): Jayant Sathaye and Harrison Kojwang co-leading five TAP experts

Date of review (fill in): First Review: 13 January, 2013;

Revised TAP Review 6 March 2013

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

Revised TAP Review: (6 March 2013) (Overview of First TAP Review included in Appendix A)

Overview:

Thailand submitted a revised R-PP on 24 February, 2013 for consideration at PC 14 (March 2013).

Similar to the previous First Order response this version of the R-PP also provided almost complete responses to all the points in each sub-component. Some Additional Comments are noted within each sub-component. TAP members would appreciate a response to these comments since they would benefit the implementation of the R-PP program. The ranking of each sub-component has either improved or been retained at the same level depending on the nature of the Additional Comments. For example, Sub-component 1b has improved from Largely Met to Met category since the Additional Comment is minor. In other cases, the Additional Comments were important enough to limit improvement. We would appreciate a response to the Additional Comments in the discussion of Thailand’s wonderful and very complete submission of the R-PP at the PC 14 meeting.

The TAP assessment of standards met by R-PP components in the First and Revised Review are summarized in the table below. Compared to the First Draft the Revised R-PP has made substantial improvements and hence almost all Components either Largely Met or Met the standards.

Components	First Draft Review (13 January) of R-PP Submitted for assessment at PC 14	Revised Review (6 March) of R-PP Submitted for assessment at PC 14
1a. National Readiness Management Arrangements	Partially met	<i>Largely met</i>
1b. Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	Partially met	<i>Met</i>
1c. Consultation and Participation Process	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Met</i>
2a. Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	Partially met	<i>Met</i>
2b. REDD+ Strategy Options	Partially met	<i>Met</i>
2c. Implementation Framework	Partially met	<i>Met</i>
2d. Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Met</i>
3. Reference Level	Partially met	<i>Met</i>
4a. Monitoring – Emissions and Removals	Partially met	<i>Largely met</i>
4b. Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	<u>Not met</u>	<i>Largely met</i>
5. Schedule and Budget	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Met</i>
6. Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Met</i>

Component 1. Organize and Consult

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:

The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness. Capacity building activities are included in the work plan for each component where significant external technical expertise has been used in the R-PP development process.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. A few questions noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document.

Additional Comments:

(1) In connection to the community forestry evaluation study TAP has recommended in component 2b, it may be worthwhile to make sure that TWG on REDD+ Strategy team and Finance & Benefit Sharing Mechanism Team should include specialist in the area of socio- ecological economist. This is also in connection with drivers of D&D where better documents with more coverage are needed. Socio-ecological driver and socio-economic driver can become potential aspects for both positive and negative effects on forest status.

(2) The revised and added more information and stakeholders are impressive. However, it is not clear how selection of the private sector (only one: Suan Kitti Group), and the international organization (RECOFTC) was carried out. However, the civil society organizations appear to be excluded. It would be useful to provide a list of names and actual practices on the ground regarding stakeholder participation including civil society.

(3) In Figure 1a-3, institutional arrangement for REDD+ implementation causes some confusion about which organizations will be selected to perform as REDD+ local offices, the 16 existing Protected Area Regional Offices in this table or the 77 (or 76) Natural Resources and Environmental Provincial Offices in the latter section.

Component 1a largely meets the standard.

First TAP Review (January 2013):

This section provides information on the arrangements for management of national readiness. It notes that Thailand established a National Climate Change Policy Committee (NCPC) chaired by the Prime Minister and vice-chaired by the Minister of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE). It includes two sub-committees Climate Change Technical Sub-Committee (CCTS) and Climate Change Negotiation Sub-Committee (CCNS) and the Climate Change Convention Officer (CCCD).

CCTS includes the REDD+ Task Force which will be chaired by the Director General of the Dept. of National Parks, Wildlife and Pant Conservation. To date few REDD+ activities have been carried out in Thailand. REDD+ Task Force includes many Technical Working Groups that will be able to support implementation of future R-PP components effectively. It also includes an information center, and national and local offices. REDD+ will also be supported by some other ministries and agencies that focus on land development, agriculture, local administration, and rubber replanting aid fund.

In addition Annex 1a-1 and 1a-2 on p.112-114 are good and clear road- map on Forest Activities along with implementation agencies and List of organizations involved in REDD+ and related activities in Thailand. These summaries provide a strong support to the National Readiness Management Arrangement.

Recommendations and Questions:

(1) The REDD+ listed and discussed Technical Working Groups (TWGs) appear to be appropriate to address many REDD+ issues. It is also encouraging to note the engagement of additional members from other key ministries. The institutional arrangement component provides information about the engagement of many other ministries. The topics that should be further addressed are noted below.

First, it would be useful to include the electricity grid controllers (EGAT) and the department that is responsible for mining

(DPIM) since their activities contribute to deforestation as well. The R-PP also does not include industries and also industrial sectors are simply not included in the Component 1a text. An additional explanation on where the industrial sector will be involved in the REDD-plus management arrangement would improve the R-PP.

Second, the proposal does not seem to provide information about how all these ministries would be engaged for detailed discussion particularly in cases where the subsidized activities such as for agriculture may have to be offset to reduce deforestation and degradation (D&D). It would be useful to provide more information about this process. To what extent have they already agreed to advancing REDD+ in Thailand?

Third, it is also not obvious as to how these set ups would overcome the many sources of deforestation that are listed in Component 2. Deforestation rate is listed to have increased during the 2000-2010 period. Have there been earlier discussions that have not succeeded or were there no such discussions before?

(2) Two departments RFD and DNP, are to be merged according to the Cabinet's Resolution last year. Has this been consideration been included in structuring the national readiness management arrangement?

(3) RECOFTC appears to be the only NGO that is listed in Table 1a-1. Since it is currently focused primarily on international foci it would be useful to engage other NGOs, CSPs and community networks for Thai coverage.

(4) DNP's REDD+ project is related to its TWG on institutional analysis for REDD+ readiness phase (after the FCPF approval and fund transfer). This component should have been undertaken prior to a project proposal due to its necessity. Otherwise, it is cumbersome for the project management.

It is not apparent how other stakeholders who are not government officials can be selected to work in any TWG. In figure 1a-2, it appears that the local forest-dependent communities/ethnic groups may work with the REDD+ local offices if needed. The structure of the Thai REDD+ project may not allow much participation from other key stakeholders who are ordinary citizens or minority groups.

(5) There are no mentions of mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD+ process and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances. Please elaborate these.

(6) Indigenous peoples should be recognized as a specific and distinct group in the REDD+ TF rather than calling them local forest-dependent communities or ethnic group in general. Such recognition will further enhance and safeguard their rights.

(7) Proportion of members in the REDD Task Force among involved stakeholders should be defined clearly such as how many per group (by percentage or number of representatives) to ensure that all involved groups are well- represented in particular the voiceless and marginalized groups such as indigenous and local communities and the size of the Task Force should be manageable. The representation of various stakeholders, particularly marginalized indigenous groups and other forest-dependent communities in the REDD+ Task Force should be clearly stated in the RPP.

(8) Commitment issue of various sectors in planning and implementation of REDD+ readiness shall be enhanced and strengthened as follows. For the purpose to prevent policy conflict that might jeopardize the REDD+ effort and outcome, please include the Cabinet and Parliament member/committees in addition to the list.

(9) The Organization charts portrays a Top-down command structure (Figure 1a-1).. To improve it, a feedback loop or mechanism that is depicted in the structure is recommended.

(10) In general the terms of reference for the committees dealing with or influencing REDD+ in Thailand should be laid out to enhance the understanding on their respective roles.

(11) In the first paragraph of pp16; TWGs reports the development of various components of the R-PP. It would be very useful to add specific Terms of Reference for each component, if possible. This will enhance the standard guidelines to facilitate the later monitoring, reporting and verification components.

(12) To ensure that views and perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities be heard and have full and effective participation in a comprehensive review, there should be representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities sitting in the said TWG (This belongs to 1a).

Component 1a partially meets the standard.

Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups:

The R-PP presents evidence of the government having undertaken an exercise to identify key stakeholders for REDD-plus, and commenced a credible national-scale information sharing and awareness raising campaign for key relevant stakeholders. The campaign's major objective is to establish an early dialogue on the REDD-plus concept and R-PP development process that sets the stage for the later consultation process during the implementation of the R-PP work plan. This effort needs to reach out, to the extent feasible at this stage, to networks and representatives of forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers and forest dependent communities, both at national and local level. The R-PP contains evidence that a reasonably broad range of key stakeholders has been identified, voices of vulnerable groups are beginning to be heard, and that a reasonable amount of time and effort has been invested to raise general awareness of the basic concepts and process of REDD-plus including the SESA.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. A few questions noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document.

Additional Comments:

- (1) Please notice a misspelling of a word "tilting" on page 35, I understand that it should be "titing". There are some misspellings in other sections as well, please check.
- (2) Local forest-dependent community, which was discussed before, focuses mainly on hill tribes but also includes other tribes such as U-raklawoy (the sea gypsy). The U-raklawoy people reside along the Andaman coast, and could be recognized as indigenous people, not the minority group. The issue about indigenous people or minority groups or local people needs serious attention and information sharing. Moreover, the Shan and Tai minority groups belong to the same groups, but they were presented as two different groups. This sub-section still needs more effort as the authors place all the minority groups together, despite their different geographies, characteristics and customs. It would be helpful if you could explain in the R-PP how these marginalized people would be treated along with the REDD+ readiness development.

Component 1b meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2013):

DNP is actively engaged in sharing and collecting REDD+ information in a national consultation process on climate change across provincial and local level governments. It engages both the private sector and NGOs heavily in the process. It identifies key stakeholders that are demonstrated in Table 1b-1. A clear communication and information materials to be developed in a later stage has been clearly mentioned in the R-PP.

Recommendations and Questions:

Observations:

- (1) It seems that on stakeholder analysis, those against REDD+ were not included and preference seems to have been given to those who can contribute to REDD+ readiness.
- (2) More information sharing seems to be required since public media such as television and/or other appropriate means to reach out to a wider audiences and general public is advisable as many people are not aware about REDD+ yet. If possible, this activity should be undertaken soon.
- (3) Sufficient time has not been provided to share the R-PP widely within Thailand for internal discussion. The draft R-PP in Thai (which was already made available) should be distributed widely for information sharing and if possible

there should be another round of dialogue and discussion with specific groups and with all involved stakeholders as a whole in a later stage. This will not only create mutual understanding but also create cooperation among involved stakeholders.

- (4) In relation to 1a, the key stakeholders outside the government bureaucracy were roughly identified while linkages among them and the responsible officials are not yet clear. It was unclear in the proposal about how they identified those stakeholders. Details of campaigns with the key stakeholders on REDD+ concept and development process were missing so it did not show how the REDD+ preparation team decided to include which group. It was unclear about the partial stakeholder analysis by stakeholder mapping, although it was mentioned that awareness processes and extensive information sharing were undertaken.
- (5) While it is great that there were two national and six regional multi-stakeholder workshops, it is still not clear how stakeholders were selected and how representative the one that were invited are of the entire stakeholder base. Furthermore the way the information gathered was used to influence the R-PP remains unclear.
- (6) This comment was provided by several TAP reviewers. Based on their two national and six regional multi-stakeholder workshops, it was unclear about how the REDD+ preparation team invite or select the stakeholders and how many stakeholders participated each time. Besides, the key stakeholders (called the target audience by the REDD+ team) were not presented in details as it was written as, e.g. difference government sector at provincial level, local communities, NGOs and private sector. The name of each province was not presented. Although it was specified in more details in Table 1b-1, it was still unclear in sub-sections of National governments, private sector and forest-dependent local communities/civil society. Suggestion shall be for an invention of innovative indicators by the TWGs sector to be used to assess and evaluate the outcome result of the pilot public hearing activities of The REDD+ program pilot location already in the work plan and could be integrated into the mentioned Mechanism, the third dot item from bottom of the p.27 in the draft text.)
- (7) Voices of vulnerable groups were not apparent. It seems that the vulnerable local stakeholders will likely be excluded unintentionally if the structure of information sharing is as such. Effective communication and outreach work plan should be materialized and carried out. It will be helpful if we can see more information (text) on how to make the structures more open to multi-stakeholder input and dialogue.

Recommendations:

The views of stakeholders who are not supportive of REDD+ should be reported alongside those who are supportive of REDD+

There is need for the R-PP to recognize and state that more sharing of information on REDD+ and the R-PP itself will continue, in order to enhance discussion and understanding of REDD+ and build a support base for its implementation.

The methods used to identify and choose stakeholders, their expectations and linkages between them could be better explained under the sub-component,

The views of the vulnerable and marginalized during the information sharing and consultation process should be made clear and given specific attention within the sub-component.

Finally a synthesis of the views from stakeholders and how they are used in component two in the REDD+ Strategy section is important to include in this sub-component.

Component 1b partially meets the standard

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals

and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP; (v) and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. A few questions noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document.

Additional Comments:

- (1) The Thailand team seems to understand about the core of this section. Only one important question about Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). Please explain why the CSOs have been mentioned but not included in the REDD+ TF Committee (table 1a-1), particularly the first step.
- (2) Equitability is needed to be incorporated into a checklist as one of the criteria of “consultation processes”, not just “clear, inclusive, transparent, timely access to information by stakeholders”.

Component 1c meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2013):

The Background statement on p.30 describes the consultation and participation process to be carried out during the implementation of the readiness phase. The extensive consultations with relevant stakeholders will be built on the early information and social mobilization campaign and dialogue conducted. The criteria of ownership, transparency in decision-making and improving the empowerment of stakeholders in decision making process, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of REDD+ activities were clearly stated.

Recommendations:

- (1) While the participation from relevant stakeholders was adequately addressed by the R-PP process, more thought needs to be placed on increasing awareness of REDD-plus related activities and strategies, and less mention of participation in monitoring and decision making process in the R-PP development, e.g., less focus on process and more emphasis on functional implementation and participation.
- (2) The sub-component needs a brief synthesis on the level of ownership the R-PP has generated in Thailand and whether there are any dissenting opinion and the reasons for that.
- (3) Consultation and participation plan in the R-PP implementation phase are rather vague and needs improvement, as only a list of statements by the REDD+ preparation team are presented. It is unclear whether the REDD+ team

³ Did the R-PP development, in particular the development of the ToR for the strategic environmental and social assessment and the Consultation and Participation Plan, include civil society, including forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples representation? In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways: (i) self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements: (a) selected through a participatory, consultative process; (b) having national coverage or networks; (c) previous experience working with the Government and UN system; (d) demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society including Indigenous Peoples organizations; or (ii) Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or Indigenous Peoples organizations (e.g., the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Program Steering Committee).

prepares how to formulate a work plan for participation process and its outcome or not. It seems that they build the work plan according to the goal and specific objectives of the Communication and Participation Plan.

- (4) On exercising of FPIC in land allocation to investments and REDD+ pilot areas (as it stated in its specific objectives). FPIC should be free, prior and informed consent (not consultation).

Component 1c largely meets the standard

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Law, Policy, and Governance:

A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends; assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD-plus; recognizes major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues; documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD; and sets the stage for development of the country's REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. A few questions noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document

Additional Comments:

- (1) The proposed information about logging ban in Thailand appears to be incorrect. Please see the information in this book "Forest out of Bounds: Impacts and Effectiveness of Logging Ban in Natural Forests in Asia-Pacific", which noted that the ban has only been effective in natural forests, not the entire forest management scheme including forest plantations. The national forestry policy was altered ever since (January 1989), so the goals of forest types have been: 1) 25% of the country area as conservation forests, and 2) 15% of the country area as economic forests. The conservation forests are supposedly overseen by the DNP, whereas the economic forests are administered by the RFD, since October 2002 under the bureaucratic reform. However, both departments (RFD and DNP) will be merged any time soon, which may result in high competition for high-level positions and yield unprecedented nepotism. Good governance may be far away in reality then.

Component 2a meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2013):

This section provides good analysis on key issues such as identifying major land use trends, assessing direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers. It also provides sufficient information on previous policies and relevant governance issues.

- (1) Indigenous and local communities' traditional practices on natural resource and forest management should be regarded as a mean to combat deforestation and forest degradation as well.
- (2) Land tenure and natural resource rights should be given more attention as this issue is very critical for indigenous peoples and local communities.
- (3) On legal aspect, the constitution of Thailand 2007 section 66 should be used as a framework in implementing REDD+ readiness as this recognizes role of communities in managing and use of natural resource in a sustainable

manner. This will help narrowing the gaps between communities and the state on forest management rights.

- (4) The authors state, without clarification, that logging is both a driver of deforestation and degradation which is confusing and NTFPs as a degradation driver without any clarification of which NTFPs are considered degradation drivers. Weakness in management within the RFD is another factor to cause ineffective enforcement of law and contributed to the indirect deforestation and degradation drivers.
- (5) While it is encouraging that Thailand has in the past attempted to predict forest cover loss based on several social, economic and environmental variables. The study is rather old and it would be useful for the R-PP to recognize this and commission another study that will build upon previous studies. The same also refers to the data in the flow diagram (Figure 2a-6) on page 44,
- (6) Forest cover losses attributed to infra-structure development (irrigation, power, construction) are well estimated but there is no clarity on overall historical deforestation rates from other drivers; **an issue which is important for components 3 and 4**
- (7) The R-PP recognizes the complex interactions between agriculture, mining and forestry which warrant further analysis
- (8) Figures 2a-2 and 2a-5 show the area (ha) cleared for other purposes (tourist resorts) and burnt by uncontrolled forest fires. The charts do not show the change in area due to other deforestation sources. This would be very useful to indicate how deforestation and degradation have caused changes in land use between 2000 and 2010.
- (9) Coverage of forest governance is very limited. The R-PP proposes to undertake this with World bank framework of principles and criteria for good forest etc. This is going to be extremely important and should also cover the approach to reduce D&D and associated carbon emissions in it.

Component 2a provided considerable information about land use change but would benefit from additional inputs suggested above. The standard is thus partially met.

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

The R-PP should include: an alignment of the proposed REDD-plus strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies, and a summary of the emerging REDD-plus strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD-plus strategy options. This summary should state: how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD-plus strategy; a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD-plus strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects; socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD-plus strategy; consideration of environmental and social issues; major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD-plus strategy; and a plan of how to assess the risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits. The assessments included in the R-PP eventually should result in an elaboration of a fuller, more complete and adequately vetted REDD-plus strategy over time.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. A few questions noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document.

Additional Comments:

- (1) In Item 1.7.1 of Table 2b-1, it was stressed that, "the RFD has set up a Forest Certification Bureau just now". It

was unclear how the Forest Certification standards will be developed and implemented. In fact, this may be seen as a strategy for fulfilling one of the requirements of the European Union (EU) – Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) prior to official negotiation between the EU and Thailand after the Parliament approved the negotiation framework in January 2013. It may not be aimed for the REDD+ strategy options although it can be helpful to the REDD+ framework. Would be very useful for this 2b Component to take this into consideration.

- (2) In this Component, since the new Growth Model is adopted – Thailand may want to evaluate the community forest at national scale level. As mentioned in the revised text, 85,000 community forests were identified that are much diversified according to social, cultural and location settings. Some are socio-ecological based and some are socio-economic based, for instance. Although both can be considered success in term of sustaining both natural resources and human well beings, these two models can give rise to different REDD+ strategies in management and monitoring and even extended to REV&REL development. These different models can also provide some different beneficial mitigation schemes which will draw attraction to participate in REDD+ program. Utilization of these models with further technology interventions in order to generate further benefit in relation to REDD+ program may be of unlimited challenges to REDD+ program promotion in the long run especially in connection with private enterprises, etc. Therefore additional research and reevaluation in these regards is worth considering.

Component 2b meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2013):

This section is a good preparation particularly on a preliminary set of strategies in addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation identified in earlier section such as Table 2b-1.

Recommendations and Questions:

Observations:

- (1) The R-PP document is missing a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits and jobs of the emerging REDD-plus strategies, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects. Therefore the assessment in the R-PP does not result adequately in examination of REDD -plus strategy over time. An additional examination on cost and benefits of the emerging REDD-plus strategies can be added to the R-PP document. Even if this R-PP does not address the design of its REDD+ strategies, then it should propose a series of analytical work to be completed. The authors propose to address encroachment but most of the emphasis is on local communities and does not address development pressures from tourist resorts and Revised homes.
- (2) To ensure that views and perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities be heard and have full and effective participation in a comprehensive review, there should be representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities sitting in the said TWG (This belongs to 1a).
- (3) The REDD+ strategy options were presented as Table 2b-1. It suggests that the REDD+ preparation team restricted the strategy options to what the government can do on its own, and even then strategies to influence policies of sectors outside forestry is not adequately addressed. It is also noted that some options may be difficult to achieve. These include, proposals to develop alternative livelihoods for people dependent on forest resources to supplement their income, develop forest certification and chain of custody standards
- (4) Two major studies to be commissioned are: 1) risk analysis of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits (focus on major types of risks and how significant of the risks on the REDD+ strategy activities), and 2) socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD+ strategy.
- (5) Recommendations:

- i. . The strategy options should explicitly include measures to address policies from outside the forest sector which will affect the REDD+ Programme. Furthermore, it should be clarified how stakeholder views have shaped or influenced the proposed strategy options
- ii. The R-PP should also be clear on whether the REDD+ Programme will benefit from a high level policy endorsement that other environmental management issues have enjoyed in the past.
- iii. More thought should be given to the option of providing alternative livelihoods to local and forest-dependent communities and a stronger collaborative structure to implement the strategies themselves

Component 2b partially meets the standard.

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) and a work plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD-plus in the country setting. Identifies key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation, and explores potential arrangements to address them; offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package. Key issues are likely to include: assessing land ownership and carbon rights for potential REDD-plus strategy activities and lands; addressing key governance concerns related to REDD-plus; and institutional arrangements needed to engage in and track REDD-plus activities and transactions.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. One question noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document

Additional Comments:

- (1) Only one concern is about land tenure conflicts in regards to forest and land issues in Thailand. The proposal did not discuss much on this issue, which can be risky. Land tenure conflicts would relate to the governance concerns requiring effective planning and strategic implementation.

Component 2c meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2013):

Very promising array of ideas is recommended in this category. The proposal has given substantial clear detail and discussion to meet the R-PP standard and convinced enough for a well development of Implementation Framework for R-PP. This section is well described in particular on key instruments used for REDD+ implementation - institutional arrangements, financial arrangements and regulatory framework. In addition, it also addressed key activities to be undertaken in the readiness phase such as benefit sharing, carbon ownership, carbon registry and capacity building with concrete ideas on how to implement it based on existing knowledge and experiences. These are for example use PES scheme, and/or existing good practices such as BCI, JoMPA projects as a mean for REDD+ payment and benefit sharing.

Recommendations and Questions:

- (1) On regulatory framework, one of important new issues that require a special REDD+ regulation is recognition of indigenous peoples and local communities' lands and resource rights. This will cover issue of carbon ownership as well.

- (2) On institutional arrangements: it's still very much state-centered arrangement so an effort to restructure the institution to decentralize of power and inclusive of more members from other sectors including indigenous and local communities is commendable.
- (3) Some additional obstacles and challenges that could be addressed (besides in the M&E section the listing of assumptions and risk) in the R-PP are:
- No legal support to the rights of the local people to utilize and manage resources including the assessment of the value of the services, the payment rate and BD system.
 - Difficulties in identifying the service providers and users, due to unclear land rights among land users who had no title document to utilize and manage lands.
 - No measures to stimulate the awareness of the beneficiaries (or the users) to return the payments for any environmental service. Willingness to pay is a key issue.
 - Inadequate regulatory environment for governing REDD+ transactions and the current institutional regime increases uncertainty, risk and transaction costs among buyers and sellers.
 - REDD+-related terminologies in Thai are neither defined nor widely accepted. The Thai terminologies used in projects are different and may lead to misinterpretation.

Component 2c partially meets the standard.

Standard 2.d: Social and Environmental Impacts during Readiness Preparation and REDD-plus Implementation:

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the World Bank's or UN-REDD Programme's safeguard policies, including methods to evaluate how to address those impacts via studies, consultations, and specific mitigation measures aimed at preventing or minimizing adverse effects. For countries receiving funding via the World Bank, a simple work plan is presented for how the SESA process will be followed, and for preparation of the ESMF.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. One question noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document.

Recommendations and Questions:

- (1) Free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) should be considered and used as a tool to prevent negative impacts to social and environmental issues as well.

Component 2d meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2013):

The SESA process will be undertaken in the implementation phase as the government has to follow the Constitution of Thailand (1997/B.E. 2550), Article 67 regarding Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which is also specified in the National Environmental Quality Promotion and Preservation Act (1992/B.E. 2535). Potential social and environmental

impacts of REDD+ strategy options will be assessed according to the identified concerns, such as, dilemma of local communities and hill tribes living in or near the forests regarding rights under the REDD+ mechanism, land tenure, potential conflicts between government agencies and local communities.

It was stressed in the proposal that the SESA process in Thailand required a multidisciplinary team of experts from various fields of specialization, i.e. land use, forest ecology and forest management, law (human rights), social and environmental assessment, policy and public participation. If the implementation is according to the objectives and work plan, this would appear to meet the standards.

Recommendations and Questions:

- (1) These tools (SESA and EIA) are difficult to understand and use by other stakeholders in particular indigenous and local communities. There should be a simplified tool kit jointly developed with experts and involved stakeholders so that these tools can be effectively used to prevent negative impacts to villagers.
- (2) In addition, FPIC (free, prior and informed consent) should also be used as a tool and process to protect the rights of indigenous and local communities. There are a number of FPIC guides which can be adjusted and used in REDD+ project activities.
- (3) The social and environmental impacts evaluation section could be made stronger. The best reference to this is the list of REDD+ Issues, Impacts and Risks on page 32 and the assumptions and risks affiliated with the M&E section (Component 6).
- (4) There is also mention of the communities' concerns but that could be detailed further throughout the R-PP (especially how strategies for implementation will address these safeguard issues). The goals of the Communication and Participation Plan would benefit from greater analysis of the environmental and social risks and impacts of the SESA process.

Component 2d largely meets the standard.

Component 3. Develop a Reference Level

Standard 3: Reference Level:

Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed. Include early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use (e.g., forest cover change and GHG emissions based on historical trends, and/or projections into the future of historical trend data; combination of inventory and/or remote sensing, and/or GIS or modeling), major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (MRV system design).

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a stepwise approach may be useful. This component states what early activities are proposed.)

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. A few questions noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document.

Additional Comments:

- (1) For capacity building in Figure 3-3, it was unclear about who will be the target of the trainings. The figure was however quite good in showing how the national REL could be developed. Forest definition is also questionable about why we need it in this figure. The 11th National Economic and Social Development Plan (NESDP) is significant for adjusting the national REL, based on this figure. It should be aware that the previous NESDPs were rather ineffective, with particular reference to the 1997-1998 Thailand’s financial crisis resulting in its fraud economic forecast, as +8% forecast was realized as -14% economic growth.
- (2) The monitoring system set up for Thailand REDD+ readiness and implementation would benefit as an independent system that would not utilize the THAIFORM as the main system, but it would be based on the THAIFORM.

Component 3 meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2013):

This section is very technical and providing comprehensive information on how forest reference emission level should be undertaken using available technology and technique. This captures all aspects required for developing national forest reference emission level.

The R-PP lays out a technically reasonable, national REL setup for Thailand targeting to progress with data and methodology beginning compliant to IPCC Tier 1 eventually proceeding to IPCC Tier 3 (the term “Tier” with respect to activity data – instead of “Approach” - is misleadingly used in the R-PP, as it is indicative only for the assessment of carbon stocks). The document suggests that, as a start, a useful range of data is available for the first steps of REL development and that Thailand can rely on strong capacities in remote sensing, GIS and forest monitoring. The document properly presents available data that Thailand employs in several approaches to develop a national REL (past trends of deforestation and degradation, projected forest cover change based on macroeconomic trends, correlation of population density and forest cover, repeated assessments of carbon stocks). Nevertheless, the R-PP acknowledges inconsistencies and deficiencies in forest data; however, data (and capacity) needs and gaps are not specified explicitly even though the document gives the impression that capacities are sufficient (at least at national level) to cover the need for data and close respective gaps. Furthermore, it remains unclear which agencies or institutions will be involved to design the RELs. The document contains no information at all about the situation on sub-national levels, although site specific and sub-national RELs are envisaged.

Recommendations and Questions:

The R-PP may benefit from following recommendations:

- (1) Consider a dedicated paragraph for additional data and capacity requirements (forest and non-forest sectors) on national and notably on sub-national level and across relevant sectors/stakeholders
- (2) Provide some understanding on how information and data sharing will be safeguarded (the document mentions obstacles regarding data sharing among institutions)
- (3) Given the approach using econometrics and cross sector data, consider the option of an alternative reference

scenario (aside from the business as usual scenario) built upon different assumptions about how relevant sectors or policies may develop and affect forests and land use

Extend the scope of discussions regarding RL/REL beyond the main institutions for measuring and monitoring forest to all relevant stakeholders including non-government agencies and local communities/forest dwellers. In addition, It is not clear how reference scenarios will be generated – will the R-PP adopt the methodologies used by Amano et al 1996?

- (4) Specify what carbon pools will be included for the REL and consider to prioritize according to significance (key carbon pools) and data availability
- (5) In its current state Component 3 does not provide a proper work plan with concrete subsequent activities, timeline and responsibilities

Component 3: The standard has been partially met.

Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

Standard 4a: Emissions and Removals:

The R-PP provides a proposal and workplan for the initial design, on a stepwise basis, of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation, and forest enhancement activities. The system design should include early ideas on enhancing country capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor emissions reductions and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and to assess the impacts of the REDD-plus strategy in the forest sector.

The R-PP should describe major data requirements, capacity requirements, how transparency of the monitoring system and data will be addressed, early ideas on which methods to use, and how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers. It should also address independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD-plus implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD-plus monitoring system with the full set of capabilities.

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. A few questions noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document.

Additional Comments:

- (1) The biomass carbon analysis looks fine but the soil carbon analysis has been problematic. Soil samples were collected some time ago, and they are expected to be analyzed after the readiness phase begins. The intention is good but the old soil samples may cause errors, so the research team must collect soil samples again for below-ground carbon analysis.
- (2) It was unclear who will conduct monitoring at the sub-national level, and how the monitoring will be integrated with results of community-level monitoring. It should be clear that the monitoring system is an integrated system, not sectoral or level oriented as per the proposal.
- (3) It was apparent that verification has been necessary. However, which party/body will undertake verification exercise is not certain. It would be helpful to stress whether it would be an independent verification body or government body.

Component 4a largely meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2013):

Like Component 3 this section presents a technically reasonable design. The R-PP points out the current status of forest monitoring and includes shortcomings regarding data and methodology. Existing monitoring methods and standards vary across the related agencies, data on carbon stocks is not available on a national basis although can be derived from data with a different focus than carbon. The document mentions an ITTO supported pre-project that is expected to deliver valuable information about the status of the existing system, about related requirements and gaps and an action plan to improve the National Forest Information System. The project was planned to be completed in December 2012 and may deliver meaningful input for this section. With the proposed road map for the National Forest Monitoring System Thailand presents an early work plan that can be refined making use of the recommendations below.

Involvement of stakeholders including participation of NGOs, local communities and private sector are emphasized earlier in the document and reoccur in this section under a separate paragraph "Community-Level Monitoring". This way the document currently suggests participation around the MRV system is limited to monitoring and is just not approved as a integrated and fundamental principle. Meaningful participation will also favor a sound reporting and verification element (which both are still not addressed adequately) and is an essential aspect with respect to transparency so that stakeholders are able to fully comprehend and reproduce the methodologies for MRV/REL development and implementation.

Multi-country regional monitoring is considered in the R-PP and appears to be a worthwhile approach in the light of the transboundary nature of major drivers (illegal logging), monitoring of displacement on regional level and experience from an already existing biodiversity initiative. Although the establishment of sub-national RELs was mentioned in Component 3, the document does not address the topic of sub-national monitoring.

Observations and Recommendations

- (1) Since the current monitoring methods are insufficient as they are scattered in various government agencies, the R-PP could strongly recommend that the National Forest Resource Monitoring System (THAIFORM) develop a national baseline for developing a National Forest Monitoring System for REDD+ implementation and monitoring.
- (2) The proposed design of national forest monitoring system may be feasible if more details of data collection and calculation are specific enough for handling by the local forest officers along with the local villagers. It may not be as productive if the data collection and calculation are undertaken only by government officials. The forest and land carbon sequestration by the local villagers will be overlooked and the fair payment may be difficult. As a consequence, the villagers do not have any incentives to protect their forest aiming for sustainable forest management.
- (3) The NFMS system relies heavily on the THAIFORM monitoring design, data collection definitions and measurement standards. Based upon some inconsistency in the R-PP analysis of deforestation, the numbers from 2000-2006 may not match up with the NFMS designed to mimic the ITTO project. There seems to be an inconsistency in the R-PP's analysis of deforestation. In the Executive Summary, the authors cite forest area has increased from 33.1% in 2000 to 33.4% in 2008. Yet in their reference scenario, the claim that the deforestation actually increased during that time from 0.7% in the 90s to 1.07% from 2000-2005, and continuing to decline at a rate of 180,000 hectares annually after 2005. These numbers don't match up and question the validity and dependence on the previous THAIFORM system rather than just designing a NFMS that addresses the needs of the country (a multi-purpose inventory system that addresses carbon but other ecosystem services as well). The R-PP also states that the NFMS may be used for the National Forest Inventory reporting on growing stock. The R-PP should be clearer on what is the difference between the NFMS and the NFI – THAIFORM seems to only address the NFI. The issue of inconsistencies in the data, particularly on historic levels of deforestation needs to be clearly analyzed and a way forward suggested in the R-PP.
- (4) Page 89 talks about regional monitoring initiatives -- "Regional cooperation is essential because of leakage and

current displacement of emissions among countries through illegal logging. There a study is proposed that would look into the potential scope of multi-country monitoring, harmonization requirements and possible implementation arrangements". The R-PP should recognize that there are a number of regional initiatives working to harmonize and develop regional guidelines. Thailand could (and should) play an important role in the development of these monitoring and implementation arrangements. The R-PP should therefore make a strong statement on what role, Thailand needs to play in the ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network for Forestry and Climate Change (ARKN-FCC) and point out how this would benefit its own REDD+ Programme..

- (5) The mention of developing a national SIS, in compliance with the Cancun agreements, is needed for the SESA component and stated as a clear priority/ integral component of monitoring.
- (6) R-PP needs to assess under which IPCC Tier the various carbon pools will be monitored taking into account their significance and ideally land use change patterns and drivers.
- (7) Capacity building/training needs in more detail should be identified. Also reporting and verification should be included along with requirements on sub-national and regional levels and other stakeholders (also non-government).
- (8) Enhance the integration of stakeholder participation, notably CSOs/communities, into the MRV system – consider mechanisms how they can already contribute to its development.
- (9) Reflect on ideas to foster transparency of the development process and the resulting system (e.g. how will open access to information/data be facilitated or how will feedback mechanisms be implemented).
- (10) Define the scope of sub-national monitoring and assess potential benefits for the design and implementation of the national MRV system.
- (11) Table 4-6 (the first one on page 89, budget is also labeled as Table 4-6) needs clarification on how the term "Tiers" is used. The IPCC Tiers only refer to methodologies of carbon stock estimation. The meaning regarding e.g. non-carbon benefits or stakeholder participation is utterly ambiguous.

Component 4a: At this time, the 4a standard is only partially met.

Standard 4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts, and Governance:

The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design and a workplan, including early ideas on capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities), for an integrated monitoring system that includes addressing other multiple benefits, impacts, and governance. Such benefits may include, e.g., rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD-plus implementation in the country.

(The FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.)

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. A few questions noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document.

Additional Comments:

- (1) This section has been revised according to the recommendations by TAP. It should be noted about the EU-FLEGT negotiation framework approval by the Parliament as mentioned previously. The official negotiation is not yet begun as the GOT (through the RFD) and the EU negotiation committee has been working on preparation for the upcoming negotiation processes.
- (2) In the sub-section on Governance and other impacts, it needs more elaboration on forest-land tenure conflicts, as well as work plans to resolve the conflicts. It would also be necessary to analyze about the impact of such conflicts on the REDD+ readiness project.

- (3) The issue on water resource, particularly water quantity, quality and regular flow, needs more elaboration about the forest cover, as this water-related issue does not require only regular forests but it needs watershed forests, so as to prevent soil erosion and landslides. Simple and low-cost techniques of water resource monitoring have been developed and applied in Thailand by the Thais already, so while it is useful to study the models from the Philippines or Australia their applicability may be limited.
- (4) Monitoring governance requires not only cooperation from all governmental departments, but it also needs transparency, accountability and responsibility as well. It should be clearer than the proposal that the monitoring system is integrated and systematic, not scattered as such.
- (5) As for the private sector participation, the REDD+ team should also involve forest-related associations, in order to get the accumulated and (may be) integrated information. It should be noted that the private companies already belong to their related associations or groups in the Federation of Thai Industries.

Component 4b largely meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2012):

This section is designed to focus on multiple benefits that may be derived from reduced environmental emissions and other impacts, governance and safeguards. It is very short and only fragmentary. Respective aspects of the MRV are merely mentioned and remain very general. Apart from some thoughts on biodiversity conservation and flood control/reduced water pollution any further information is missing. Consequently, an initial design or even work plans are not presented. The end of this section refers to Component 2d for the topic of social and environmental safeguards. There, however, only basic intentions are described and no monitoring mechanisms and activities are discussed. In the light of this also the associated budget inevitably appears arbitrary. This component certainly needs more attention.

Recommendations and Questions:

- (1) Please follow the guidelines provided by the FCPF with the R-PP template for completing this component.
- (2) Biodiversity conservation should be included in the MRV system which will be measured and mapped by remote sensing techniques. Flood control and reduced water pollution should be incorporated in the REDD+ pilot activities.
- (3) The governance factors directly pertinent to REDD+ implementation in Thailand should be seriously identified and further implemented. Up to now, the proposal does mention very little about governance factors owing to its misunderstanding about the governance conceptual framework. These ought to be explicitly covered in this component and others as well.
- (4) The authors write extensively in section 2 about SESA but they don't mention the development of national safeguards to adhere to the Cancun Agreement. The Safeguards Information System (SIS) would need to be developed in order to monitor the Cancun Safeguards and there is little to indicate in this R-PP of adherence to the UNFCCC standards. Perhaps it is assumed that SESA would meet the Cancun requirements but if so, then I would recommend that this be made explicit (as in other countries working with the World Bank to develop SESA to adhere to its policies and develop their own safeguards separately to meet the Cancun requirements).

Component 4b: Noting these deficiencies, 4b standard is not met.

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements

The R-PP proposes a full suite of activities to achieve REDD readiness, and identifies capacity building and financial resources needed to accomplish these activities. A budget and schedule for funding and technical support requested from the FCPF and/or UN-REDD, as well as from other international sources (e.g., bilateral assistance), are summarized by year and by potential donor. The information presented reflects the priorities in the R-PP, and is sufficient to meet the costs associated with REDD-plus readiness activities identified in the R-PP. Any gaps in funding, or sources of funding, are clearly noted.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document.

Component 5 meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2013):

Schedule and budget in this section is well presented in matrix. It's also clear on how much budget needed and from which source for implementation of the proposed activities.

Recommendations and Questions:

- (1) The secured funding from all sources is US\$ 4,656,000. Additional funding to be sought as mentioned in budget plan is US\$ 16,188,000. This should identify and document the potential sources of funding otherwise it may affect the planned activities.
- (2) The current R-PP proposes roughly \$4 million dollars in consultations, workshops and "media". While it is an attempt to make the activities of the R-PP into a very participatory process, the authors may be leaning too heavily on process for the sake of process (without the necessary buy-in from the other sectors needed for REDD+ to be successful in Thailand). There lacks the necessary coordination between the various governmental bodies needed to make this work plan succeed and no amount of resources will be able to overcome these shortcomings. While there has been additional resources for additional consultations (\$4 million), when looking at the funding other areas (such as the commitment to national safeguards, mechanisms for conflict resolution, and the analyses of deforestation and degradation drivers), it seems that the budget and associated resources could be better allocated to areas which currently lack attention.

Component 5: Noting this deficiency, the standard is largely met.

Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Standard 6: *The R-PP adequately describes the indicators that will be used to monitor program performance of the Readiness process and R-PP activities, and to identify in a timely manner any shortfalls in performance timing or quality. The R-PP demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources, to meet the activity schedule.*

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Revised TAP Review (6 March 2013):

Most of the TAP comments raised in this sub-component were addressed in this Revised R-PP document. A few questions noted below would be worth addressing prior to the completion of the R-PP document

Additional Comments:

- (1) It has been confusing about a number of NRE provincial offices, whether there are 75 (in this section) or 77 provinces (previous section).
- (2) It would be necessary for the REDD+ team to decide whether to use 16 Protect Area Regional Offices or the NRE provincial offices (Table 6-1). In Item 4b of Table 6-1, it is unclear, why the first two activities focus on consultation with agencies, and the last (third) activity is to establish a system for collating data on co-benefits and integrate with MFMS. What is MFMS (not in the abbreviation list)?

Component 6 meets the standard

First TAP Review (13 January 2012):

The document provides useful and relatively complete information on most of the Components. It provides good description of major activities with clear indicators. It's also well presented in a log frame format.

Recommendations and Questions:

- (3) However, some activities remain a question such as activity that promotes local forest dependent communities in selected sites adopt sustainable agroforestry system instead of shifting cultivation (2d page 106). This activity needs to be further discussion as not all shifting cultivation system destroying environment instead it helps promote biodiversity and increase food security for villagers including reduction of CO₂. In addition, the issue of safeguards, which is very important for indigenous peoples and local communities, is not listed in the matrix.
- (4) Due to the number of stakeholders involved, the R-PP should also detail how to build capacity for M&E for country and provincial staff (and the local partners), including regular reviews and field site verification to ensure performance indicator data is collected, recorded, analyzed and stored correctly. This will ensure better participation in the long run for Thailand to monitor its readiness and the various multi-sectoral actors needed to implement this R-PP work plan.
- (5) The last Time Frame column in Table 6-1 should indicate how often the meetings will be held with operators of each project. Generally meetings held every 3 or 6 months are extremely valuable in understanding the effectiveness of the activities and also provide good insight in changing the implementation patters.

Component 6: The standard is largely met.

Appendix A

Overview of First TAP Review (13 January 2013)

Background:

Thailand submitted a first draft R-PP in December, 2012 for consideration at PC 14 (March 2013). A TAP Team consisting of seven members reviewed the draft R-PP. Members submitted their drafts that were assembled to establish a synthesized review on 13 January, which is reported below with a summary of the issues that were described for each component.

Overview:

Strengths of the RPP

Seven TAP reviewers have studied this version and their general impression is as follows:

- The current version of the R-PP is quite well written and the ideas are presented in a comprehensive manner and the content under each component and respective sub-component have responded to the guidance set out in the R-PP Template.
- The executive summary has provided a concise overview of the entire R-PP, in which the types of consultations and information sharing during the preparation of the R-PP are highlighted, as is a summary of the key drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and associated strategy options.
- It is evident from the R-PP that the rate of deforestation still needs to be further analyzed during the implementation of the R-PP and will certainly be needed in the construction of reference levels. In addition more systematic and precise data on carbon stocks in the chosen pools and forest definitions are required.
- The proposed MRV system, including a system for monitoring of multiple benefits and safeguards seem sufficient, even though experience in the aspect of safeguards is still limited. What is encouraging is that Thailand has a long history of forest resource mapping and other forms of assessment, which it hopes to build upon.
- The proposed SESA and EIA frameworks are relevant and generally demonstrate an admirable understanding of the subject matter.

They have concluded that Components 1c, 2d, 5 and 6 largely meet the standard; 4b does not meet the standard while other Components partially meet the standards.

Issues that need to be addressed

Despite the general observation that the treatment of the various components are quite complete there are still some items and issues that need to be addressed in order to meet the standards set for them. These are noted below, and their inclusion would assist in meeting each component standard.

1. *Under sub-component 1a, Cabinet level interaction and participation is critical for successful operation of REDD+ programs since sources of D&D are often promoted by non-forestry ministries such as agriculture, mining, land use, power sector, etc.*
2. *R-PP had been prepared mostly by DNP officials. Would be good to engage other ministries in preparing this R-PP document to get their comments and insights about the proposed activities.*
3. *Industrial sector needs to be given a stronger participation in several Components.*
4. *Larger portion of budgets is allocated to entities whose names should be listed as potential funders.*
5. *Capacity building is an important topic for every component with particular needs in Components 3 and 4.*
6. *Drivers of D&D need to be better documented with more coverage that might need collection of data.*
7. *Local persons should be given a stronger participation and their roles should be highlighted in each Component text since they can more easily slow or improve REDD+ implementation, and also help the collection of local data.*
8. *Including a bibliography would be helpful.*
9. *A general recommendation is to try to structure more the sections, making sure they address all the requirements of the program, to make it easier for the reader to follow. Also, to have an initial paragraph for each section detailing the content that will follow.*

B. Component 4b appears to require much more effort to meet the Standards.

C. TAP Recommendations and questions that focus broadly on the R-P presentation are noted under each Sub-component.