



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conservation of critical wetland PAs and linked landscapes			
Country(ies):	Viet Nam	GEF Project ID: ¹	4760
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4537
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)	Submission Date:	November 20, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Agency Fee (\$):	318,029
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas	Output 1. Two new protected areas and coverage at least 31,000 ha of unprotected ecosystems	GEF TF	1,532,634	5,100,000
	Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management	Output 3. Sustainable financing plans (number).	GEF TF	500,000	4,000,000
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 2. National and sub-national land-use plans (number) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem valuation.	GEF TF	996,303	5,056,600
Sub-total				3,028,937	14,156,600
Project management cost			GEF TF	151,350	735,000
Total project costs					14,891,600

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To establish new wetland protected areas and to create capacities for their effective management to mitigate existing and emerging threats from connected landscapes						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Establishment of new wetland PAs and relevant	TA	Key wetlands-related policies, laws and plans updated, including: a new decree and associated legal guidance to replace Decree 109 on	1.1 <u>New and updated national policy, regulatory and planning frameworks for wetland conservation</u> , that includes (1) an	GEF TF	2,032,634	9,100,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

systemic capacities for their effective management	<p>the Conservation & Sustainable Use of Wetlands; a 5-year Wetlands Action Plan, with vision to 2020; and an updated national wetlands inventory with database based on a unified classification system</p>	<p>up-to-date, comprehensive inventory of Viet Nam’s wetlands, (2) an updated National Wetlands Action Plan presenting the status of wetlands, their representation in PA network and key actions and processes to fill gaps; and (3) an updated Decree on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wetlands that clarifies (i) Wetland Conservation Areas (WCAs) categorization according to types, level of protection and management objectives; (ii) management responsibilities in relation to WCAs from national to local level, including the extent and types of community and private sector engagement in natural resource management; (iii) an emphasis on adopting an ecosystem-based approach to wetlands management; and (iv) reference to the importance of assessing and valuing ecosystem services generated by wetlands.</p>			
	<p>Enhanced capacity of MONRE to implement wetland-related policies, legislation, strategies and programmes demonstrated through the increase in score from 21% to at least 45% as measured by the UNDP capacity Development Scorecard</p>	<p>1.2 <u>Strengthened national capacity for administration of wetland conservation areas</u>, MONRE staff development for national WCA system administration nationally (planning, establishing , monitoring, negotiation and partnership-building skills)</p>			
	<p>At least 2 new wetlands PAs in different landscapes established, bringing at least 35,316 ha under effective protection to address the current under-represented wetland ecosystems in the national PA system³ - 21,620 ha as the Tam Giang-Cau Hai Wetlands Conservation Area (WCA) and 13,696 ha as the Thai Thuy WCA. Strengthened PA functions: planning, patrolling and enforcement, monitoring, community relations and conflict management to deliver increased PA management effectiveness from 0% to at least 40% as measured by the METT scorecards and income from various sources to cover at least the recurrent costs of TGCH WCA and TT WCA as defined by each WCA’s business plan</p>	<p>1.3 <u>Two new wetland conservation areas (WCAs) established with management systems in place</u>, including boundary demarcation, provision of public consultation, determination of governance arrangements, zoning and community use rights for different zones as well as the emplacement of PA functions to address threats including (i) PA management plans and business plans, biodiversity monitoring and enforcement systems; (ii) Clarified roles, responsibilities and rights of provincial and local authorities,</p>			

³ “Although some wetlands are included within the national Special-use Forests network, wetlands remain notably under-represented. In addition, the management objectives of Special-use Forests are generally focused on the conservation of terrestrial forests, not wetlands.” Tordoff, A. W., Tran Quoc Bao, Nguyen Duc Tu and Le Manh eds (2004b). *Sourcebook of existing and proposed protected area in Vietnam*. Second edition. Hanoi: Birdlife International in Indochina and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

			<p>communities and the private sector in management; (iii) agreement on sources of finance, details of human resources, infrastructure, equipment and other essential capacity needed to manage the areas effectively.</p> <p>1.4 <u>Strengthened provincial capacity for wetlands conservation and management and sustainable use</u>, DONRE staff development for WCA management (PA planning, threat analysis, stakeholder engagement, partnership building, negotiation, conflict resolution, monitoring and adaptive management) and Management Board capacity development (Importance of intersectoral cooperation and coordination in wetland conservation and development and implementation of sustainable financing options)</p>			
2. Integrity of wetland PAs are secured within the wider wetland connected landscapes	TA	<p>EIAs of all major development activity in Thua Thien-Hue and Thai Binh Provinces include sections referring to impacts on environmental services as a result of widely communicated assessment of the value of Tam Giang-Cau Hai and Thai Thy wetlands' ecosystem services</p> <p>Threats reduced by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and the PA system within the sectoral and development planning frameworks by strengthening the application of key standards & regulations that support wetlands conservation and sustainable use in the Provincial and selected District Development plans for two key sectors in the two demonstration provinces⁴: Agriculture, specifically rice cultivation, fisheries and aquaculture incorporate wetland biodiversity friendly standards for application in relation to activities under that sector. This will include zoning of the different land use types within the WCAs and remaining areas within district boundaries in 6 District</p>	<p>2.1 <u>Increased understanding and knowledge about wetlands values, sustainable use and management across the wider landscape</u>, through conducting a systematic assessment and valuation of ecosystem services generated by TGCH and TT wetlands and the threats these currently face in order to demonstrate their economic importance and the consequences of their degradation and loss to a range of audiences, from planners and decision-makers to local communities and other sectors of civil society.</p> <p>2.2 <u>Wetlands conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed into key provincial plans</u>. (i) Provincial master plans and sector plans and district socioeconomic development plans for areas around WCAs adjusted to include specific standards and guidelines on EIAs, fisheries and aquaculture practices, seagrass bed management and monitoring, maintenance of intertidal mudflats, control of pollution from aquaculture, agriculture and other sources; (ii) Supporting Integrated</p>	GEF TF	996,303	5,056,600

⁴ In Thai Binh Province, agriculture and aquaculture sectors will be targeted while in THua Thien Hue Province the agriculture and fishing sectors will be targeted.

	<p>Development Plans. Zoning will include prescriptions for strict protection areas among others seagrass beds, mangrove and mudflat protection zones.</p> <p>Water pollution levels around O Lau in TGCH & Thuy Trong in TT reduced as a result of improved agricultural & aquacultural practices. [Baselines and targets to be developed with local communities in Year 1].</p> <p>No increase in the extent of coverage of clam culture on the intertidal mudflats in Thai Thuy WCA as a result of mainstreaming wetland values into district fishery sector development plan</p> <p>Increased Catch per Effort of <i>Siganus</i> in TGCH WCA as a result of further establishment of aquatic reserves and Fishery Associations, ensuring us of appropriate gear and enforcing existing regulations on destructive gear and fishing practices</p>	<p>River Basin Management in Thua Thien Hue, and (iii) Supporting the implementation of the Red River Delta Biosphere Reserve Management Framework.</p> <p>2.3 <u>Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods</u>, through supporting sustainable livelihood activities to enhance conservation friendly livelihoods (i) Demonstrate Integrated Pest Management and Integrated Crop Management in Rice Cultivation, (ii) Introduce wetland-friendly clam cultivation and reduce further expansion of clam culture in Thai Thuy; (iii) Establishment of Fishery Associations to ensure the use of appropriate gear and enforcing existing regulations on destructive gear and fishing practices; (iv) Community capacity programmes for planning, implementation and monitoring of landscape health – including mitigation of pollution and sustainable tourism expansion opportunities.</p>				
Subtotal					3,028,937	14,156,600
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁵				GEF TF	151,350	735,000
Total project costs					3,180,287	14,891,600

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	ISPONRE	Cash	142,000
National Government	ISPONRE	In-kind	300,000
National Government	Vietnam Environmental Administration	Cash	1,863,600
National Government	Vietnam Environmental Administration	In-kind	1,200,000
Local Government	Thua Thien Hue Province's People Committee	Cash	2,924,000
Local Government	Thai Binh Province's People Committee	Cash	6,442,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	1,000,000
CSO	RIFEE	In-kind	100,000
CSO	IUCN	In-kind	400,000
CSO	WWF	Cash	70,000
Others	Hue University	In-kind	450,000
Total Co-financing			14,891,600

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

⁵ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Viet Nam	3,180,287	318,029	3,498,316
Total Grant Resources				3,180,287	318,029	3,498,316

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	188,500	0	188,500
National/Local Consultants	377,000	150,000	527,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No.

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc

N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The fundamental problem that this project will address remains unchanged since the PIF stage. Under the “business-as-usual” scenario, wetlands biodiversity in Viet Nam will continue to be undervalued and subject to multiple threats. Unique wetlands biodiversity and associated ecosystem services, including globally significant biodiversity, will continue to be degraded and lost. The current PA system is insufficient to address loss of biodiversity in wetlands. Although some wetlands are included in several Special-use Forests, representativeness of wetlands was not considered and there are significant gaps in representation of wetlands in the national PA system. Wetland ecosystems are very dynamic with seasonal changes in water levels and species movements making management more complex. The long term solution to addressing the continuing degradation and loss of wetlands biodiversity in Viet Nam, is to ensure greater biogeographic representation of wetlands within the national PA system and to create adequate national and local systemic capacity for their effective management, including the capacity to address threats that emanate from the wider landscape as this is particularly crucial in the case of wetlands given their vulnerability to changes in landscape-level connectivity and upstream developments [*wording slightly different than what is in PIF, but meaning similar*].

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

The barrier section has been elaborated on from what appeared in the PIF (see section “1.6 The Long-term Solution and Barriers to its Achievement” in the Project Document). This has meant some slight adjustment in project design outlined under the incremental cost section A5.

The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address have not changed as the project is seeking to address the same problem, what has changed is one of the demonstration sites (from Pa Khoang Lake in Dien Bien Province to Thai Thuy District in Thai Binh Province), but the new demonstration site still fulfils the same function as a pilot (see Section A. 5 “Incremental/Additional Reasoning” below).

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

One of the demonstration sites proposed in the PIF, Pa Khoang Lake in Dien Bien Province has been substituted with a wetlands area covering 13,696 ha, in Thai Thuy District in Thai Binh Province in northern Viet Nam. Based on the comments from the GEF reviewer during the PIF review, the Project Development Team undertook an extensive screening and selective process to choose a site that Viet Nam can demonstrate the management practices necessary for wetland management and that contained significant globally important biodiversity. The criteria and process used to select sites to establish demonstration WCAs are detailed in Annex 4 of the Project Document and summarise here. An initial set of criteria was developed at the beginning of the project to long-list potential sites and a one hundred key wetlands in Viet Nam were identified. The draft criteria and the longlist of wetlands were presented at a national workshop and more refined criteria were agreed on, namely biogeography representation, global biodiversity significance, national significance, protection status, level of threats, having linked landscapes, size, socio-economic and cultural diversity, social feasibility, economic feasibility, management feasibility and no overlap with completed or on-going projects. A shortlist of four potential sites were decided in another Stakeholder Consultation meeting. Tam Gian-Cay Hai lagoon site was easily agreed on, while the remaining three sites required field work. After the field work and further discussions with experts and stakeholders, the Thai Thuy coastal wetlands site was chosen as the second demonstration site.

Unlike Pa Khoang Lake, the global biodiversity significance of the Thai Thuy wetland area is indisputable. The Thai Thuy coast is of particular importance as a wintering ground for migratory birds in the Red River Delta and is consequently classed as an Important Bird Area (IBA) by BirdLife International. Around 100 species have been recorded here, including six globally threatened or near-threatened species. These included the vulnerable Saunders’s Gull (*Larus saundersi*), the critically endangered Spoon-billed Sandpiper (*Eurynorhynchus pygmeus*), the endangered Baer’s Pochard (*Aythya baeri*), the near threatened Ferruginous Pochard (*A. nyroca*) and two vulnerable raptors, the Greater Spotted Eagle (*Aquila clangai*) and the Imperial Eagle (*A. heliaca*). BirdLife has been monitoring this site periodically since 2005/6. The global significance of this area and the threats to the area’s biodiversity were further confirmed during project preparation. The area has been identified as one of seven key wetland sites within the Red River Delta Biosphere Reserve (RRDBR), which was declared in 2004. The mangrove forests found around the Thai Binh and Tra Ly river mouths, which cover some 300 ha dominated by *Sonneratia caseolaris*, represent the largest remaining tracts of old-growth mangrove in the Red River Delta. Other patches of mangrove found here were replanted with *Kandelia candel*. However, most of Thai Thuy District’s coastal land has been converted to aquacultural ponds, which cover some 175 ha. Rice cultivation is also an important economic activity. Both rice cultivation and aquaculture contribute to the pollution of local wetlands. Thai Thuy’s intertidal mudflats are also threatened by clam cultivation.

Thai Thuy was also selected because of the global significance of its wider connected landscape, i.e. the Red River Delta, as well as the opportunity to mainstream wetlands conservation principles into district development plans in line with the Red River Delta Biosphere Reserve Interprovincial Management Regulation.

The project seeks to address key threats to Thai Thuy’s wetlands biodiversity by establishing a Wetlands Conservation Area and by reflecting standards on rice cultivation and aquaculture in provincial, sector and district development plans. Further the wetland area of the Thai Thuy wetland area to be declared as WCA is 13,696 ha which will reduce the representativity gap in Viet Nam versus the 9,000 ha of the PIF-proposed Pa Khoang Lake area PA.

As a result of substituting Pa Khoang Lake with Thai Thuy, the project is likely to generate a higher level of global environmental benefits. Specifically, the GEF investment will generate the following **Global Environmental Benefits**: GEF funding will secure critically important coastal wetland biodiversity in 35,316 ha of new wetland PAs in the Indo-Burma Hotspot, which is ranked in the top 10 hotspots for irreplaceability, top 5 for threat, has only 5% of natural habitat remaining and has more people than any other hotspot.⁷ This will include 21,620 ha covering the Tam Giang-Cau Hai coastal lagoon complex in Thua Thien Hue Province. The lagoon is the largest of its kind in South-east Asia and contains a diversity of natural and artificial wetlands, which together comprise a unique assemblage of wetlands biodiversity with over 920 species documented so far including at least one globally near threatened species, the Asia Dowitcher and several nationally threatened species. The lagoon complex is critically important as a nursery area for both inland and marine fish species and for numerous bird species, with over 70 birds recorded including over 30 migratory birds. The project will also contribute to the conservation of at least 800 ha of seagrass beds within the lagoon complex, which in turn will help strengthen the biodiversity values of the wetland. A further 13,696 ha of wetlands will be protected through the new Thai Thuy WCA, including 300 ha of old-growth mangrove forest and 9,000 ha of intertidal mudflats, a habitat type that is of critical importance to many water birds, including several globally threatened and near threatened species, such as the Critically Endangered Spoon-billed Sandpiper (*Eurynorhynchus pygmeus*) and the vulnerable Saunders's Gull (*Larus saundersi*), both of which have been recorded regularly in Thai Thuy. The project also expects to generate a range of global environmental benefits through improved management of landuses in over 310,000 ha of land including some 283,000 ha around TGCH in TTH province and 27,300 ha of land around TT in the Red River Delta Biosphere Reserve. This will be achieved by supporting the further development of two key land use management frameworks for the wider landscape around TGCH WCA and TT WCA that will address threats to the integrity of both WCAs that emerge from outside through new developments, landuse change and other economic activities. These are the TTH River Basins Management Framework and the Red River Delta Biosphere Management Framework. The specific nature of these additional global environmental benefits will be quantified during project implementation.

Further changes from the PIF: The emphasis on the emplacement of the protected area functions in the two WCAs during the project period has slightly changed to the process of the establishment of the WCAs with management systems in place. The process of establishing PAs is lengthy in Viet Nam. This is further exacerbated by the fact that MONRE and the PPC and DONRE have limited capacity and experience in management and in the establishment of the WCAs. With the limited funds and period for implementation, the project will focus on putting the capacity, processes and functions in place (including the identification of financial resources) for the long-term management of the protected area, rather than focusing purely on emplacement of functions during the project period. A sustainable model that can be up kept after project closure was therefore developed in the project strategy. The issue of finance has similarly adopted this approach as the WCAs are new protected areas and the Government of Viet Nam cannot at this stage commit to underwrite to cover all the investment and operational costs of PA functions. All efforts will however be made during project implementation to broker the necessary funds. Further, there has been commitment that the recurrent costs of the management of the protected areas will be covered by various sources and that by end-of-project there will be an agreement on sources of finance, details of human resources, infrastructure, equipment and other essential capacity for effective management of each WCA to address both site-level and landscape-level threats including a monitoring system that supports adaptive management.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The risk analysis undertaken at the PIF stage was further refined. The updated risk assessment and proposed mitigation measures is given in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Project Risks Assessment & Mitigation Measures

Risk	Level	Mitigation
------	-------	------------

⁷ Indo-Burma Biodiversity Hotspot: Ecosystem Profile - 2011 Update. CEPF, October 2012. http://www.cepf.net/Documents/final.indoburma_indochina.ep.pdf, p. 2

Risk	Level	Mitigation
Mainstreaming wetland biodiversity conservation into landscape-level development plans and other existing frameworks hindered by competing interests/lack of incentives	Medium	A number of measures will be used to counter this risk. First, the results of the ecosystem services assessment & valuation will be packaged and communicated to different target audiences in a manner designed to generate greatest interest among key planners and decision-makers. The project focus on bringing together key decision-makers and actors on wetlands to strategize, plan and learn by doing through various fora including the ecosystem services assessment, various capacity development programmes as well as the Wetlands Working Groups and the WCA Management Boards is designed to foster both greater understand of the need for landscape level approaches to site-based wetlands conservation as well as to foster greater intra and intersectoral cooperation. The Local Wetlands Working Groups will be key to helping champion the wider wetlands conservation agenda and membership of these groups will be selected accordingly. Additionally, the project will make use of existing regulations and policies that support mainstreaming to further strengthen these and ensure their adoption and use, for example by making better use of the EIA process.
The effects of climate change degrade the conservation value of wetlands and the new WCAs	Low during project life-time rising to Medium over the long-term	Wetlands are particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts of rising temperature and changing patterns in the seasonal distribution of rainfall but these will not change significantly during the life of the project. Over the longer term, river water flows are expected to change significantly at different times of the year, particularly in dry seasons where water abstraction upstream (within Viet Nam and also across international borders with neighbouring countries) is likely to impact on wetlands significantly. In general, knowledge gained and sustainable management practices introduced by the project are likely to prove more rather less adaptive with respect to climate change impacts.
Government institutions are unable to agree on their respective roles & responsibilities with regard to WCA establishment and management	Low	The Government of Viet Nam is keen to advance the wetlands conservation agenda and to harmonize planning of the wetlands PA system. MONRE and MARD area already cooperating to harmonize the existing PA system with the requirements of the new Biodiversity Law. Given that MONRE is mandated by law to lead on state management of wetlands biodiversity and is currently leading on many processes relating to harmonization, this is not thought to be a major risk, although it may take some time to harmonize policies and laws and the current roles and responsibilities of different government departments. Additionally, there is strong support for harmonization of biodiversity conservation approaches in Viet Nam from GIZ, who work especially closely with MARD.
NWWG and LWWGs are not effective due to insufficient interest and participation of key members and are thus unable to take wetlands agenda forward in a coordinated and strategic manner	Medium to Low	The success of these working groups will depend very much on strong engagement by BCA/ISPONRE, the project team and UNDP to ensure that the membership of these two groups are well-aligned with the intended functions of these groups and that these groups do not become too exclusive or bureaucratic in their operation. These need to be dynamic vibrant groups that act as a force for positive change to drive the wetlands agenda forward and will require considerable support from project partners during their establishment and initial operations to ensure that this happens. Specific tasks may need to be identified for each group or sub working groups so that there is a sense of specific purpose to group meetings rather than being just a general get together. Provided this support is given by UNDP, BCA/ISPONRE and others to give the groups initial direction and guidance on effective ways to operates, these groups should be able fulfill their intended functions.
Local communities will not participate in wetland conservation because they fear this will lead to reduced access to use of natural resources.	Medium to Low	Local communities in TGCH have had some exposure to concepts of sustainable use and biodiversity conservation through earlier work done here such as the establishment of aquatic reserves and co-management through Fishery Associations. The design, transparency and accountability through participatory management planning process will provide a means of addressing prejudices and genuine obstacles to protecting and sustainably managing natural resources. Furthermore, the Wetland Conservation Areas will be zoned to provide for a variety of uses raging from strict protection of biodiversity to its sustainable use based on conservation principles. Additionally, the project will develop strategies with local communities to address any benefits forgone as a result of WCA creation. These measures should help allay local concerns especially if additional support is being provided to generate livelihood benefits.

Risk	Level	Mitigation
The benefits of competing landuses are perceived by planners and decision-makers to outweigh their costs in terms of wetlands degradation and loss	Medium to High	Viet Nam's top development priority is to achieve industrialised nation status by 2020. Therefore, there are enormous competing demands on land and other natural resources and new developments and ongoing economic activities on varied scales are continually threatening biodiversity including wetlands biodiversity. At the same time, there is growing recognition of the importance of certain types of natural resources, notably the need to sustain water flows and quality and the role of natural ecosystems in climate change adaptation. This is without a doubt a major challenge that can only be addressed through combination of measures from improved communication of the many benefits of maintaining wetlands particularly to constituencies of particular interest to decision-makers and planners. The results of the ecosystem services assessment and valuation will contribute to this. In general, however, local governments are more likely to support interventions if these obviously also benefit their local electorates in tangible ways or to oppose actions in the wider landscape that will clearly adversely impact their local electorate. Thus project interventions that help to both reduce threats from local livelihoods practices as well as increase local incomes for example through ICM/IPM and improved aquacultural and fisheries practices are likely to be persuasive. There is also need to make better use of existing policies and laws that promote sustainable management of wetlands at different scales. No one single mitigation measure exists to address this particular risk, which will need to be periodically evaluated and locally appropriate measures deployed on a case by case basis.
Local community engagement in wetlands planning, management and sustainable use is hindered by lack of capacity among key government stakeholders within the People's Committees and government departments at subnational level to effectively promote and strengthen such engagement.	Medium - Low	There is growing interest within Government to increase community engagement in both conservation and the sustainable management of natural resources. This is increasingly reflected in national policies on biodiversity. In one project site, Tam Giang-Cau Hai local government already has considerable experience of working closely with local communities to establish aquatic reserves with co-management agreements as well as engaging with them to promote more sustainable fisheries and aquacultural practices. Given that most wetlands are heavily utilised in different ways by a range of local stakeholders, their effective management will not be possible without community engagement. However, not all government agencies and individuals have the necessary skills and expertise to engage effectively with local communities and transitioning from government-led to true co-management can be more challenging. The project will be specifically developing this kind of practical capacity within local government agencies and also promoting a variety of mechanisms to bring communities and key government actors together to strategize and plan for wetlands management and sustainable use.
Increased and uncontrolled water transport and fishing vessels (ships and boats)	Medium - Low	The project will undertake baseline studies to determine the current water transport use as well as the presence of vulnerable wetland areas and important biodiversity in the two wetland areas. On the basis of the information obtained, and through negotiation and participatory planning process, zone plans for the wetland area will be developed and agreed on. The emphasis will be concluding on a win-win situation, where economic and biodiversity (environmental) benefits are both obtained rather than the exclusivity of only one.
Unforeseen larger developments outside the control of project and the Government cause major wetlands degradation and loss at site-level or within wider landscape with knock-on effects on the new WCAs (eg a major oil spill at sea)	Low Risk/High Impact	Given the large number of ships moving through this region, this remains a possibility. Industrial accidents are also possible and wetlands are particular vulnerable to these. However, such externalities are beyond the scope of the project to plan for. However, as in the case of climate change, improved conservation management of wetlands will increase overall ecosystem resilience to external shocks.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

N/A

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation⁸

STAKEHOLDER AGENCY	INVOLVEMENT	REFERENCE TO PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment (MONRE)	MONRE has many departments and agencies within it and is responsible amongst other things for the state management of biodiversity, including wetlands conservation. MONRE's Biodiversity Conservation Agency (BCA) was established in 2008 to implement the Biodiversity Law, while its Institute of Natural Resources & Environment (ISPONRE) undertakes research and develops policy.	As below
Institute of Policy on Natural Resources & Environment (ISPONRE)	ISPONRE is the policy advice unit of MONRE, in charge of strategy and policy development and research activities. ISPONRE mandate covers all sectors within MONRE. ISPONRE will be implementing agency of the project together with BCA of VEA. ISPONRE will also provide technical support to project activities relating to policy revision and development, ecosystems services valuation and institutionalisation new models for wetlands PAs in the policy framework for wetlands conservation.	Output 1.1: Wetlands policies and laws Output 1.2: Wetlands PA administration capacity Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation Output 2.2: Mainstreaming wetlands conservation into provincial plans
Biodiversity Conservation Agency (BCA)	BCA falls under the Viet Nam Environment Administration (VEA), a subsidiary body of MONRE. Within the VEA, BCA is responsible for the implementation of the biodiversity conservation provisions of the Biodiversity Law in cooperation with other ministries. BCA is the focal point of the CBD, Ramsar Convention, Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and Nagoya Protocol on ABS. Institutionally BCA is the agency authorized for preparation of NBSAP, biodiversity master planning, and reporting of biodiversity. BCA will implement this project together with ISPONRE.	Output 1.1: Wetlands policies and laws Output 1.2: Wetlands PA administration capacity Output 1.3: Wetlands PA establishment Output 1.4: Provincial capacity for conservation management of wetlands PAs Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation Output 2.2: Mainstreaming wetlands conservation into provincial plans Output 2.3: Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods
Department of Water Resource Management (DWRM)	The main duty of DWRM is the execution of the State administration on water including wetland, surveying and mapping and some other fields in the whole country. Given the critical importance of water for wetlands, DWRM is an important stakeholder in the long-term sustainable management of wetlands, and has a particularly important role to play given that it's mandate covers the wider landscape of importance to a given wetland. However, there is currently no integration of biodiversity values in DWRM's work.	Output 1.1: Wetlands policies and laws Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation Output 2.2: Mainstreaming wetlands conservation into provincial plans
Viet Nam Administration of Seas & Islands (VASI)	VASI is the state agency responsible for managing activities related to exploitation and utilization of seas and islands, including coastal areas; conducting research in coastal, marine, and island environment and resources monitoring and control. VASI is mandated to undertake and guide local government in implementation of integrated coastal management. VASI is an important	Output 1.1: Wetlands policies and laws Output 2.2: Mainstreaming wetlands conservation into provincial plans

⁸ Also refer to Section V: Management Arrangements and Annex 3: Stakeholder Involvement Plan in the Project Document

	source of information on wetland policies, regulations and best practices for coastal environmental monitoring and management.	
Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development (MARD)	MARD has primary and long-standing responsibility for forest and fisheries management. MARD has also been responsible for developing the national protected area (PA) system, including the more recent establishment of 'marine PAs', some of which include coastal wetlands. MARD has also been given responsibility for establishing Inland Water Conservation Areas. Additionally, MARD is responsible for enforcing wildlife protection regulations and thus play an important role in preventing overexploitation of a range of species, including wetland species.	Output 1.1: Wetlands policies and laws Output 2.2: Mainstreaming wetlands conservation into provincial plans Output 2.3: Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods
Department for Capture Fisheries and Resources Protection (DCFRP) / MARD	DCFRP is particularly key to wetlands management and conservation as the state agency responsible for managing fishery resources including conservation and protection of endangered fish species, inland habitats and marine protected areas. Since 2008, DCFRP has been responsible for planning the development 45 Inland Water Conservation Areas, which focus on protection and conservation of fishery resources. DCFRP has experience of testing and promoting best practices for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture management, which are key to conserving wetlands biodiversity in Viet Nam.	Output 2.3: Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods
Research Institute for Forest Ecology and Environment (RIFEE) / MARD	Research Institute for Forest Ecology and Environment (RIFEE) is a research institution under MARD's Forest Science Institute of Vietnam (FSIV). RIFEE's strategic research and development program is focused around three central themes (i) sustainable uses of forests and forestland including wetland, (ii) forest and wetland ecology and physiology and (iii) monitoring and assessment of forest biodiversity. The Institute carried out studies and training on forest ecosystem, wetlands and mangrove that are relevant to the feasibility study on the establishment of Wetland Conservation Areas, and capacity building for WCA management.	Output 1.2: Wetlands PA administration capacity Output 1.4: Provincial capacity for conservation management of wetlands PAs Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation
Research Institutions	The Viet Nam Academy of Science & Technology (VAST) conducts multi-disciplinary studies in socio-economic development, ecology and environmental management, policy analysis, culture. Two VAST Institutes the Institute of Ecology and Biological Resources (IEBR) and the Institute of Marine Environment and Resources (IMER), are of particular relevance to this project. IEBR has a number of wetlands experts, while IMER has considerable experience of working in the Tam Giang-Cau Hai area and will be an important partner in relation to seagrass conservation zone establishment and monitoring. Additionally, the college of Economics under Hue University has been involved in different projects on economic valuation of wetland and sustainable financing mechanism for wetland conservation in Thua Thien Hue province.	Output 1.3: Wetlands PA establishment Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation Output 2.3: Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods
Provincial People's Committees (PPCs) of Thua Thien Hue and Thai Binh	PPCs play a major role in provincial development and sector planning and implementation. They are responsible for coordinating the biodiversity conservation activities of various line departments at the provincial (and city) level.	Output 1.3: Wetlands PA establishment and management Output 1.4: Provincial capacity for conservation management of wetlands

	<p>PPCs currently have management responsibility for many Protected Areas. PPCs also have an important role in ensuring that biodiversity is integrated into sectoral plans and programs at the local level.</p> <p>The project will be working with Thua Thien Hue PPC and Thai Binh PPC to establish wetlands conservation areas in Tam Giang-Cau Hai and Thai Thuy, respectively. PPCs of selected sites will be also responsible for coordination the activities of provincial departments to implement the management mechanism in newly established WL conservation areas. Additionally PPCs will play a major role in ensuring the mainstreaming of wetlands conservation and sustainable use principles in Provincial Development and Sector Plans.</p>	<p>PAs</p> <p>Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation</p> <p>Output 2.2: Mainstreaming wetlands conservation into provincial plans</p> <p>Output 2.3: Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods</p>
District and Commune People's Committees in and around Tam Giang-Cau Hai and Thai Thuy	District and Commune PCs are important in supporting local socio-economic development and being closest to local communities play an important role in overseeing and supporting development activities in their districts and communes. Thus, DPCs and CPCs have a key role to play in terms of ensuring environmental sustainability, particularly in relation to activities such as fishing, aquaculture, rice and other forms of agricultural production and overexploitation that are known to negatively impact wetlands. DPCs and CPCs will be key project partners at site level, particularly in relation to implementing activities targeting at reducing threats to biodiversity arising from current livelihood practices.	<p>Output 1.3: Wetlands PA establishment</p> <p>Output 1.4: District capacity for conservation management of wetlands PAs</p> <p>Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation</p> <p>Output 2.2: Mainstreaming wetlands conservation into district plans</p> <p>Output 2.3: Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods</p>
Department of Natural Resources & Environment (DONRE)	DONRE is the provincial arm of MONRE and the thus the state agency responsible for managing natural resources and environment at the provincial level (including issues related to biodiversity. Currently a key part of DONRE's responsibilities are on land administration. DONRE also undertakes activities on pollution monitoring. DONRE will now have to play an increasing role in supporting biodiversity management generally and in this instance in assisting PPCs to establish and manage new wetlands conservation areas. DONRE is the primary technical government partner of this project at local level along with DARD.	<p>Output 1.3: Wetlands PA establishment and management</p> <p>Output 1.4: Provincial capacity for conservation management of wetlands PAs</p> <p>Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation</p> <p>Output 2.2: Mainstreaming wetlands conservation into provincial plans</p> <p>Output 2.3 Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods</p>
Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD)	DARD is the provincial arms of MARD and thus critically important for wetlands management given its responsibilities for the agricultural and fisheries and aquacultural sectors. DARD also has considerable experience of managing PAs cross Viet Nam and of establishing aquatic reserves in one of the project demonstration sites. DARD also has greater manpower and is thus very important at the local level for ensuring wetlands biodiversity conservation. They will be a key project partner at the local level along with DONRE.	<p>Output 1.3: Wetlands PA establishment and management</p> <p>Output 1.4: Provincial capacity for conservation management of wetlands PAs</p> <p>Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation</p> <p>Output 2.2: Mainstreaming wetlands conservation into provincial plans</p> <p>Output 2.3: Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods</p>
Local communities & Community-based Organizations, e.g. Fisheries Associations (FA), Farmers Unions, Women's Unions and Youth Union	<p>Local communities will be key participants and beneficiaries of the project. Their involvement will be sought in the planning and management of the new wetland PAs to be established in Tam Giang-Cau Hai and Thai Thuy.</p> <p>At the local level in Tam Giang-Cau Hai lagoon, a number of local Fishers Associations exist, which had been active</p>	<p>Output 1.3: Wetlands PA establishment and management</p> <p>Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation</p> <p>Output 2.3: Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods</p>

	<p>in several aspects of wetland management and conflict resolution. They will be actively involved in the project. Viet Nam also has social organisations such as Farmer Union, Woman Union, Youth Union, and Veteran Union at community level and their involvement will be sought for appropriate activities at both sites. If required, the project will also facilitate the establishment of relevant community groups to support conservation and sustainable livelihoods actions and ensure their participation in protected area management boards.</p>	
<p>Local & International NGOs supporting Wetlands Biodiversity Conservation in Viet Nam</p>	<p>A number of local and international NGOs have considerable experience of working on different aspects of wetlands conservation and management. The latter includes IUCN, Birdlife International and WWF, who have a long history of engagement in biodiversity conservation in Viet Nam, including on protected areas management and wetlands conservation.</p> <p>IUCN has made important contributions to biodiversity conservation and environmental protection in Viet Nam, primarily through support to the development of various laws and policies including the Biodiversity Law (2008). IUCN was also closely involved in supporting the preparation of the first National Wetlands Action Plan, which came to an end in 2010. IUCN will be a key partner for this project. IUCN is currently supporting the revision of various laws and policies on biodiversity/wetlands, payment for ecosystem services including mangrove/wetlands as well as undertaking advocacy for sustainable wetlands management and biodiversity conservation. IUCN's technical expertise will be particularly useful for the development of the new wetlands policies and the unified wetlands inventory.</p> <p>WWF has worked closely with the Vietnamese government since the 1990s on a diverse range of environmental issues. WWF has four strategies in Vietnam including (i) securing landscape integrity and climate change resilience, (ii) ensuring sustainable hydropower development, (iii) strengthening law enforcement and protected area management, and (iv) securing sufficient sustainable financing. WWF is supporting a project in Thua Thien Hue Province on mangrove planting and biodiversity planning. WWF is also working on communication, education and awareness raising. WWF's expertise is particularly relevant to WCA design and management, sustainable use of wetland, mainstreaming wetlands conservation into the wider landscape and increase conservation awareness about wetlands among different stakeholders.</p> <p>The following local conservation NGOs are of particular relevance to wetlands conservation generally and to this project.</p> <p>Marine Life Conservation & Community Development (MCD) is a civil society organisation focusing on effective management of coastal resources and enhancement of coastal community livelihoods through localising relevant international knowledge and</p>	<p>Output 1.1: Wetlands policies and laws Output 1.3: Wetlands PA monitoring Output 2.1: Ecosystem services assessment and valuation Output 2.3: Community engagement on wetlands PA management including monitoring</p>

	<p>experience into adaptive practical models in the Vietnamese context.</p> <p>MCD has implemented a number of projects in coastal areas of Viet Nam including Thai Binh, Nam Dinh to promote ecotourism development and has cooperated with MAB Viet Nam, provincial authorities and local communities in Red River Delta Biosphere Reserve (RRDBR) and supported the development of the interprovincial management regulation for the RRDBR.</p> <p>The Viet Nam Wetlands Association (VNWA) is an organization under VACNE, specializing on sustainable development of wetlands in Viet Nam. While VACNE was established in 1988 and is very active, VNWA is a relatively new organization. The main functions of VNWA are (i) doing research, training, providing consulting services for sustainable management of wetland ecosystems in Viet Nam; (ii) developing, coordinating and implementing projects in the field of rehabilitation and sustainable management of wetland ecosystems; (iii) research and advise on policies, strategies and legislation on the conservation and sustainable management of wetlands and (iv) wetland networking to exchange information and propose appropriate regulatory measures and policy to promote wetland conservation activities in the country. VNWA will be important focal point for networking and information sharing for the Wetland Conservation Area.</p> <p>Viet Nature Conservation Centre (Viet Nature)</p> <p>Viet Nature is a national NGO that developed out of Bird Life International's work in Viet Nam over 20 years through its Indochina Programme. Viet Nature has considerable experience and knowledge of globally significant birds in Viet Nam through its work on Important Bird Areas and associated bird surveys including at the proposed project sites. They also have experience of undertaking ecosystem services assessment.</p>	
--	---	--

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

In terms of **Socioeconomic benefits**, both the new WCAs as well as improved wetlands management and conservation more generally within the wider landscape as a result of this project, will generate enormous economic and social benefits to people in these areas. In TGCH alone some 200,000 people rely primarily rice cultivation and a further 100,000 primarily on fishing and aquaculture, while in TT, some 20,000 people rely on rice cultivation and some 11,000 on fishing and aquaculture. Both agricultural production, particularly of rice, and intensive aquaculture are associated with heavy use of agro-industrial chemicals. Over use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides resulting in high nutrient loads and concentrations of persistent organic pollutants is considered a major source of soil, water and air pollution in many parts of Viet Nam and is not only a threat to wetlands biodiversity, but also to human health and wellbeing. Key health-related benefits include increased community understanding of the varied risks associated with pollution and improved capacity to manage household waste and improved water quality as a result of strengthened pollution standards and improved agricultural and aquacultural practices. In total, at least 10,000 households or some 40,000 people are expected to benefit from reduced pollution in the areas where they live, cultivate, fish and have aquaculture ponds.

Improved protection of intertidal mudflats, seagrass beds and, through the aquatic reserves, selected areas of the lake area in TGCH including important spawning ground, together with improved fishing and aquaculture practices will contribute to increasing the productivity of the system overall as well as of economically valuable species. Additionally, in Thai Thuy, the project will develop local capacity to improve clam culture practices to increase production without expanding the area of clam farming. Project support will thus result in higher incomes for aquaculturists and fishers in the target project areas. The quality of fish and aquacultural products will also be improved as result of lower use of pesticides, fertilizers, medicines and other chemical compounds generating further health benefits. The exact number of households that will benefit from increased productivity of fish and other aquatic species will depend on where new the aquatic reserves and seagrass conservation zones are established and the size of the Fishery Associations that are established. However, it is expected that around a 1,000 households will benefit from improved clam production.

Similarly, the project's promotion of new methods of rice cultivation through Integrated Crop Management in seven communes (1 commune in Thai Thuy and 6 communes around the O lau river mouth in TGCH) is expected to significantly increase yields (and potentially costs through reduced use of pesticides, chemical fertilizers and added) for local rice farmers while reducing negative environmental impacts including pollution generating further ecological and health benefits. This will benefit some 1,600 households in Thai Thuy and 6,000 households in TGCH. For example, on-farm evaluation of ICM in other provinces has shown that ICM practices can increase rice yield on average from 0.3 tonnes/ha up to 1.5 tonnes/ha, reduce seed use by 28%, reduce pesticide use by 50% and increase overall profit to farmers by 1-3 million VND per ha in contrast to prevailing rice cultivation practices that rely on high inputs of commercial fertilizers and pesticides.⁹ Similar results are reported of ICM/IPM application in Thai Binh where this approach has led to increases in rice yield by 9-17%, reduction in pesticide use by 41.84%, and increased overall profit to farmers by VND 1.2–1.4 million per ha. Additionally, opportunities will be identified for local communities to supplement existing their income through a range of ecotourism options and targeted capacity developed for this.

Finally, the livelihoods of all local farmers, fishers and aquaculturists are ultimately dependent on the maintenance of the water sources that feed each wetland. Thus, the project's interventions to promote mainstreaming of environmental safeguards and standards for wetlands at the provincial and broader landscape levels within different sectors will also contribute to improving water quality, sustaining water flows and the continued provision of a range of socioeconomic benefits from these wetlands.

Ecosystem Services: Valuation of ecosystem goods and services will be a first priority after project inception. As noted in the ProDoc, monetizing the value of goods and services produced by wetlands through a wetlands valuation step is designed to bring wetlands' economic value into the mainstream of government thinking and planning. The lack of perceived economic value of wetlands makes it very difficult to promote the conservation and expansion of wetlands protected areas, especially in Viet Nam where most decisions are influence by 'economic value'. Monetization is designed to change government attitude in ways they will understand (i.e. monetary value). This also flows through to the ability to argue successfully for a sustainable fishery that reflects a balanced approach to economic well-being of a wetland and the economic benefits it brings both to the fishery and to other sectors (such as tourism). A change in government attitude towards the value of wetlands will have far-reaching benefits for global biodiversity through improved stewardship of wetlands namely, demonstrating the economic benefit of wetlands. However, until the wetland valuation is completed we cannot quantify this benefit. There have been a few economic valuations of wetlands in Viet Nam in the past although most have focused on one or two selected values. Nevertheless, these have shown that that the value of wetlands is considerable. For example, the total value of mussel exploitation in Xuan Thuy National Park is 2004 was estimated to be between US\$ 7 – 10 million and contributed to local community income. Tourism in wetland areas such as Xuan Thu, Ba Be, Ca Mau and U Minh Thuong national Parks, Ha Long Bay, Cat Ba Island, Con Dao Island, the beautiful beaches in Phan Thret and Vung Tau attract many international and domestic tourists and are a major source of revenue, including foreign exchange.

Gender: Recognizing the disadvantages faced by women, the project will make a concerted effort to ensure that women are able to participate effectively in project activities that are most relevant to them, including having access to training

⁹ Nguyen Ho Lam, Hoang Thi Nguyen Hai, Tap chi khoa hoc, Dai hoc Hue, Vol. 75A, Number 6, (2012), 75-81, Result of application model 3 increases and 3 reductions in Viet Nam

and being able to engage in the establishment of the WCAs, and the development and implementation of the WCA management plan. The Project will fully integrate both men and women in the the establishment and management of each WCA, particularly the planning and implementation of activities at commune and village level. In particular the training for sustainable livelihood will incorporate a gender perspective, to ensure that the needs of women, who frequently form a marginalized group in the fishery and aquaculture sector, are taken into account and that implementation the project could promote gender equality. Thus, benefits made to households and communities should include safeguards to ensure gender equality.

Local wetlands also serve as an important coastal defence against extreme weather events, tidal surges and anticipated future sea level rise. Increased community capacity for sustainable management and use of local wetlands developed through project will also strengthen local adaptive capacity. Finally, mainstreaming of wetlands conservation into the larger areas will generate considerable socioeconomic benefits for many more people with the wider landscape around TGCH and TT WCAs, which will be quantified during the course of the project through an ecosystem services assessment and valuation that will assess the baseline situation as well as identify the nature and volume of additional socioeconomic benefits that are likely to be generated by the GEF alternative. Additionally, MONRE will ensure that mainstreaming approaches and sustainable agriculture, aquacultural and fishing practices that are successfully demonstrated in the project will be more widely replicated not just in TTH and Thai Binh provinces, but in other areas where new WCAs are subsequently established. Thus, the GEF alternative has the potential to generate immeasurable socioeconomic benefits as well as global environmental benefits.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project has taken the most cost-effective approach in its design by choosing to focus on removing system-level barriers to wetlands PA establishment at both national and provincial levels. This includes addressing current gaps in: the policy, regulatory and planning framework; institutional and individual capacity at national and subnational levels, including technical and non-technical skills and knowledge; and mechanisms for improved inter and intra-sectoral information sharing, coordination and cooperation to advance the wetlands conservation agenda more widely. The project's approach of establishing a new PA subsystem of wetlands in Viet Nam combined with developing capacity to address existing and emerging threats from the wider landscape is considered more effective, particularly cost-wise, and more sustainable than the other alternatives considered, which included:

- 1) Primarily focusing on mainstreaming wetland values into local development. As discussed earlier in the PIF, PA establishment is considered more effective for wetland conservation as it affords stronger legal protection against encroachment and/or conversion of wetlands as well as enforcement of environmental regulations and safeguards. The mainstreaming only option was discarded because it needs more intensive conservation management to sustain wetland values, which can be more costly. However, the project realizes that it is vital to address threats at source outside the PA boundary—hence the project takes a combined approach linking management of the target sites and the wider landscape. Without addressing threats at the landscape level, biodiversity at the WCA sites would continue to be degraded or lost.
- 2) Primarily focusing on strengthening existing PAs (mostly SUFs) that already contain wetlands. Whilst this is an important issue to be addressed, this approach would not address concerns about existing gaps in the conservation of important wetlands in Viet Nam or the need to manage wetlands in different ways from existing terrestrial SUFs amongst other things because of the nature and high level of competing demands on wetlands resources and their particular sensitivity to ecological changes in the wider landscape. Furthermore, an approach that focused on overall PA strengthening, which is already being supported through another on-going UNDP-GEF project would have constituted duplication of effort.

The proposed choice of developing a subsystem of wetlands PAs combined with some mainstreaming activities to address threats arising at the landscape level is likely to be more sustainable than the alternative options considered for several reasons. First, the total GEF investment of \$3,180,287 for this project will leverage a minimum of \$14.80 million in cofinancing giving a cost-effective ratio of 1: >4.2. While figures are not yet available for the value of ecosystem services in the areas targeted by this project, many valuation studies have shown the high value of the ecosystem services generated by wetlands. Thus, the degradation and loss of wetlands and their associated biodiversity and ecosystem services is likely to be very costly and their restoration more complex and costly than protecting these ecosystems in the first place would have been. Where extinctions occur, then the changes are likely to be irreversible

as even where captive bred populations exist, it is generally difficult and extremely costly to reintroduce them. Additionally, it is increasingly well-accepted that protection of wetlands is an important first line of defence against the potential adverse impacts of climate change as well as increasing people's adaptive capacity generally given the critical role of water to human survival and agricultural production.

Research on the economic benefits of coral reefs, mangroves and major river deltas have all consistently shown that these have tremendous economic value and that their benefits are often shared by very large numbers of relatively poor people in terms of their immediate well-being and as a major source of livelihood than alternative uses. For example, the Lower Mekong Basin (LMB) is globally renowned for its rich biodiversity and its vast inland and marine fishery resources, which together represent around 2% of the total global capture fisheries yield. The bulk of production, however, is from the inland freshwater fishery, which has an estimated value of over US\$2 billion per year. These fisheries are central to the lives of local people, especially the rural poor, of Cambodia, Laos PDR, Thailand and Viet Nam as roughly two thirds of the LMB's 60 million people engage in some form of fisheries-related activity. Fish are the primary source of animal protein and an important source of micronutrients for local people. Estimated annual per capita consumption of fishery products is around 34 kg and there are no readily available substitutes for the nutritional benefits obtained from fish for poor rural people in the region. In Vietnam, the Mekong Delta is home to over 17 million people and the most densely populated part of the country. The area is also crucial to the country's food security: half of Viet Nam's rice and an even larger proportion of its fisheries and fruit products are produced in the Mekong Delta. Agricultural development in the delta has contributed greatly to poverty reduction in the area, although an estimated 4 million people still live in poverty. The Red River Delta too is very important for its fisheries and agricultural production potential as well as its biodiversity. For example, the total value of mussel exploitation in Xuan Thuy National Park, a small area within the Red River Delta region, was estimated to be between US\$7-10 million in 2004, contributing significantly to local community income.¹⁰ Additionally, Results of studies by Le Van Khoi et al. (1999)¹¹ have shown the benefits of mangroves as a net carbon sink: for example, an area of 20,000 ha of mangrove plantations in Can Gio absorbed 10,164,440 tons of CO₂ and produced 6,776,296 tons of O₂.

The investment by GEF to overcome systemic barriers to effective wetlands conservation in Viet Nam through an approach that combines capacity development with strengthening the enabling environment and mainstreaming wetlands conservation strategies into wider development and landuse planning and management is undoubtedly a cost-effective use of resources compared to alternative approaches that focus exclusively on strengthening the PA system or exclusively on mainstreaming. This is especially true, given the high-level of threat to Indo-Burma's biodiversity, including its wetlands, and the costs of ecosystem degradation and loss.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

Table M & E Workplan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: \$10,000	Within first three months of project start up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Team ▪ UNDP CO 		Within 2 weeks of IW
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project

¹⁰ Nguyen Huu Ninh, Mai Trong Nhuan, et al. 2003. *Economic valuation of demonstration wetland sites in Vietnam*. UNEP/GEF

¹¹ Le Van Khoi, 1999. Study on development of the urban green of Ho Chi Minh city till the year 2010. City level project (in Vietnamese).

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
	relevant team members.		
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by Project Manager ▪ Project team with inputs from experts 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Indicative cost: 10,000.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP-GEF 	None	Annually
Quarterly progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
Combined Delivery Reports (CDRs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager 	None	Quarterly
Issues Log	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO 	None	Quarterly
Risks Log	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO 	None	Quarterly
Lessons Learned Log	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP-GEF RCU 	None	Annual
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP-GEF RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: US\$ 30,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team, ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP-GEF RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : US \$30,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Lessons learned report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ MONRE (BCA/ISPONRE) ▪ WCA Management Boards & PPCs ▪ UNDP-GEF RCU 	Indicative cost US\$ 10,000	
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Project manager and team 	Indicative cost per year: 3,000 (Total US\$ 12,000)	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST			
Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 102,000	

Project Start:

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

1. Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
2. Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
3. Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
4. Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
5. Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.

Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).

Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.

Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc... The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR

- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through Site Visits:

UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term of Project Cycle:

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Review at the mid-point of project implementation (insert date). The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle as well as the co-financing accounted for.

End of Project:

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and Knowledge Sharing:

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communication and Visibility Requirements

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the UNDP logo. These can be accessed at <http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/reaching-the-outside-world/outside-world-core-concepts-visual.shtml>. Full compliance is also required with the GEF Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the GEF logo. These can be accessed at http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP and GEF logos should be the same size. When both logs appear on a publication, the UNDP logo should be on the left top corner and the GEF logo on the right top corner. Further details are available from the UNDP-GEF team based in the region.

Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines").¹² Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

Audit Clause

The Government will provide the Resident Representative with certified periodic financial statements, and with an annual audit of the financial statements relating to the status of UNDP (including GEF) funds according to the established procedures set out in the Programming and Finance manuals. The Audit will be conducted according to UNDP financial regulations, rules and audit policies by the legally recognized auditor of the Government, or by a commercial auditor engaged by the Government.


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Dr. Nguyen Van Tai	GEF Operational Focal Point Director General, ISPONRE	Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment	11/30/2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP/GEF Officer- in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		November 20, 2013	Johan Robinson, Regional Technical Advisor for Biodiversity, UNDP	+662 3049100 Ext 5102	johan.robinson @undp.org

¹² The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:					
Outcome 1: Government economic policies support growth that is more equitable, inclusive and sustainable. Specifically, Outcome 1.4: By 2016, key national and sub-national agencies, in partnership with the private sector and communities, implement and monitor laws, policies and programmes for more efficient use of natural resources and environmental management, and to implement commitments under international conventions.					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators:					
Indicator 1: Proportion of land area covered by forest					
Baseline (2010): 39.1% Target (2016): 45%					
MoV: MARD/ GSO data (MDG indicator)					
Indicator 2: Proportion of terrestrial and marine protected areas protected					
Baseline (2010): 126 terrestrial/forest protected areas covering 2.2 million ha; 16 marine protected areas covering 169,617 ha; 3 RAMSAR sites, no wetland protected areas.					
Target (2016): Maintaining 2.2 million ha of terrestrial/forest protected areas; and at least 2 wetland protected areas covering 500,000 ha established and operational					
MoV: MARD and MONRE reports.					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area : 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: BD1: Improve Sustainability of PA Systems, ; BD2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas; 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management; 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: 1. Two new protected areas and coverage at least 35,000 ha of unprotected ecosystems; 2. Two business plans for newly-established WCAs; 3. At least 310,000 ha of multiple-use landscape around the two WCAs effectively managed to reduce threats to local wetlands					
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Project Objective ¹³ To establish new wetland protected areas and to create capacities for their effective management to mitigate existing and emerging	Coverage of natural wetlands within the Wetlands Conservation Area-subsystem	Flooded grasslands and savannas - 0 ha Mangrove – 0 ha Estuaries – 0 ha	Flooded grasslands and savannas – 14,474 ha ha Mangrove – 3,024 ha ha Estuaries – 17,816 ha	PPC decisions to establish Tam-Giang Cau Hai WCA & Thai Thuy WCA	
	Ecosystem Health Index (EHI) ¹⁴ monitoring systems for monitoring wetland health developed and in place for WCA sub-system with a focus to reduce	Currently no use	Development of EHI and adoption at the sub-system WCA level	EHI Scorecards	Assumptions: National & provincial governments (PPCs) remain committed to investing in wetlands management, sustainable

¹³ Objective (Atlas Output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

¹⁴ A draft outline of the EHI scorecard has been developed during the PPG (see Annex 4). The scorecard will be completed at the time of the establishment of the WCAs and targets for end of project developed.

threats from connected landscapes	threats				use & conservation and give their full support to the establishment and operation of the two WCAs.
	Hectares of landscape where impacts on wetland biodiversity are avoided, mitigated or offset	No planning provisions for the protection of wetland biodiversity outside formal PAs	At least 310,300 hectares covered by provincial development plans/provincial sector development plans where standards and guidelines supporting wetland values integrate effectively preventing impact on wetland biodiversity	Provincial Development Plans Provincial Sector Development Plans RRDBR Management Framework	Stakeholder institutions engage constructively in capacity development initiatives. Government & PPCs are committed to working across sectors & different groups of key actors to address landscape-level threats to Tam Giang Cau Hai and Thai Thay. Risks: Mainstreaming wetland biodiversity conservation into landscape-level development plans and other existing frameworks hindered by competing priorities/lack of adequate incentives. The effects of climate change degrade conservation value of wetlands and the new WCAs.
Outcome 1¹⁵: New wetland PAs and relevant systemic capacities for their effective management established	Outputs: 1.5 New and updated national policy, regulatory and planning frameworks for wetland conservation 1.6 Strengthened national capacity for administration of wetland conservation areas (WCAs) 1.7 Two new wetland conservation areas (WCAs) established and operational 1.8 Strengthened provincial capacity for wetlands conservation and management and sustainable use				
	Changes to major wetlands-related policies, laws & plans	A number of wetlands inventories and classification systems	A revised wetlands inventory and database using a unified classification system	Project monitoring reports New Government	Assumptions: MONRE continues to see value in bringing about these changes.

¹⁵ All outcomes (Atlas Activity) monitored annually in the APR/PIR

		<p>exist, which need to be consolidated, rationalised and updated.</p> <p>Decree 109 on the Conservation & Sustainable Development of Wetlands (2003) needs better alignment with Biodiversity Law (2008)</p> <p>The first Wetlands Action Plan period has come to an end in 2010.</p>	<p>A new decree (& associated legal guidance) to replace Decree 109 that supports an ecosystem-based approach to wetlands management & emphasises importance of wetlands-related ecosystem services</p> <p>A 5-year Wetlands Action Plan towards 2020.</p>	<p>Decree & associated guidance</p> <p>The new Action Plan</p>	<p>Targeted national and subnational institutions engage constructively in capacity development initiatives, see value in strengthening intersectoral cooperation and coordination including information sharing on wetlands and engage actively in the NWWG & LWWGs</p> <p>Both national & provincial governments remain committed to establishing the two WCAs & engage proactively to make them fully operational. They also commit necessary financial resources to cover operational costs.</p> <p>Risks: NWWG and LWWGs are not effective due to insufficient interest and participation of key members and are thus unable to take wetlands agenda forward. Government institutions are unable to agree on their respective roles & responsibilities with regard to WCA establishment & management</p>
	Capacity of MONRE to implement wetlands-related policies, legislation, strategies and programmes as measured by the Capacity Development Scorecard	21%	> 45%	Project reports & UNDP Capacity Scorecard applied at Mid-Term and Final Evaluation	
	Extent (ha) of the two areas formally proclaimed and managed as the Tam-Giang Cau Hai WCA and Thai Thay WCA	0 ha	21, 620 ha as the TGCH WCA 13,696 as the TT WCA	PPC decision to establish Tam-Giang Cau Hai WCA and Thai Thuy WCA Project & WCA reports	
	Income from various sources for the management of the WCA PA Subsystem	\$ 0	Income from various sources covers at least the recurrent costs of TGCH WCA and TT WCA as defined by the business plans developed for each	DONRE Financial Reports	
	METT scores in each of TGCH WCA and TT WCA	TGCH WCA: 0% TT WCA: 0%	TGCH WCA: > 40% TT WCA: > 40%	METT applied at Mid-Term and Final Evaluation	
Outcome 2: Integrity of wetland PAs are secured within the wider	Outputs: 2.1 Increased understanding and knowledge about wetlands values, sustainable use and management across the wider landscape 2.2 Wetlands conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed into key provincial plans 2.3 Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods.				

wetland connected landscapes	Biodiversity conservation strengthened through monetary and non-monetary valuation of ecosystem services	No comprehensive (evidence-based) valuation of the ecosystem services exists	EIAs of any major development activity in Thua Thien-Hue and Thai Binh Provinces include sections referring to impacts on environmental services as a result of widely communicated assessment of the value of Tam Giang-Cau Hai and Thai Thuy wetlands' ecosystem services	Economic valuation report and communications documents EIAs	<p>Assumptions: A better understanding of the benefits and values of wetlands ecosystem services & the consequences of their degradation and loss provides sufficient incentive to promote change in policy and practice to favour wetlands conservation and sustainable use.</p> <p>Sectors see value in collaborating to further the conservation & sustainable development of wetlands agenda at a wider landscape level and have the capacity and time to do so.</p> <p>Environmentally friendly agricultural, aquacultural and fishing practices generate as much or more benefits to local communities as existing unsustainable practices</p> <p>Locally communities perceive adequate value in adopting new environmentally friendly economic practices and are willing to invest time and effort in learning new methods & applying them.</p> <p>Risks: Mainstreaming WCAs & wetlands biodiversity values into sector policies is hindered by lack of incentives for other sectors to apply this in practice & weak enforcement of to ensure that agreed priorities and plans for wetlands conservation are implemented especially where greater short-term benefits</p>
	Threats reduced by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and the PA system within the sectoral and development planning frameworks, indicated by effective intersectoral coordination and plans incorporating BD conservation measures.	<p>No provincial inter-sectoral coordination mechanism for BD conservation and PAs at Landscape Level</p> <p>Provincial sectoral plans do not include adequate measures for BD conservation</p> <p>District Development Plans do not currently include any reference to wetlands values of TGCH or TT</p>	<p>Two Local Wetlands Working Groups with good representation from key stakeholders and experts established and supporting WCA Management Boards & PPCs more generally in TTH Province and TB Province to strengthen application of key standards & regulations that support wetlands conservation and sustainable use</p> <p>Four Provincial Sector Plans (Thai Binh Province: Agriculture and Aquaculture sectors; Thua Thien Hue Province: Agriculture and Fishing sectors) incorporate wetland biodiversity friendly standards for application in relation to activities under that sector</p> <p>6 District Development Plans zone the different land use types within the WCAs and remaining areas within district boundaries. Zoning includes prescriptions for strict protection areas among others seagrass beds, mangrove and</p>	<p>Minutes of the LWWGs Project Reports</p> <p>The targeted sector plans (4 in total) & project reports Project monitoring records</p> <p>Revised District Plans</p>	

			mudflat protection zones.		may be generated through alternative uses
	Level of water pollution levels around O Lau in TGCH & Thuy Trong in TT as a result of improved agricultural & aquacultural practices	Baselines to be established in Year 1 ¹⁶	Reduction in pollution level against the baseline levels. Targets to be agreed in Year 1	Project reports Community-based water monitoring records	The benefits of competing landuses are perceived by planners and decision-makers to outweigh their costs in terms of wetlands degradation and loss
	Extent of coverage of clam culture on the intertidal mudflats in Thai Thuy WCA	Baseline to be established in Year 1	No increase in clam culture on the intertidal mudflat	Project reports Habitat mapping exercises	adopted ecological standards are effectively applied by concerned sectors Unforeseen larger
	Catch per Effort of <i>Siganus</i> in TGCH WCA as a result of further establishment of aquatic reserves and Fishery Associations, ensuring us of appropriate gear and enforcing existing regulations on destructive gear and fishing practices	Baseline to be established in Year 1	Increase in Catch per Effort of <i>Siganus</i> against the baseline	Project reports Community-based fishing monitoring records	developments outside the control of project & WCA Management Board cause major wetlands degradation and loss at site-level or within wider landscape with knock-on effects on the new WCAs (eg a major oil spill at sea) The WCA Management Board and key PPC, DPC and CPC officials engage actively with local communities to increase their involvement in wetlands conservation planning and management.

¹⁶ To enhance replication potential and sustainability of the WCA model, the project will work closely with local stakeholders, particularly rice farmers, fishers and aquaculturalists, to develop a simple community-based monitoring system for key parameters such as water quality, area and impacts of clam farming, and change in abundance of selected wild aquatic species such as *Siganus guttatus*. The project intends to establish baselines for these parameters after first working with target communities for up to six months in order to familiarize them with the project objectives and approach and build greater local ownership of these. For example, the siting of new aquatic reserves and establishment of Fishery Associations will need to be identified and agreed through a joint process involving all local stakeholders.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
Comments from the GEF Secretariat		
Q.15 Further details requested on the global significance of Pa Khoang lake and global biodiversity benefits expected if the site was retained in the full proposal	As noted earlier, Pa Khoang lake has been replaced with Thai Thuy, a larger natural wetland area in Thai Thuy District of Thai Binh province. The global significance of Thai Thuy and expected biodiversity benefits are explained above in Sections A.4 and A.5.	See Sections 2.4.2 and 2.6
Q. 25: "Co-financing has been increased to a ratio of 1:4.1. It is also acknowledged that a large part of the indicated funds are grants. Still, every effort should be made to further increase co-financing now and/or at CEO endorsement stage. For example, the GEF/UNDP project #3603 "Removing Barriers Hindering PA Management Effectiveness", which the proposed PIF will complement, had a higher co-financing rate in GEF-4.	Co-financing has been increased to a ratio of 1:4.2 (see Section C above)	See Section IV
Comments from the GEF Council		
No comments received		
Comments from STAP		
No comments received		

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁷

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$100,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Activity 1	11,000	11,997.98	0.00
Activity 2	10,000	7,200.00	2,800.00
Activity 3	5,000	3,000.00	2,000.00
Activity 4	15,000	11,199.23	1,596.62
Activity 5	13,000	10,735.48	2,264.52
Activity 6	14,000	9,947.16	4,052.84
Activity 7	3,000	1,686.97	1,313.03
Activity 8	2,000	1,000.00	1,000.00
Activity 9	15,000	13,165.11	1,834.89
Activity 10	12,000	13,206.17	0.00
Total	100,000	83,138.10	16,861.90

*Note: Project Preparation covers the following activities as per the PPG request: (1) Baseline studies, (2) Assessment of Institutional Capacity to support co-management and implementation of project activities, (3) Project strategy and budget.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

¹⁷ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the EF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.