

## Completeness Check of the final version of Cambodia’s R-PP

**FMT, July 26, 2013**

Cambodia presented its Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) for assessment by the FCPF Participants Committee (PC) at its 8<sup>th</sup> meeting held in March, 2011 in Dalat, Vietnam. At this meeting, the PC adopted a resolution PC/8/2011/6 and allocated funding to Cambodia to enable it to move ahead with the preparation for readiness. The PC requested Cambodia to submit a revised R-PP addressing the key issues in the summary report prepared by the FMT included in the annex of the resolution.

Cambodia submitted a revised R-PP to the FCPF FMT on March 11, 2013. The table below presents the main issues raised in the PC resolution PC/8/2011/6 and the responses provided in the revised R-PP. This analysis allows the FCPF FMT to assess whether the issues raised by the PC were addressed, and for a Delivery Partner to undertake its due diligence process in view of making the Readiness Preparation grant available to the country.

Working methodology used by Cambodia to revise the R-PP: Cambodia worked with its cooperators in the development of the R-PP to address the key issues of the PC resolution.

<b>Key issues identified in PC Resolution PC/10/2001/2</b>	<b>Responses in the revised R-PP and Accompanying Summary of Edits</b>
<p>1. Under Component 2, include a subsection that provides for a review of the implementation of relevant existing national laws, policies, and procedures to inform strategies and implementation plans to address community forest land tenure and resource rights, and forest land conflicts.</p>	<p>The R-PP clearly identifies the importance of recognizing community forest land tenure and resource rights if REDD+ is to be successfully implemented in Cambodia. Key parts of the document include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Component 1a and 2a of the R-PP explain the current legal management types for Cambodia’s forests, which include community forestry agreements for Production Forest areas, community protected areas within Protected Areas, community fisheries within the Fisheries Domain, and Indigenous Land Titling (see Table 1 on page 11, pages 10 and 12, the review of national laws and policies in Annex 2a starting on page 115, page 40, and pages 44-45). The National Forestry Programme (NFP) contains a specific programme on community forestry, and community protected areas are recognized under the PA Law (see Annex 2a, pages 117-122).</li> <li>• Similarly, the Ministry of Environment is actively increasing the number of community protected areas in Protected Areas. The R-PP explains that the PA Law, which mandates community protected areas, has been recently passed but the subsidiary regulations under the Law relating to community protected areas and zonation of protected areas have not yet been approved or in some cases developed. The R-PP states that: “For communities in PAs, it is important to enact the CPA Prakas soon and to develop mechanisms for revenue-sharing from REDD+ to Protected Areas and Community Protected Areas. Effective development of PA Zonation regulations is particularly important for implementation of REDD+.” (page 47)</li> <li>• The R-PP recognizes the importance of community fisheries agreements for flooded forest areas within the fisheries domain (see pages 12 and 47).</li> <li>• The R-PP states: “A critical issue is clarifying management rights of local people over forest areas, through existing modalities such as Community Forestry,</li> </ul>

	<p>Community Protected Areas, Community Fisheries and Indigenous Communal Land Titling. REDD+ would need to support scaling-up of these existing modalities.” (page 47-48)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local forest protection contracts are identified as a key REDD+ strategy (pages 48-49).</li> <li>• On implementation (Component 2c), the R-PP states that: “Local communities should be involved in local management decisions, implementation and monitoring, e.g. through existing Community Forestry agreements and similar modalities. Other non-state actors, such as NGOs or community forestry groups, may play key roles in implementation at particular sites. Implementation is expected to involve REDD+ projects within a nested framework. Examples might include implementation in: ... (ii) community forests or groups of community forests and/or indigenous communal land titles in the Permanent Forest Estate; (iii) community protected areas or groups of community protected areas and/or indigenous communal land titles in PAs” (page 57).</li> </ul> <p>It is recognised that community forest land tenure and resource rights are critical for successful implementation of REDD+ in Cambodia. It is therefore proposed to:</p> <p>a. Revise Component 2b (REDD+ Strategies). The R-PP identifies two principle REDD+ Strategy Options for Cambodia: (1) Effective management of Cambodia’s forests in accordance with existing laws and policies, and (2) Designing and implementing effective strategies to address drivers from outside the forestry sector. Under Strategy (1) a new sub-strategy has been added on community forest land tenure, which reads:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“(f) <u>Promoting engagement of local communities in REDD+ implementation.</u> Local communities in Cambodia can enter into community forestry, community protected area or community fisheries agreements with the state in order to receive management responsibilities over forest resources. Under Cambodian Law, indigenous groups can also receive ownership of forest land under Indigenous Land Titles. Clarifying local forest land tenure arrangements is critical if REDD+ is to be implemented effectively in Cambodia. Therefore, development of REDD+ strategies should recognize and build on these existing modalities, and should support and scale-up their implementation throughout forest lands in the country. In particular, community forestry should be actively promoted in order to achieve the 2 million hectare target set under the NFP. A review of the implementation of these modalities will need to be undertaken in order to inform REDD+ strategies and REDD+ implementation plans under the R-PP. REDD+ implementation will particularly need to actively consider the engagement of local communities in order to effectively conserve and manage forest land resources, e.g. through appropriate benefit-sharing arrangements and mechanisms for conflict resolution (see Component 2c). Finally, local communities will also need to actively be consulted and participate in management of state forest land resources, such as protected areas and protection forests, in order to ensure that local resource-use access rights are not compromised by REDD+ implementation.”</p> <p>Revised Component 2c (REDD+ implementation): The R-PP already identifies local communities as key stakeholders in management decisions, and recognizes community forestry, community fisheries, community protected area and Indigenous Land Titling as appropriate modalities for REDD+ implementation. There is, however, no text on the importance of clarifying local forest land tenure, although this is mentioned in the R-PP text (pages 47-48. Under ‘Additional Implementation Framework Elements’. A new section has been added that reads:</p>
--	---

	<p>“8. Securing forest land tenure. The assessment of forest law, policy and governance (Component 2a) has highlighted the ‘open access’ nature of Cambodia’s forests and the importance of supporting processes to clarify and demarcate forest land tenure to prevent land grabbing. This would include demarcating the Permanent Forest Estate, including community forests, based on the forest estate demarcation procedures (2005 Sub-decree 53), demarcation of Protected Areas and protected area zones, including community protected areas, based on the 2008 PA Law, and demarcation of fisheries areas. The NFP sets ambitious targets for demarcation of the Permanent Forest Estate. Key activities would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting and promoting the demarcation procedures for the Permanent Forest Estate, in accordance with the NFP and including community forestry areas</li> <li>• Supporting Protected Area zonation processes, including development of appropriate subsidiary regulations under the 2008 PA Law, and demarcation of agreed zones, including community protected areas</li> <li>• Supporting demarcation of fisheries areas, including community fisheries areas”</li> </ul> <p>The R-PP already identifies the importance of improving conflict resolution mechanisms in order to resolve conflicts. The relevant activities in Components 1c and 2c are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of mechanisms for conflict resolution and addressing grievance, by the REDD+ Consultation and Safeguards Technical Team which will include local representatives (see R-PP Component 1c on page 32)</li> <li>• Under implementation (Component 2c), the R-PP includes development of conflict resolution mechanisms, stating that: “Conflicts have been widely documented in sustainable forestry and natural resource management in Cambodia. The NFP and 2008 Protected Area Law contain measures to manage conflicts and for conflict resolution (e.g. for community forests), however these have not yet been operationalised. Development of these mechanisms will be supported through the R-PP and their suitability for REDD+ assessed. Where possible, mechanisms mandated by existing laws and policies where possible to avoid creating duplicate or redundant structures.” (see pages 62 and 63).</li> </ul> <p>It is therefore not proposed to make any changes to the R-PP in relation to this point, as development of conflict resolution mechanisms are covered by the activities above.</p>
--	--

<p>2. Requests Cambodia to clearly identify Economic Land Concessions (ELC) as a driver of deforestation and forest degradation in the R-PP; and further elaborate during the REDD+ readiness phase on possible strategies to reduce rates of deforestation and forest degradation caused by ELCs</p>	<p>The activities outlined in the R-PP to address concessions as a driver include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Management Arrangements for REDD+ Readiness, Components 1a of the R-PP, identify the ELC Technical Secretariat, the Ministry of Land Management, and the Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy, as key members of the REDD+ Taskforce (pages 17-18). This is necessary in order to promote discussion between Government agencies on the concession issue.</li> <li>• Page 41 describes how specific site-based projects have been successful at reducing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, including agricultural expansion through land concessions.</li> <li>• Development of ‘conservation concessions’, financed through REDD+ and other mechanisms, as an alternative to agri-industrial land concessions (pages 46, 48, 50)</li> <li>• Implementing the targets set in the National Forestry Programme for expansion of community forests and protection forests, and properly demarcating the Permanent Forest Estate and Protected Areas (pages 47, 49, and 50); this would legally gazette these sites as forest areas making the allocation of land concessions more difficult.</li> <li>• Reviewing regulations for land concessions, including the planning processes and whether concessionaires could chose to avoid forest clearance under a REDD+ mechanism. The impact of land concessions on overall emissions could also be investigated and taken into account during decision-making (pages 49, 51).</li> <li>• Integrating REDD+ into land-use planning processes at subnational scales (page 49).</li> <li>• Establishing the REDD+ financing mechanism as quickly as possible in order to demonstrate that forests do have value as forests (page 49).</li> <li>• Improving Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) (pages 46, 48, 50)</li> </ul> <p>Table 8, on page 54, provides an overview of the drivers from outside the forestry sector and the proposed REDD+ strategies to address these drivers.</p> <p>Furthermore, since the original submission, the RGC has issued a moratorium on issuance of further ELCs. This means that the role of ELCs as a driver will diminish in the future. Consequently, the following changes have been made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A sentence has been added on page which reads: “The RGC has issued a moratorium on ELCs dated 7 May 2012, as a result of which ELCs will no longer constitute a driver of D&amp;D in the future”.</li> <li>2. A candidate REDD+ strategy has been added on page 49 and in Table 8 working with private sector companies to reduce the impact of concessions.</li> </ol>
<p>3. Continue the progress to date on information sharing and consultations among the government and stakeholders, and enhancing capacity of all participants in the REDD+ process, based on the principles for consultation set out</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principles for consultation are set out in the R-PP, Section 1c, based on the process that occurred during the preparation of the R-PP. These principles will be followed during the implementation of the R-PP.</li> <li>• On implementation (Component 2c), the R-PP states that: “Local communities should be involved in local management decisions, implementation and monitoring, e.g. through existing Community Forestry agreements and similar modalities. Other non-state actors, such as NGOs or community forestry groups, may play key roles in implementation at particular sites. Implementation is expected to involve REDD+ projects within a nested framework. Examples might include implementation in: ... (ii) community forests or groups of community forests and/or indigenous communal land titles in the Permanent Forest Estate; (iii) community protected areas or groups of community protected areas and/or indigenous communal land titles in PAs” (page 57).</li> </ul>

<p>in R-PP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised REDD strategy, new section added: “(f) <u>Promoting engagement of local communities in REDD+ implementation</u>. ... A review of the implementation of these modalities will need to be undertaken in order to inform REDD+ strategies and REDD+ implementation plans under the R-PP. REDD+ implementation will particularly need to actively consider the engagement of local communities in order to effectively conserve and manage forest land resources, e.g. through appropriate benefit-sharing arrangements and mechanisms for conflict resolution (see Component 2c). Finally, local communities will also need to actively be consulted and participate in management of state forest land resources, such as protected areas and protection forests, in order to ensure that local resource-use access rights are not compromised by REDD+ implementation.”</li> </ul>
<p>4. State the intention to initiate discussion with neighboring countries on collaboration with regard to controlling cross-border trade in illegal forest products and on REDD+ and, potentially, Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2b of the R-PP (on REDD+ Strategy Options) identifies, on page 49, “Regional cooperation and coordination with bordering countries, including cooperation on law enforcement and MRV” as a candidate REDD+ strategy. This text has been amended to read: “Regional cooperation and coordination with bordering countries on REDD+ activities, including cooperation on law enforcement, MRV, and, potentially Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT), including through existing mechanisms such as ASOF.”</li> <li>Improving Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) is addressed in the R-PP on pages 46, 48, 50.</li> </ul>
<p>5. Include adequate budget for monitoring and evaluation of R-PP implementation in Component 6, and for environmental and social safeguards work; and avoid duplication of activities or funding between UN-REDD and FCPF.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The R-PP budget had \$0 allocated for Monitoring and Evaluation of R-PP implementation in Component 6, because it was anticipated that these costs would be covered by UNDP/FCPF. This amount has been increased to \$200,000.</li> <li>Significant funds are allocated to environmental and social safeguards work throughout the R-PP, principally: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$175,000 from FCPF in Component 2d for Social and Environmental impact activities, including development of nationally-appropriate safeguards (pages 66-69).</li> <li>\$100,000 from FCPF in Component 2b for evaluation of candidate REDD+ strategies, including SESA of the strategies based on the safeguards decided under Component 2d (pages 51 and 55)</li> <li>\$50,000 from FCPF and \$100,000 from UNREDD in Component 2b for valuation and promotion of REDD+ co-benefits (environmental and social) (see pages 49, 50 and 55)</li> </ol> <p>Total available: \$325,000 from FCPF and \$100,000 from UNREDD. It is assumed that this is sufficient for the activities detailed.</p> <li>The Cambodia R-PP has been designed to support the continuation of activities initiated under the Cambodia UNREDD Programme once the UNREDD programme is completed, and expansion of activities to include new areas. Management and governance arrangements for UN-REDD and FCPF will ensure no duplication of activities or funding between the two programmes.</li> </li></ul>