

PC – Review: RPP Thailand

PC Comments & Recommendations

PC-14 March, 2013

Prepared by

Denmark and Switzerland





Strengths

10 components met or largely met

- **The R-PP is well-prepared and addresses the key issues**
- **The «technical» components are well presented**
- **Much effort has been invested in mapping stakeholders and commencing a stakeholder participation process**
- **Concerns and criticism of stakeholders and agents of civil society are openly presented and discussed;**



Areas for Improvement (relating essentially to components 1c and 2d)

- **The «mechanics» of participation require further deliberation; much has been done by IPs on forest conservation → needs to be reflected in the RPP process**
 - participation can refer to a spectrum of options from simple voicing of opinions to true decision making power (voting / veto power)
 - SESA process need to be clearer outlined
- **More emphasis needs to be given as to how land tenure issues shall be clarified**
 - Clarification is a stated goal but not well-described and underrepresented in the budget

Summary

Standard	
1a	Largely met
1b	Met
1c	Partially met
2a	Largely met
2b	Largely met
2c	Largely met
2d	Partially met
3	Met
4a	Largely met
4b	Met
5	Met
6	Largely met



- Comments addressed by Thailand (Note of 20 March 2013)
- Some more effort for inclusion of CS proposed
- 1c and 2 d changed to «largely met».