



MANUSHYA
Empowering Communities | Advancing Social Justice



UPDATES ON THE SAI THONG NATIONAL PARK CASE

14 Land Rights Defenders jailed & unfairly treated as 'criminals'



All you need to know on the Sai Thong National Park Case, from charges, convictions, trial monitoring to national & international advocacy efforts, is available on our dedicated webpage:

<https://www.manushyafoundation.org/sai-thong-np-case>

Table of Content

Monitoring of the court hearings of 2 and 3 July 2019	Page 2
Updates from the prison	Page 6
Appeals to the Supreme Court	Page 6
Overview of the Legal Framework misused to criminalise 14 HRDs	Page 7

The criminalisation of the 14 Sab Wai villagers in the Sai Thong National Park is a representative case of the false climate solution adopted by Thailand and the misuse of the Forest Reclamation Policy and NCPO orders related to its enforcement (NCPO orders 64/2014 and 66/2014), targeting poor communities and land rights defenders to evict them from their lands, rather than recognizing them as key caretakers and protectors of the forest.

1. Summary of Court Hearings of 2-3 July 2019

Summary & Pictures of Court Hearings of 2 July 2019 available here:
EN: <http://tiny.cc/wy978y> & TH: <http://tiny.cc/k6978y>

Summary & Pictures of Court Hearings of 3 July 2019 available here:
EN: <http://tiny.cc/t9978y> & TH: <http://tiny.cc/e8978y>

1.1. Mr Put Sukbongkot, 2 July 2019

On 2 July 2019, Mr Put received the judgment of the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court. During the hearing, the prosecutor as well as Mr Put's lawyer were present. Contradicting to previous cases, Mr Put had to wear handcuffs during the reading of the sentence. In this case, the Appeal Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance and both the criminal and civil charges have remained the same. Mr Put is sentenced to 6 months and 20 days in prison. With respect to the civil charges, Mr Put is ordered to pay a compensation of damages of 370,000 THB with 7.5 % interest per year, starting from 6 July 2016. In the Appeal Court judgment, it was concluded that NCPO Order 64/2014 would be applied in this case. Although NCPO Order 66/2014 aims at protecting poor communities from being evicted, Mr Put was excluded from protection under the order. To justify, the Court judgment included that the land Mr Put utilised was given to Mr Put by his wife's father, however, as his wife's father was not on the survey list of persons allowed to utilise the land in the national park (the list established under Cabinet Resolution 30 June 1998), Mr Put could not legitimately utilise the land. The court judgment read that his wife's father had many chances to be included in the list as three surveys had taken place: the first one from 1998 to 2003, the second one took place in 2008, and the last survey was conducted in 2010. Therefore, NCPO Order 66/2014 does not apply.

SAI THONG NATIONAL PARK CASE

14 LAND RIGHTS DEFENDERS UNFAIRLY TREATED AS CRIMINALS

Communities do not destroy the forest; they protect it better than anyone else!

MR. PUT SUKBONGKOT

47 years old

COURT HEARING

CASE 1734/2017	2 July 2019
----------------	-------------

CONVICTED TO

	ALLEGED ENCROACHED SURFACE	CRIMINAL CHARGES	CIVIL CHARGES
CASE 1734/2017	14 rai, 3 ngan and 8 square wah	Jail time 6 months and 20 days	Fine - each one with 7.5% interest per year 370,000 THB
+ LAND EVICTION			

*1 rai = 0.16 hectare *1 ngan = 400 square meters *1 square wah = 4 square meters

MANUSHYA

Empowering Communities | Advancing Social Justice

1.2. Mr Sompitr Taennok, 2 & 3 July 2019

On 2 July 2019, Mr Sompitr received the judgment of the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court in the first case number 1746/2017 against him. During the hearing, the prosecutor was not present and Mr Sompitr was made to wear handcuffs during the reading of the sentence. During the reading of the sentence, Mr Sompitr’s lawyer was present. In his case, the Appeal Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance for both the criminal and civil charges. Mr Sompitr was sentenced to 10 months in prison. With respect to the civil charges, Mr Sompitr was ordered to pay THB 100,000 with an additional 7.5 percent interest per year, starting from 11 September 2016. In the Appeal Court judgment, it was concluded that NCPO Order 64/2014 (reclamation of the forest policy) would apply in this case. This was due to the fact that although NCPO Order 66/2014 aims at protecting poor communities from being evicted, Mr Sompitr was excluded from protection under the order. To justify this, the court judgment concluded that in order to be protected under NCPO Order 66/2014, a person had to be both poor and included in the list of those having resided on the land before its declaration as a protected area. As Mr Sompitr was poor but not included in the list of those exempted from eviction, the court judgment stated that he could not be protected under NCPO Order 66/2014.

SAI THONG NATIONAL PARK CASE

14 LAND RIGHTS DEFENDERS
UNFAIRLY TREATED
AS CRIMINALS

Communities do not destroy the forest; they protect it better than anyone else!

MR. SOMPITR TAENNOK

54 years old

COURT HEARING

CASE 1746/2017	2 July 2019
CASE 2452/2017	3 July 2019

CONVICTED TO

	ALLEGED ENCROACHED SURFACE	CRIMINAL CHARGES	CIVIL CHARGES
		Jail time	Fine - each one with 7.5% interest per year
CASE 1746/2017	10 rais, 3 ngan and 49 square wah	10 months	100,000 THB
CASE 2452/2017	11 rais, 1 ngan and 88 square wah	10 months and 20 days	100,000 THB
TOTAL		20 months and 20 days	200,000 THB

+ LAND EVICTION

For case 1746 - within 30 days from the date of the court judgment

*1 rai = 0.16 hectare *1 ngan = 400 square meters *1 square wah = 4 square meters

MANUSHYA

Empowering Communities | Advancing Social Justice

On 3 July 2019, Mr Sompitr received the judgment of the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court in the second case number 2452/2017 against him. During the hearing, the prosecutor was not present and Mr Sompitr was made to wear handcuffs and his feet were chained during the reading of the sentence. During the reading of the sentence, Mr Sompitr’s lawyer was present. . In his case, the Appeal Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance for both the criminal and civil charges. Mr Sompitr was sentenced to 10 months and 20 days in prison. With respect to the civil charges, Mr Sompitr was ordered to pay THB 100,000 with an additional 7.5 percent interest per year, starting from 3 June 2017. In the Appeal Court judgment, it was concluded that Mr Sompitr cannot get the advantage under NCPO Order 66/2014 as although he got the land from his wife’s father who was already living on the land, Mr Sompitr’s name was not included on the list. Since his wife’s father lived on the land before its declaration, the Court of first instance has reduced the amount from 943,087 THB to 100,000 THB, which is already an appropriate amount.

1.3. Mr Suwit Rattanachaisi, 3 July 2019

On 3 July 2019, Mr Suwit received the judgment of the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court. During the hearing, the prosecutor was not present, but Mr Suwit’s lawyer was present. Mr Suwit had to wear handcuffs during the reading of the sentence. In this case, the Appeal Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance with respect to the criminal charge which remained the same, but the civil charge was increased. Mr Suwit is sentenced to 17 months in prison. With respect to the civil charges, Mr Suwit is ordered to pay a compensation of damages amounting to 110,762 THB which was increased from 40,000 THB with 7.5 percent interest per year, starting from 3 July 2016. In the Appeal Court judgment, it was concluded that the appeal Court believes that since the prosecution witness is an expert and neutral all the evidence presented by him as well as the calculation by the prosecution on the fine amount would stand. Since Mr Suwit’s name was not included in the list discussed under NCPO 66/2014, he is guilty of what he has been charged. Even though Mr Suwit was utilising the land long before it was declared as protected, the Court

concluded that since he did not have any document to prove that he received the land from his wife’s father he cannot be protected from utilising it.

SAI THONG NATIONAL PARK CASE

14 LAND RIGHTS DEFENDERS
UNFAIRLY TREATED
AS CRIMINALS

Communities do not destroy the forest; they protect it better than anyone else!

MR. SUWIT
RATTANACHAISI

62 years old

COURT HEARING

CASE 1747/2017	3 July 2019
----------------	-------------

CONVICTED TO

ALLEGED ENCROACHED SURFACE	CRIMINAL CHARGES	CIVIL CHARGES
	<i>Jail time</i>	<i>Fine - each one with 7.5% interest per year</i>
CASE 1747/2017 2 rai, 1 ngan and 20 square wah	17 months	110,762 THB
<p style="font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.1em;">+ LAND EVICTION </p> <p style="font-size: 0.8em;">*1 rai = 0.16 hectare *1 ngan = 400 square meters *1 square wah = 4 square meters</p>		

MANUSHYA
Empowering Communities | Advancing Social Justice

1.4. Ms Suwalee Phongam, 3 July 2019

On 3 July 2019, Ms Suwalee received the judgment of the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court. During the hearing, the prosecutor was not present, but Ms Suwalee’s lawyer was present. Ms Suwalee was not made to wear handcuffs during the reading of the sentence. In this case, the Appeal Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance with respect to the criminal charge and the civil charge, which remained the same. Ms Suwalee is sentenced to 5 months 10 days in prison. With respect to the civil charges, Ms Suwalee is ordered to pay a compensation of damages amounting to 160,000 THB with 7.5 percent interest per year, starting from 3 July 2016. In the Appeal Court judgment, discussing point 2.1 and 2.3 of NCPO Order 66/2014, the Court stated that these are merely a guideline for the officer to follow. Furthermore, NCPO Order 64/2014 should be implemented but must not affect those with less income and no land, who reside on the land before NCPO Order 66/2014 was passed. While Ms Suwalee’s mother was on the list of those exempted under NCPO Order 66/2014, she was not included in the list. Therefore, even if she is poor, she cannot be protected as she is not included in the list. On the aspect of signing off the land to return it, the Court concluded that it does not matter if the document was signed voluntarily or if it was forced. This is because the Court believes that signing off the



land is only to formally announce that a person does not have a right to the land that they are anyway not entitled to.

SAI THONG NATIONAL PARK CASE

14 LAND RIGHTS DEFENDERS UNFAIRLY TREATED AS CRIMINALS

Communities do not destroy the forest; they protect it better than anyone else!

MS. SUWALEE PHONGAM
36 years old

She's worried about her daughter, who is very young.

“ I am concerned about many things such as my children, my parents, my husband, expenses for food, water and electricity, school and my previous husband's debt. Basically I am responsible both for taking care of my family and working to earn money every month. ”

COURT HEARING

CASE 1748/2017	3 July 2019
----------------	-------------

CONVICTED TO

ALLEGED ENCROACHED SURFACE	CRIMINAL CHARGES	CIVIL CHARGES
	Jail time	Fine - each one with 7.5% interest per year
CASE 1748/2017	5 rais, 3 ngan and 9 square wah	5 months and 10 days 160,000 THB
+ LAND EVICTION		

*1 rai = 0.16 hectare *1 ngan = 400 square meters *1 square wah = 4 square meters

MANUSHYA
Empowering Communities | Advancing Social Justice

1.5. Ms Narisara Muangklang, 3 July 2019

On 3 July 2019, Ms Narisara received the judgment of the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court. During the hearing, the prosecutor was not present, but Ms Narisara's lawyer was present. Ms Narisara was made to wear handcuffs during the reading of the sentence. In this case, the Appeal Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance with respect to the criminal charge which remained the same, but the civil charge was increased by more than four times the amount. Ms Narisara is sentenced to 9 months 10 days in prison. With respect to the civil charges, Ms Narisara is ordered to pay a compensation of damages amounting to 162,805 THB and 444,356 THB (total of 607,161 THB) with 7.5 percent interest per year, starting from 11 July 2016 and 8 April 2016 respectively. In the Appeal Court judgment, the court concluded that in Ms Narisara's case neither her name, nor that of her father or mother are included in the list under NCPO Order 66/2014. Ms Narisara was already

SAI THONG NATIONAL PARK CASE

14 LAND RIGHTS DEFENDERS UNFAIRLY TREATED AS CRIMINALS

Communities do not destroy the forest; they protect it better than anyone else!

MS. NARISARA MUANGKLANG
33 years old

She is Nittaya's and Suphaphorn's sister. She worries a lot about her father who has serious health issues and needs someone to take care of him.

“ I am worried about the amount of debt that we have. If I really have to go to jail, how could my father live alone as every woman in my family has been charged? I am so stressed that I cry all the time. My mental health is really affected. ”

COURT HEARING

CASE 1742/2017	3 July 2019
CASE 1743/2017	

CONVICTED TO

ALLEGED ENCROACHED SURFACE	CRIMINAL CHARGES	CIVIL CHARGES
	Jail time	Fine - each one with 7.5% interest per year
CASE 1742/2017	3 rais, 1 ngan and 87 square wah	9 months and 10 days 607,161 THB
CASE 1743/2017	8 rais, 3 ngan and 51 square wah	
+ LAND EVICTION		

*1 rai = 0.16 hectare *1 ngan = 400 square meters *1 square wah = 4 square meters

MANUSHYA
Empowering Communities | Advancing Social Justice



aware it was National Park and still continued to live on the land, therefore she is guilty of violating NCPO Order 64/2014. Additionally, the witness of the prosecutor who checked the soil samples for nitrogen, oxygen and phosphorus is an expert who could prove that the quantities show that the forest and biodiversity have degraded, and the soil cannot retain the water. This information along with the pictures taken to prove the clearing of forest to grow tapioca show that Ms Narisara is guilty of destroying and clearing the forest.

2. Updates from the Prison

Currently, 9 women land right defenders and 4 male land right defenders are in jail. 1 HRD is being monitored and assigned at home.

In prison, Ms Nittaya continues to be kept separate from the other villagers from Sab Wai village, who are in prison following their appeal judgments. Although she continues to enjoy special treatment and is being treated better than the others, she believes her isolation from them is being used to manipulate her and to demotivate the others. Further, Ms Nittaya's mother, Mrs Thongpan is very unwell. She is listless and has not been able to sleep. Despite the doctor visiting her and giving her medicine to help her deal with the stress she has been under, she has still not been able to sleep at all and continues to have a very high fever.

3. Appeals to the Supreme Court

All 14 villagers are found guilty and casted as criminals. 13 villagers (9 women and 4 men) are currently in jail, while 1 villager, Mr. Samon Somchitr, is being monitored. To follow up on the cases of all the villagers, their lawyer Mr. Somnuek Tumsupap has submitted and will submit an appeal to the Supreme Court within 30 days from the date of the appeal court judgment, along with an application for bail for the 13 HRDs in jail. In the appeal before the Supreme Court, the lawyer expects to question the validity of the exclusion of the poor villagers from NCPO Order 66/2014 which should protect them from being charged under NCPO Order 64/2014.

Furthermore, it should be noted that this case is emblematic with respect to the proceedings before the Thai Supreme Court, as this will be the first time that such a case, questioning NCPO Order 66/2014, will be brought to the Supreme Court. Moreover, a judgment in the cases of the villagers are expected to be given between six-months to one year due to the high volume of cases submitted to the Supreme Court, operating in Bangkok, and this would most likely be a closed-door process which defendants and prosecutors being unable to attend. Instead, once a final decision is reached, a written judgment will be provided by the Court to the lawyer.

Thus, we are concerned with the lack of transparency and due process as there is no knowledge about how laws are analysed and decisions are reached. In the event the Supreme Court dismisses the cases against the villagers, they will be entitled to receive compensation for the time they unjustly spent in jail. With respect to vacating the land, no action will be taken until the final judgment of the Supreme Court is provided. However, if the villagers lose their cases and the Supreme Court upholds the Appeal Court's decisions, the land eviction will be enforced, and no compensation or alternate land will be provided to them.

3.1. Mrs Sakl Parkit

In the case of Mrs Sakl Prakit, her husband has stated that he does not want the lawyer to submit the appeal to the Supreme Court. Instead, he wants his wife to be separated from the others and submit her appeal separately to the Supreme Court, using a different lawyer. Community members suspect that government officials have tried to convince Mrs Sakl's husband to do so as the husband has relatives in the military. They suspect that the person is attempting to 'steal money' from Mrs Sakl's family, as the person had requested 30,000 THB for lawyer fees alone.

The lawyer is worried about this as there are only 10 days left to submit Mrs Sakl's appeal to the Supreme Court and she still does not have a lawyer to assist with her Supreme Court appeal petition. A new lawyer would need to read into the case, analyse the facts, etc and might not have sufficient time to prepare an adequate appeal. The lawyer is afraid that Mrs Sakl will lose her chance to appeal by switching lawyers. However, the husband has threatened to sue the lawyer if he will submit an appeal for Mrs Sakl to the Supreme Court, along with that for the other 13 villagers.

3.2. Ms Nittaya Muangklang

The Court of First Instance and the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court have after a 20-day waiting period approved Ms Nittaya's appeal petition to the Supreme Court in the first case against her, which they refused to approve earlier. Her appeal petition has now been sent to the Supreme Court. However, this appeal petition needs to be admitted by the Supreme Court and the prosecutor will also be given the opportunity to submit a response to the petition, once the case is accepted. The lawyer is also waiting for the Supreme Court appeal petition in the second case against Ms Nittaya to be approved soon by the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court, as even if the Supreme Court approves the bail in the first case she could be put back in prison for the sentence that she has to serve in the second case against her.

The lawyer will also submit the bail application in Ms Nittaya's case shortly, which normally the Supreme Court takes 3 days to make a decision on. Finally, the lawyer believes that now Ms Nittaya's appeal petition has been approved by the Provincial Court, the petitions for the other villagers will also be accepted faster.

3.3. NCPO Order 66/2014 and its analysis for the Supreme Court petition

The Cabinet issued a resolution of 30 June 1998, which was proposed as a solution to land problems in areas designates as national reserved forest area, by surveying the land and data available with respect to it. This resolution of 30 June 1998 allows those who have been occupying land prior to its declaration as a reserved area to continue to inhabit the area in accordance with the National Reserved Forest Act, and also allows subsequent inhabitants the right to occupy such land pursuant to the Community Sufficient Economy Project.

Explaining further on NCPO order 66/2014, the lawyer clarified that nowhere in the Order is the Cabinet resolution of 30 June 1998 discussed. However, the Court of First Instance and the Appeal Court both discussed this Cabinet resolution as the basis for the distribution of land, and the application of NCPO Order 64/2014 and 66/2014.

Furthermore, he believes that provisions 2.1. and 2.4. of NCPO Order 66/2014 do not complement each other. Indeed, while provision 2.1. states that *'any activity under this Order should not affect the poor and the landless, before the announcement of this Order except in the case of new encroachers for which there has to be investigation to prove the action taken and to decide on a solution through next steps'*, provision 2.4. directly states that *'any case already brought to trial must be pursued till a judgment has been reached.'* Therefore, according to the lawyer, no specific point in the NCPO Order mentions that charges should be brought against those encroaching or that a case should be filed against them. He says that it is action taken by the rangers and the prosecutor on their own.

4. Overview of the Legal Framework misused to criminalise 14 HRDs

4.1. Thailand's false climate solution & the misuse of forest conservation policies to criminalise rural communities rather than capitalist investors

Thailand is one of the developing countries participating in the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), which is a global partnership of governments, businesses, civil society and indigenous peoples focused on reducing emissions from deforestations and forest degradation, forest carbon stock conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in

developing countries (activities commonly referred to as REDD+).ⁱ The FCPF hosted by the World Bank has created a framework and processes for REDD+ readiness, which helps participating countries get ready for future systems of financial incentives for REDD+.ⁱⁱ Thailand was selected as one of the REDD participant country in 2009. Its REDD+ readiness preparation proposal was approved in 2013 with a condition to undertake additional consultations with the concerned stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities that have been monitoring the REDD+ implementation in the country.ⁱⁱⁱ Subsequently, in 2014, the Forestry Master Plan, the 'Forest Reclamation Policy', was issued based on NCPO Order 64/2014.

4.2. The Forestry Master Plan: 'Forest Reclamation Policy' as a strategy to evict the Poor

With this policy, the Thai government, specifically the Royal Forest Department (RFD), aims to combat problems such as forest destruction and trespassing on public land, while intending to increase Thailand's national forest area by 26 million Rai or up to 40% of the total area of the country. The Master Plan was around the discourse that commercial investors' exploitation of Thailand's natural resources is responsible for deforestation and must be stopped. The government appeared sincere in its intentions to target only wealthy investors after it released Order 66/2014, a supplemental directive which states that government operations must not impact the poor. However, implementation of the Master Plan has overwhelmingly targeted impoverished villagers and indigenous peoples who lived on their lands for decades as "investors" or alleged that local communities were being funded by wealthy investors, resulting in a complete disregard of the protection measures set out by Order 66/2014. The RFD does so by misusing laws and policy by confiscating land and evicting villagers from their land, by enforcing various forests and national park related laws such as (a) the Forest Act B.E. 2484, (b) the National Reserved Forests Act B.E. 2507, and (c) the National Park Act B.E. 2504.

Focus on the controversial NCPO orders operationalizing the Forest Reclamation Policy

To operationalise the forest reclamation policy, orders were also passed by the National Council for Peace and Order (NCPO) consisting of the military junta. The two most relevant orders include NCPO Order No. 64/2014 and 66/2014.

- NCPO Order 64/2014 related to the suppression and cessation of encroachment and destruction of forest resources, provides that authorized state agencies are to suppress violations and arrest those who encroach on, seize, possess, destroy, or act in any manner that may cause damage to the forest, specifically on protected land. The aim of the NCPO Order 64/2014 is to stop deforestation which has been caused by commercial investors' exploitation of Thailand's natural resources.
- NCPO Order 66/2014 suggests that the primary targets of these measures must be investors or large-scale outside developers, whereas the poor, landless and those who have settled in the land before it was declared as a protected area, should not be affected by the NCPO order 64/2014. NCPO Order 66/2014 establishes a list of such people who are permitted to use the land. The Order 66/2014 appeared to focus only on wealthy investors. However, during its implementation of the Forestry Master Plan, the government has persistently identified impoverished villagers who lived on their lands for decades as "investors" or alleged villagers as being funded by wealthy investors, resulting in the loss of protection as set out by Order 66/2014. Five strategies have been followed by the NCPO to evict people, namely stopping illegal logging, stopping forest encroachment, seizing encroached areas, destroying villagers produce while filing lawsuits, and conducting area surveys.

Discrepancies in the application of NCPO Order 66/2014, meant to protect poor people from being evicted for forest land

In order to target HRDs protecting their land and protesting against land evictions, the government has purposely excluded villagers from the protection guaranteed to poor people under NCPO Order 66/2014. The Sai Thong National Park case clearly demonstrates the discrepancies in the application of NCPO Order 66/2014: the Royal Forest Department (RFD) said that NCPO Order 64/2014 is meant to target investors and NCPO Order 66/2014 is meant to exclude poor people from NCPO Order

64/2014 and protect them from being sued by the government. The definition of poor, according to the RFD, is not properly defined and depends on the appreciation of the Thai authorities and judges. All the 14 Sab Wai villagers currently prosecuted find themselves unfairly targeted as they are only small-scale farmers. This highlights the unequal application of the NCPO Order 66/2014, considering that those who were supposed to be protected, not only lost their land but also were found guilty of the charges of trespassing, having to pay a fine of between 40,000 THB to 1,6587,211 THB, together with jail time ranging from 5 months 10 days to 4 years. Finally, their criminalisation further put them in poverty situation, leaving their families, elders and children behind, with insufficient financial resources and care.

The abovementioned existing laws, policies and NCPO Orders place limitations on community rights, while restricting land rights, management and utilisation of natural resources by local people, especially in protected areas. In this manner, authorities enforce strict legislative and implement coercive measures against those who have settled and sustained their livelihoods in forest areas. By December 2015, Order No. 64/2014 had impacted nearly 1,800 families, mostly in the north and northeast, home to large indigenous populations. At that date, 681 cases filed against exercise of powers under Order No. 64/2014 towards local and indigenous communities were recorded, and 168 of these cases amounted to judicial harassment.^{iv} Further, since the 2014 military coup, there are at least 226 women human rights defenders (WHRDs) from rural areas who have been subjected to judicial harassment by State and non-state actors.^v

All you need to know on the Sai Thong National Park Case, from charges, convictions, trial monitoring to national & international advocacy efforts, is available on our dedicated webpage:

<https://www.manushyafoundation.org/sai-thong-np-case>

Endnotes

- i Forest Carbon Partnership. N.d. *About FCPF*. [online] Available at: <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/about-fcpf-0>
- ii Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. N.d. *What is REDD+?*, available at: <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/what-redd>
- iii *Thailand R-PP: TAP Comments and Recommendations*, 2013, available at: <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2013/Thailand%20R-PP%20TAP%20Comments%20and%20Recommendations.pdf>. See also, *Response Matrix to TAP Final Review*, available at: <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2013/Response%20matrix%20to%20TAP%20Final%20review%20comment%2018%20March.pdf>
- iv Thai CSOs Coalition for the UPR, *Information on the Status of the Human Rights Situation in Thailand – UPR Advocacy Factsheet on The Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Thailand*, developed by the Network of Indigenous Peoples of Thailand (NIPT) and the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) to inform Thailand 2nd UPR Cycle, (2016), available at: https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CCPR/Shared%20Documents/THA/INT_CCPR_ICO_THA_23570_E.pdf
- v APWLD and Protection International, Joint Statement of 25 May 2019 '[Human Rights Groups Urge Thai Government to Release Nittaya Muangklang, Women Human Rights Defenders Working on Land Rights Issues](https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2013/Thailand%20R-PP%20TAP%20Comments%20and%20Recommendations.pdf)', available at: <https://apwld.org/statement-human-rights-groups-urge-thai-government-to-release-nittaya-muangklang-women-human-rights-defenders-working-on-land-rights-issues/>