

## Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF): Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) – External Bank Review Form

May 10, 2008

**Guidelines for Reviewers:**

- 1) This review form is a record of your review, which may be shared for transparency. Please bear that in mind when filling it out.
- 2) Please summarize your comments-- address whatever you feel is important.
- 3) Please evaluate and mark (score) each of the 5 Summary Assessment review criterion from the FCPF Information Memo, the Participants Committee Selection Criteria, and the numbered R-PIN major topics, as requested in the right-hand column. Select a mark from the scale below:  
NA: Not Addressed. 1: Inadequately addresses criterion. 2: Barely adequately addresses criterion. 3: Average, or adequately addresses criterion. 4: Good job of addressing criterion. 5: Excellent job of addressing criterion.

<p>1) <b>Country submitting the R-PIN:</b> Thailand</p> <p>2) <b>Date of Review:</b> January 31, 2009</p> <p>3) <b>Name and affiliation of R-PIN Reviewer:</b> TAP Review Synthesis</p>	
<p><b>I. Summary Assessment of the Quality and Completeness of the R-PIN:</b> <i>Note with value of 1 – 5; internal Bank reviewers do not score.</i></p>	<p><b>Mark</b></p>
<p><b>Criterion (i): Ownership of the proposal by both the government and relevant stakeholders:</b> Clear ownership of proposal –it has been drafted by several government agencies and includes a large and diverse list of stakeholders, including several village headmen and cluster headmen.</p>	
<p><b>Criterion ii): Consistency between national and sectoral strategies and proposed REDD Strategy:</b> The proposal notes the development plan articulated by the NESDP and that a REDD strategy could be imbedded in it.</p>	
<p><b>Criterion (iii): Completeness of information and data provided:</b> The information provided is very complete relative to other proposals—it has many tables and figures of existing data, each section if pretty well described and well presented</p>	
<p><b>Criterion (iv): Clarity of responsibilities for the execution of REDD activities to be financed;</b> Main responsibility will belong to the DNP with additional local and pilot scale activities to appropriate implementation.</p>	
<p><b>Criterion v): Feasibility of proposal and likelihood of success.</b> Given its ongoing experience with the Tenasserim corridor the proposal has an excellent chance of success.</p>	
<p><b>Improvements country could make to R-PIN, and any TA needs for it:</b> The R-PIN could use TA in data collection and analysis for monitoring and reference case setting.</p>	
<p><b>How well do proposed activities fit into existing Bank-supported or other country development plans?</b> The proposed activities compare very well with others hence consistent with existing Bank-supported work.</p>	

## II. Participants Committee Selection Criteria: Information

- **Relevance of country in REDD context: Priority to countries with: (i) substantial forest area and forest carbon stocks; and (ii) relevance of forests in economy, including livelihoods of forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples:**

Very relevant country and would be a good additional candidate country along with Vietnam and Laos—would contribute to the development of a regional group of countries. Also has many ethnic minority groups that depend on forest resources for their livelihood and this has been well described in their RPIN and programs and policies are in place to include them in decision making

- **Geographic and biome balance: across the world's main forest biomes.**

Provides balance, especially in consideration of its regional position in SE Asia—will be a good balance with other countries in region already accepted to FCPF and will result in another regional set of countries that balances those in the Congo Basin

- **Variety of approaches:** Proposed many innovative approaches to tackling deforestation and degradation; methods; testing new mechanisms and distribution of REDD revenues; and/or regionally important leadership.

## III. Detailed Review of R-PIN Response to Template Questions:

*Please review the R-PIN quality and completeness in terms of addressing the major questions in the FCPF R-PIN template.*

### 1. Government focal point, and ownership and consultation in producing the R-PIN:

- a. Government focal point is noted as the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE).
- b. Authors from several forestry institutions, local NGOs, academic and international institutions have authored or contributed to the writing of the R-PIN document. Headmen of 20 villages were also consulted in writing of the document.

Comment:

1. The government is to be commended for drafting the proposal with input from a wide array of authors from government, local communities, financial institutions, and NGOs. It will give the REDD program a broad ownership that can form a strong basis for its success.

### 2. Identification of institutions responsible for: forest monitoring, law enforcement, conservation, and coordination across forest, agriculture and rural development:

The proposal notes that the Dept. of National Park, Wildlife, and Plant Conservation (DNP) and the Royal Forest Department (RFD) are responsible for resource assessment and monitoring of protected and other reserved forests respectively. The two departments are governed by five acts that were passed since 1941. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) is ultimately responsible for all state forest lands. In addition to the above two departments, three other departments and many local offices are involved in forest management. In addition, the National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB) provides a 20-year framework plans that cuts across sectors. The current 10<sup>th</sup> Plan has emphasized the maintenance of forest ecosystem integrity and restoration of over exploited forests including promotion of sustainable biodiversity.

Comment:

The proposal clearly states the responsibilities of the institutions and notes the role of NESDB in demonstrating the linkages between forestry and other sectors.

Are there any other forests besides state lands (protected and other reserved forests) that would benefit from REDD mechanism? If so please add

### 3. Current country situation:

**Where do forest deforestation and degradation occur, main causes, estimates of greenhouse gas emissions, data available? Key issues in forest law enforcement and forest sector governance?**

Forest cover data was collected until 1999 using manual methods, and since 2000 it has been collected using more

advanced GIS/satellite imagery approaches. As a result there is a break in the data set in 2000. Forest cover, however, has declined since 2000 from 33% to 31% of the country's land area despite the many acts and laws that have been promulgated to eliminate deforestation. In addition to the forest area, the country also has about 2.5 Mha of plantations about half of which are rubber plantations. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from forestry amounted to about 60 MtCO<sub>2</sub> in 1994. Sequestration due to plantations significantly reduced net emissions that year compared to 1990. Forest resources were reduced through shifting cultivation, land resettlement, dam and road construction, and conversion to agricultural use. The Thai government banned commercial logging in natural forests in 1989, but this does not appear to have slowed deforestation. Poor and ethnic minorities living near protected forests have been noted in the proposal to be largely responsible for deforestation.

Comment:

1. Table 5 needs clarification. 1990 data appear to be in C units and 1994 in CO<sub>2</sub> units. Is that correct?
2. Deforestation has continued since 1989 despite the logging ban and taking into account the deforestation in neighboring countries it could well be worse than reported because wood products demand is being met through not only deforestation in Thailand but also in neighboring countries.
3. Given the serious reduction (110 thousand ha or >1% annually) in forest cover since 2000, is it possible that other means could be causing deforestation and not just the ethnic minorities? If so please add.
4. It would be useful to provide a rough estimate of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from deforestation that have occurred since 2000 to the present. A rough way to get this is to take the total emissions from forest conversion during 1994 and divide by area to get a rough idea of t CO<sub>2</sub> per ha and then multiply this number by new area of gross deforestation (could say this in footnote and say just a rough estimate which would be improved with REDD financing).
5. Also need to focus more on data for C stocks of forests being deforested rather than talking about forest volume—need to think about how you would go about getting C stock data—this is what is needed for estimating emissions. Other reviewers may not link forest volume to carbon stocks so need to show that this is your value of interest.

**4) Data available on indigenous peoples and forest dwellers?**

Detailed statistics are not available on the indigenous populations. The total estimated population of dwellers in protected forest areas is about 555 thousand or less than 1% of the total Thai population. Can you say anything more about ethnic minority populations—even rough number that would be improved during REDD implementation.

**5. Current strategy in place to address deforestation and degradation. What stakeholder process was used to arrive at it?**

Based on a Thai Cabinet Resolution of Dec 2007, DNP has launched several measures on forest conservation and forest fire control that have clearly be shown to have an effect based on figures 3-4—need to highlight this that have laws and they can be shown to make a difference. These include items in an urgent plan, intermediate plan, and long-term plan. The 1997 Thai constitution recognizes the rights and roles of Thai people, including civil society, to participate in national policy formulation. A 2002 Community Forestry Bill is awaiting approval. Current strategy is laid out in the NESDP's 10<sup>th</sup> four year plan. It includes five strategies. These include strengthening the economic foundation of local communities, sustainable development through protection and sound management of the environment and natural resources and a strategy of good governance.

Comment:

There is extensive experience in Thailand over many decades with plans, laws and schemes to implement programs to improve forest management including the banning of all timber extraction from natural forests in 1989 and reducing forest fires. For 2008-2011, several strategies are being implemented for forest conservation and control.

**6. What would be needed to reduce deforestation and forest degradation? Have you considered the potential relationship between REDD strategies and your country's broader development agenda? Has any technical assistance been received, or is planned on REDD?**

The proposal notes several areas that would need to be improved to address REDD. These include better measurement, monitoring and verification, carbon cycle assessments, and working in Tenasserim Biodiversity Corridor pilot site as a model example. The pilot site has already received inputs and TA under an existing program from USAID and ADB, The main goal will be to provide adequate financial and other support to local communities that are adjacent to the forested areas and empowering them to ensure that the forests are properly protected and also to encourage forest restoration and afforestation. The proposed and ongoing REDD programs are closely tied to the 10<sup>th</sup> Plan and contribute to Thailand's UNFCCC obligations and to the economic development of remote, upland and ethnic minority areas

Comment:

1. The Tenasserim scheme laid out in the proposal appears to be a viable solution for protecting forest areas. Would be useful to know how this scheme differs from earlier ones, if any, to accomplish the same goal.
2. Also useful to mention if this pilot study area could be replicated in the other regions of Thailand and what if any modification might be needed.
3. You need more than a “representative sampling of Thailand’s forests” to feed into reference scenarios. Might want to think about how would design a study to improve estimates of C stocks—even a brief description would help.

**7. What stakeholder consultation process you would use for developing and implementing REDD under FCPF support?**

Thailand has experience with multi-stakeholder consultation processes that engage local communities, private sector, civil society, academics, etc. The country is divided into four administrative regions and the process will need to be made specific to each region. The government recognizes its importance and a Thai cabinet decision, for instance, instructed the formation of a stakeholder process for The Tenasserim area.

Comment:

Overall, the implementing agency for the REDD proposal has prior experience with the multi-stakeholder process and should be able to pursue the same for the REDD program.

Comment about the establishment of a “REDD Focal Point (under this section that will serve as the secretariat and document stakeholder consultations) needs to come earlier in document—this is an excellent point and clearly thought about how you would organize a REDD program.

**8. Implementing REDD strategies: challenges to introducing effective REDD strategies, and how might they be overcome? Would performance-based payments through REDD be a major incentive for implementing a more coherent strategy to tackle deforestation?**

Lack of an integrated approach, limited state investment, lack of public private partnerships, raising the living standard of forest dependent communities, are some of the key challenges. Multi-criteria based assessment of land use, landscape planning, and zoning for specific purposes, public awareness creation, enhancement of local community participation, performance-based payments that provide financial support to villagers, instituting a village guard system, and proper distribution of village funds are some of the ways that the challenges would be overcome.

Comment:

1. The proposal provides adequate information about challenges and solutions that are not uncommon among other deforesting countries. Clearly the issue will be what are the ways that implementation could be successfully practiced.
2. Need to link lessons learned from Tenassarim Biodiversity Corridor study to the list of challenges to implement a REDD mechanism—I think there are many lessons learned that you could demonstrate link to the challenges for implementing REDD—how could you overcome some of challenges you have given based on TBC study.
3. At the local level, where communities depend on forest ecosystem services for their living, there is no framework set up to effectively manage natural resources – therefore public awareness through the extension works of forest sustainable utilization focusing on local communities is needed. In addition, network of local community could be developed

**9. REDD strategy monitoring and implementation:****How are forest cover and land use change monitored today, and its constraints?**

An ITTO-supported project has established a national forest resources monitoring information system. A follow-up project is being implemented to increase its accuracy.

Comments: Carbon content by forest types, ground truthing, updated mapping of plantations, assessment of degraded areas are the key missing components. Current national monitoring system (ITTO) will not be adequate for REDD monitoring so need to think how they would develop one—need to present some ideas.

**10. Additional benefits of potential REDD strategy, and how to monitor them: biodiversity and rural livelihood?**

In major forest complexes biodiversity conservation is being monitored. In Tenasserim additional biodiversity monitoring is being conducted. Rural livelihoods are being monitored in the same area but not elsewhere in the country.

**11. What assistance are you likely to request from FCPF Readiness Mechanism ?**

The proposal lists assistance need at the national level of about \$2 million for development of a REDD plan by August 2012, stakeholder consultations, data collection and MMV activities, and investments for the Tenasserim corridor of about \$12 million plus another \$0.2 million for informing GMS countries that include Cambodia, Lao and Vietnam.

Comment:

MMV should be replaced by MRV—monitoring, reporting and verification

The budget for the national plan seems appropriate but the time period stretched out to 3.5 years seems unusually long. Assuming that the proposal is accepted and the funds are approved by this summer, it should be possible to complete it an year earlier.

**12. Donors and international partners already cooperating with you on REDD.**

None so far.

**13. Country's Potential Next Steps and Schedule:**

The next steps include establishing a REDD management and steering committees, recruiting experts to review current databases, national consultation workshop, and field level participatory consultation.

Comments:

All these are appropriate steps but not time frame has been laid out.

During consultations, a focus on why earlier efforts have not fully succeeded and ways to address them by region with examples drawn in from neighbouring and other REDD participating countries would be very useful.

**14. Attachments and their usefulness:**

Attachments included maps that were unfortunately difficult to read.

CONFIDENTIAL