

PAYMENTS FOR FOREST ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IN MAINLAND SOUTH-EAST ASIA: FROM IDEAS TO PRACTICE

Pia Katila

Coordinator IUFRO WFSE

Natural Resources Institute Finland, Luke

**IUFRO Special Project World Forests, Society and Environment
(IUFRO WFSE)**

PAYMENTS FOR ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (PES)

- Voluntary transactions between service users and service providers that are conditional on agreed rules of natural resource management for generating offsite services (Wunder 2015)
- Promising approach to natural resource management
 - Most schemes in the US, Europe and Latin America
 - Development at early stages in Asia and Africa



IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF A PES SCHEME

- **Additionality**
 - Contribution in addition to without the scheme
- **Transparency**
 - Contract terms, decision making, benefit sharing are transparent and known to all
- **Conditionality**
 - Payment is made only as long as the service is provided
- **Voluntary transactions**
 - Providers act voluntarily



©Creative Commons Dennis Jarvis (cropped)

FOREST CONDITIONS IN MAINLAND SOUTH-EAST ASIAN COUNTRIES

COUNTRY	FOREST AREA 1 000 ha	% OF LAND AREA	ANNUAL CHANGE RATE 2010–2015 %	PLANTED FOREST % OF FOREST AREA (2015) [annual change rate 1990–2015 %]
CAMBODIA	9 457	53.6	–1.3	0.7 [0.1]
LAO PDR	18 761	81.3	1.0	0.6 [16.5]
MALAYSIA	22 195	67.6	0.1	8.9 [0.0]
MYANMAR	29 041	44.2	–1.8	3.3 [3.6]
THAILAND	16 399	32.1	0.2	24.3 [1.6]
VIETNAM	14 773	47.6	0.9	24.8 [5.5]

FOREST TENURE

COUNTRY	% OF FOREST AREA OWNED & ADMINISTERED BY GOV.	% UNDER SOME DEGREE OF COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT	% OF FORST LAND UNDER PRIVATE/ COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP	RURAL POPULATION % OF TOTAL 2015**
CAMBODIA ¹	100	3		79
LAO PDR ²	100	32		61
MALAYSIA ^{2,3}	95		5	25
MYANMAR ^{2,3,5}	100	2		66
THAILAND ^{2,3}	100	3 (community land use permit)		50
VIETNAM ^{3,4}	71 *		25/4 allocated	66

1 Kurashima et al .2015; 2 RECOFT 2013; 3 FAO 2015; 4 To Xuan Phuc & Tran Huu Nghi 2014; 5 Tint et al. 2014

*includes: State Enterprises, Forest Management Boards, Peoples Committees, Army, other organizations

**<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.RUR.TOTL.ZS>

PES POLICY AND PROGRAMMES

COUNTRY	Specific PES legislation	PES recognized in national plans/strategies	Projects/programmes
CAMBODIA	No	Yes*	Pilots and Voluntary market
LAO PDR	No	Yes**	Pilots
MALAYSIA	No	Yes***	Voluntary market
MYANMAR	No	No	Pilots
THAILAND	No	Yes****	Pilots
VIETNAM	Decree No. 99 on the Policy for Payment for Forest Environmental Services, 2010	Yes*****	Nationwide PFES programme

RECOFTC 2013; *National Forestry Programme 2010–2029; **Strategy for agricultural development 2011–2020; ** *Eleventh Malaysia Plan (11MP); ****11th National Economic and Social Development Plan; *****E.g. Vietnam National Green Growth Strategy and Viet Nam Sustainable Development Strategy for 2011–2020

EXAMPLES OF PES PROJECTS (1)

COUNTRY	Projects/ programmes	Current/ Potential providers	Current/ Potential buyers	Comments
CAMBODIA	Pilots: watershed, biodiversity	Local people, communities	Tourists, hotels, NGOs, donors, hydropower companies	
	Carbon: 2 VCM (VCS) projects: Oddar Meanchey; Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary	Communities, Gov., NGO	Global voluntary markets, e.g. Disney (Keo Seima)	Oddar Meanchey: 63 831 ha Keo Seima: 292 690 ha
LAO PDR	Pilots: watershed, biodiversity, carbon	Gov.agency, university, NGO, local people, communities	Gov.agency, foreign companies in hydropower and mining, downstream water users	Large scale off- sets, in these and other pilots so far no direct payments to local communities

EXAMPLES OF PES PROJECTS (2)

COUNTRY	Projects / programmes	Current / Potential providers	Current / Potential buyers	Comments
MALAYSIA	Malua BioBank: biodiversity	Sabah State gov.+ private investors (biodiversity conservation certificates)	Voluntary buyers (companies, NGOs, private citizens)	Gov. provides or participates in provision, locals benefit through employment Seeks to preserve 34 000 ha
	Perak State Forest: watershed	State forest dept.	Voluntary buyer: Hydro-power company	0.25% of profits
	Rehabilitation of logged-over dipterocarp forest in Sabah: Carbon (VCS)	Company+Foundation of the Dutch Electric Generation Board	Global, voluntary carbon markets	Rehabilitate 25 000ha logged over forest
MYANMAR	Pilots: Carbon	N/A	N/A	Improvement of the Quality of Life of Ethnic Minorities in the Naga Area through Youth Participation in REDD

EXAMPLES OF PES PROJECTS (3)

COUNTRY	Projects/ programmes	Current/ Potential providers	Current/ Potential buyers	Comments
THAILAND	Pilots: watershed, biodiversity	Local people, communities, NGOs, gov.	Water users, tourism sector, companies (CSR), general public, NGOs	Pilots in initial stages National organizations + donor driven, private companies (CSR)
VIETNAM	National PFES programme: currently watershed, landscape, biodiversity (future: carbon, soil protection)	Individuals, households, communities, organizations (forest management boards, state forest enterprises)	Current: Hydropower (majority), water supply, tourism sector	Payments trough central and provincial Forest Protection and Development Funds, REDD+ fund will be part of PFES Supports forest protection on 3–4 milj. ha /year

TYPES OF PAYMENTS

■ Voluntary non-governmental payments for voluntary actions

- Voluntary payments by non-governmental stakeholders to compensate suppliers (private or gov. agency) who voluntarily take action to provide or safeguard ecosystem services

■ Regulatory non-governmental payments for (voluntary) actions

- Regulatory framework to establish demand (compulsory fees for e.g. water/hydropower companies; tourists; tourism business)

■ Governmental payments for voluntary actions

- Local/regional/national government agency, quasi public agency represent the general public and acts as buyer by financing the provision of ecosystem service(s)

CONCLUSIONS₍₁₎

- In general lack of acknowledgement of ES and their value
- No formal institutional framework (except Vietnam)
- Governments own and administer most of the forest land
 - Lack of or unclear legal property rights and/or restricted rights of local communities (Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Thailand, partly Vietnam)
 - Reluctance to allow local communities to benefit financially from forest resources (Cambodia, Laos)
 - PES seen as an option for obtaining funding for state forest administration/protection (Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Vietnam)
- High transaction costs



©Creative Commons Thomas Quine

CONCLUSIONS₍₂₎

- Problems with
 - Transparency
 - Conditionality
 - Additionality
- Monitoring and evaluation mostly lacking
- High forest cover + large rural populations => in theory potential for poverty alleviation exists, in practice depends on institutional setting
- Well-designed PES schemes can complement regulatory intervention rather than substitute them
 - Interplay within the whole institutional setting is crucial (Schomers & Matzdorf 2013)



MAIN SOURCES

FAO 2015 GLOBAL FOREST RESOURCES ASSESSMENT 2015 2015 <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4808e.pdf>

Forest Trends and The Katoomba Group 2008. Payments of Ecosystem Services: Getting Started, A Primer. Forest Trends, The Katoomba Group, and UNEP. Nairobi.

Jarungrattanapong et al. 2016. Payment for ecosystem services in Thailand and Laos. EEPSEA SRG report no 2016-SRG3.

Milne, S. & Chevier, C. 2014. A review of payments for environmental services (PES) experiences in Cambodia. CIFOR Working Paper 154.

Nabangchan, O. 2014. A review of the legal and policy framework for payments for ecosystem services (PES) in Thailand. CIFOR Working paper 148.

Pham Thu Thuy et al. Payments for forest environmental services in Vietnam. From priority to practice. CIFOR Occasional Paper 39.

Pham Van Trung 2016 <http://www.slideshare.net/CIFOR/lessons-and-experiences-from-implementation-of-pfes-in-viet-nam>

RECOFTC 2013. Community forestry in Asia and the Pacific. Pathway to inclusive development.

Schomers, S. & Matzdorf, B. 2013. Payments forecosystem services: A review and comparison of developing and industrialized countries. Ecosystem services 6: 16-30.

Tacconi, L. 2012. Redefining payments for environmental services. Ecological Economics 73: 29-36.

Tacconi, L. 2015. Regional synthesis of payments for environmental services (PES) in the greater Mekong Region. CIFOR Working Paper 175.

Tint et al. 2011 Community Forestry in Myanmar: Progress & Potentials

<http://www.burmalibrary.org/docs13/Community+Forestry+in+Myanmar-op75-red.pdf>

Wunder, S. 2015. Revisiting the concept of payments for environmental services. Ecological economics vol 117.

<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Registry/index.html>

<http://www.un-redd.org/partner-countries>

<http://www.ecosystemmarketplace.com/>

<http://www.vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/projects/st /c TH/ss 14/so /di /np>

<https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org>

THANK YOU

