

Table 1 Response matrix to TAP final review

	TAP recommendation	Explanation	Revision text
Component 1a			
(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.		Add specialists on socio-ecological economist for TWG on REDD+ strategy team and Finance & Benefit Sharing Mechanism on Page 21 and 22.
(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 Kittu 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.		A detailed stakeholder analysis will be conducted during readiness as mentioned in Comp.1 c. This will include identification and self-selection process of relevant stakeholders relating to forestry and land use-e.g., CSOs, Private/industrial Sector, forest dependent communities, etc.
(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.	The 77 Natural Resources and Environmental Provincial Officers will perform the function of REDD+ local offices	
Component 1b			
(10)	Please notice a misspelling of a word “tilting” on page 35, I understand that it should be “titling”. There are some misspellings in other sections as well, please check.		Noted
(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	As part of the institutional arrangement Comp. 1a, the forest dependent communities/ethnic groups are represented in the national REDD+ Task Force. During the readiness phase, they will also be represented in the various technical working groups as mentioned in comp.2d.	

	<p>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.</p>	<p>The world bank's safeguards policies - specifically the strategic social and environmental assessment (Comp.2d.) combined with extensive consultations (Comp.1.c.) will be implemented to ensure the active inclusion and participation of this stakeholder group, and to ensure that their rights, concern and interests will be safeguarded during readiness.</p>	
Component 1c			
(1)	<p>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.</p>	<p>As a matter of fact CSOs are included please revisit table 1a1. Terminology used is NGOs/local community networks. Also see table 1b.1. However in-depth stakeholder analysis will be conducted in the early stages of readiness to fine tune the relevant CSOs engaged in REDD+, NRM and Environment, etc.</p>	
(2)	<p>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".</p>		Noted
Component 2a			
(1)	<p>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</p>	<p>The 1889 logging ban was the consequence of the intense forest conservation pressure due the disastrous landslide in the southern province of Nakhon Srithammarat in late November 1988. All forest concessions were banned. However, it should be noted that conservation pressure also took effect in 1979 when the government imposed the partial ban on forest concessions, i.e., logging was halted on 50% of the total concession areas.</p> <p>In 1993, the government revised the targeted forest areas, as stated in the 1985 National Forest Policy, to be 25% conservation forest (formerly 15%) and 15% economic forest (formerly 25%)</p>	<p>It will be revised in R_PP text accordingly.</p>

	governance may be far away in reality then.	due to serious concern about increasing deforestation and forest degradation.	
Component 2b			
(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.	This is a strategy option that will be further developed during the Readiness Phase and is linked to Items 4.2 and 4.3 in the same Table, which would provide the information required to develop a long term strategy for the wood industry to balance sustainable supply and demand	This issue is also addressed in comp.2b
(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.	The different models referred to by the reviewer are appropriate in different circumstances, with the former (socio-ecological) being more appropriate to protected forest areas and the latter (socio-economic) being more appropriate in economic forest areas. The proposed pilot studies will aim to gain experience in implementing these strategies in the context of REDD+	
Component 2c			
(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		The government takes the issue of land conflict seriously, as a result, a high level holistic committee on land management system chaired

	risky. Land tenure conflicts would relate to the governance concerns requiring effective planning and strategic implementation.		by Vice PM was established in 2012 to focus on resolving land conflict. Land use zoning system will be conducted throughout the country with emphasis on land less and poor communities. During Readiness the technical working group on land use policy and planning will conduct a workshop to explore the bottom up participatory process that will be put in place to brainstorm and make suggestions, action plan and strategies for land conflict resolution and management. Furthermore analytical work on land tenure will be conducted; this will be combined with the consultation process to help determine solutions for resolving the land tenure problems. The outcomes for this work will serve as a proposal for the committee to consider.
Component 2d			
(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.	As mentioned in the document Thailand committed to use FPIC only during the pilot projects as an instrument to pilot how to operationalize FPIC and put it into practice. The World Bank's SESA process and its safeguards policies will be used to mitigate negative social and environmental impacts.	
Component 3			
(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.	In establishing REL different assumptions will be used based on historical data to determine the baseline and more analysis and appropriate design for Thailand will be conducted during readiness	Comment noted, capacity building will be provided to the following: REL and MRV Working Group, DNP/RFD, DMCR, LDD, local communities/CSOs
(2)	The monitoring system set up for Thailand REDD+ readiness and implementation would benefit as an independent system that would not	The National REDD+ monitoring system (see component 4a) will incorporate the NFMS system (based on the THAIFORM) into	

	utilize the THAIFORM as the main system, but it would be based on the THAIFORM.	a more comprehensive system that will also incorporate the BSIS and other operational systems from other agencies	
Component 4a			
(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 belowground Carbon analysis.	During readiness, collection of soil samples and above ground monitoring in the same plot will be conducted.	The text will be revised accordingly
(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.	Guidelines for sub-national monitoring will be developed through a proposed study during the readiness phase, through a participatory approach involving government and non-government stakeholders. These guidelines will include definition of roles and responsibilities for the monitoring, and how to integrate it with the community-level and national level monitoring.	Two additional activities for the proposed study have been added to the text: 4) define roles and responsibilities for the monitoring and 5) Include sub-national monitoring as an integral part of the NFMS, which includes the community-level and national level monitoring.
(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.	The verification body has not been decided yet. It is clearly stated in the R-PP that the verification guidelines to be developed in the readiness phase "... would include decisions on who the verification bodies are ..."Note that the R-PP also states clearly that the verification would be independent and transparent.	A sentence has been added in the text. This effect. Verification will be an Independent process under the Guidelines Of UNFCCC. However capacity building is needed.
Component 4b			
(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.	It is assumed that these negotiations will be successfully concluded in the not too distant future and that, as stated in the R-PP, an important outcome will be strengthened capacity to enforce restrictions on logging and ensure that the wood industry uses only certified timber.	
(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	It is already addressed and captured in 2C1 in this response matrix	

	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.	Various cabinet decisions between 1985 and 1995 referred to in Component 2a have defined watershed classes and prescriptions for their management and the role of forests, and these will need to be enforced	
(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.	See response to comment 6(2) below	
(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.	Agreed, forest sector Association should be involved. Reference is made under the section on the role of stakeholders to both the private sector and to companies already implementing relevant activities	Reference to trade associations has been added to the text
Component 5			
	No recommendations		
Component 6			
(1)	It has been confusing about a number of NRE provincial offices, whether there are 75 (in this section) or 77 provinces (previous section).	Amended to 77	The text has been corrected
(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)?	The first two activities are required in order to determine in detail what indicators are being recorded, where, how frequently and in what format the data is collected, and then to obtain agreement from the various agencies to share their data with the proposed REDD+ Monitoring system. The third activity is then needed to organise the handling of the data, some of which may need to be converted or adapted to meet the REDD+ requirements.	

		The final sentence should refer to the NFMS (National Forest Monitoring System) (the “M” was a typographical error)	The text has been corrected
--	--	---	-----------------------------