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Outline

1. Public policy-what is the most effective policy design?

2. Political economy-is the policy politically feasible (who wins and loses; and losers be made winners)?

3. Environmental governance-what institutional reforms are needed to make the policy effective (and scale solutions)?

→ Applied example: Thailand case
1.1 Public policy

- Command-control, market-based, informational instruments
- Policy mixes/packaging
- Combining destructive and constructive policies
- Policy coherence
1.2 Political Economy (3i’s)

• Ideas
  • Norms
  • Epistemic communities and transnational advocacy networks

• Interests (winners and losers)
  • Businesses
  • Politicians, lawmakers
  • Bureaucracies and agencies

• Institutions
  • Political and electoral institutions (election cycles, voting counting, representation)
  • Bureaucratic and agency coordination
  • Business-government consultation
1.3 Environmental Governance

• Multi-level, multi-stakeholder governance

• Engagement mechanisms/participatory processes

• Learning and demonstration effects
Environmental Governance Model

1. Horizontal Coordination

2. Vertical Coordination

3. Stakeholder Engagement
Applied Example: Thailand’s 8 Point Plan
2.1 Design Effective Package of Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prohibit burning of agriculture residue, waste, and unwanted flora during an “80 day period” (21 January – 10 April) except in areas receiving a waiver. Each province received a quota and defined area for burning during this period. Special permission from local administrators is required for burning during the period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intensify forest fires prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promote “villages free from burning”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engage private companies to participate in haze and forest fire countermeasures through corporate social responsibility programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Raise awareness by stepping up public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establish an early warning haze incident notification system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expand cooperation with neighbouring countries to mitigate trans-boundary haze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish “haze pollution prevention and solution centres” for nine provinces in Northern Thailand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Solution 1  
Technical Solution 2  
Technical Solution 3

Constructive Policy  
Destructive Policy
2.2 Consider political feasibility

• Ideas
  • Is there good science/technical analysis to support policy?
  • Is there a (transnational) scientific community to support policy?
  • Are there other advocacy networks to support the policy?

• Interests (winners and losers)
  • Which businesses, politicians, and agencies win and lose from the policy?
  • How can benefits be maximized and aggregated?
  • Can losers be paid off with side payment?

• Institutions
  • Are there political opportunities to promote the policy?
  • What institutional changes are needed to form coalitions that can recognize and act upon full benefits
  • What engagement mechanisms are needed to work with businesses and other stakeholders
2.3 Map actors’ interests and institutions

- Ministry of Interior (MOI) with other key agencies, i.e. Department of Provincial Administration (DOPA), Department of Local Administration (DOLA), Governors of Chiang Mai, Chiang Rai, Phrae, Nan, Lampoon, Lampang, Phayao, Mae Hong Son, and Tak Provinces
- Ministry of Transport (MOT) with key agencies, i.e. Department of Highways (DOH), and Department of Rural Road (DORR), for control of open-burning along the highways
- Department of National Park Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP) and Royal Forest Department (RFD) in close collaboration with the aforementioned agencies for countermeasure 1
- Pollution Control Department (PCD) and the Department of Environmental Quality and Promotion (DEQP) within the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE)
- Electricity Generation Authority of Thailand (EGAT) - Ministry of Energy (MOEN) - Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC) with key agencies, i.e. Land Development Department (LDD), and Department Agricultural Extension (DOAE)
- Public Relations Department (PRD) - Ministry of Tourism and Sports (MTS) - Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MOS) - Ministry of Education (MOE) - Ministry of Public Health (MOPH)
- Thai Meteorological Department (TMD) - Department of Disaster, Prevention and Mitigation (DPM) in cooperation with the Royal Thai Army, Royal Thai Navy, Royal Air Force, and Border Patrol Police in case of need to putting out the large-scale open fires
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) - Ministry of Defense (MOD) in collaboration with MNRE
- Ministry of Interior (MOI) with key agencies assigned for countermeasure 1 and Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation (DPM) in collaboration with PCD of MNRE
Concluding thoughts

• Effective solution requires theory of change

• This presentation presents theory that draws on public policy, political economy, and environmental governance research

• Theory of change suggests need to consider: 1) design of policy package; 2) consider feasibility; and 3) map actors interests and institutions

• Theory is then applied to slightly dated case of Thailand 8-point plan

• Still some missing pieces: 1) how to apply to future policies?; 2) what about finance and enabling technologies; and 3) how can this be integration with other disciplines