



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4760		
Country/Region:	Vietnam		
Project Title:	Conservation of Critical Wetland PAs and Linked Landscapes		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4537 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,180,287
Co-financing:	\$14,891,600	Total Project Cost:	\$18,171,887
PIF Approval:	January 24, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Sameer Karki

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. Letter dated Nov 30, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. UNDP is long-standing government partner in Vietnam in BD conservation and PA management.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. Will be supported by UNDP country and regional office. Clear link with UNDAF.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

Resource Availability			
	• the STAR allocation?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. (BD \$3.5 million).	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	n/a
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Not fully. Some components of the project focus on the enabling framework, which would maybe fit better with BD-2. 4 JAN 2012 UA: Addressed.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	12 DEC 2011 UA: BD-1, Please check whether the project relates to BD-2 (see comments above). 4 JAN 2012 UA: Addressed.	BD-1 BD-2
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. Also in line with NPFE.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. Through the established regulations, plans, and protected area management boards	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.

Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. The baseline project is the package of government decrees and regulations concerning PA area management and the related programme and project support.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. Incremental reasoning has been applied.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	12 DEC 2011 UA: No. - the hectare figures provided are not comprehensive, and not consistent with figures in the text - please check. - The text mentions several times community participation and CBNR management agreements, none of which is reflected in the project framework - the project framework as it stands does not balance the need to work on the enabling framework with activities in the new PAs on the ground, that is, it is too much focussed on the enabling framework. - The selection criteria of the two PAs are not explained	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. The project framework has further improved during project preparation.

livelihoods is mentioned but not further elaborated on in the text. For GEF to invest in alternative livelihoods a thorough and robust economic analysis would have to be provided. As the biodiversity literature is full of failed examples of investments in alternative livelihoods, a detailed description of what is planned here would be required.

- The components as they stand do not allow for a clear picture of what would be the investment into the enabling framework and what into the management of PAs on the ground. Please clarify.
- The framework also does not explain the linkage of the PA establishment with the wider landscape objectives under component 2. How will the landscapes be effectively managed. And is overfishing a threat in the Pa Khoang area?

4 JAN 2012 UA:

Most questions have been adequately addressed. Further clarification and information is requested on the following items:

a1) Regarding the selection of the two demonstration sites, a Prime Minister Decision is mentioned. Are these priorities mentioned in other documents, i.e. what is the priority for these sites under the NBSAP?

a2) Apart from the species list, please elaborate on the expected Global Biodiversity Benefits that investment into these sites would bring.

b) On the alternative livelihoods, the explanation of alternatives that will be

		<p>Further, only one experience from Cambodia is referred to. Are there any good practice examples from Vietnam on viable alternative livelihood schemes based on economic analysis?</p> <p>20 JAN 2012 UA: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>12 DEC 2011 UA: Not fully. While the description of the global importance of the Tan Giau-Cau Hai lagoon for biodiversity is comprehensive; the description for the Pa Khoang Lake area raises serious questions whether this is an globally important wetland and if the set of species does really exist anywhere near this lake (man made reservoir?). Is the lake located in a SUF area and what are the main threats there?</p> <p>4 JAN 2012 UA: In line with Question #14(a2), especially on the Pa Khoang site, please provide more information on the expected Global Biodiversity Benefits already at PIF stage.</p> <p>20 JAN 2012 UA: The question has been addressed. Further details are expected at CEO endorsement stage should the Pa Khoang site indeed be selected.</p>	<p>26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. During Project preparation, Pa Khoang site has been substituted with a wetlands area covering 13,696 ha, in Thai Thuy District in Thai Binh Province in northern Viet Nam. The new pilot site has globally significant BD value.</p>
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/</p>	<p>12 DEC 2011 UA: Not fully. As mentioned under #14 - as the socio-economic benefits partly rely on the "sustainable alternative livelihoods supported". please elaborate more on</p>	<p>26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.</p>

		<p>4 JAN 2012 UA: Has been addressed. Further details are expected at CEO endorsement stage.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>12 DEC 2011 UA: Not sufficiently. Please elaborate in the respective sections. In particular the participation of local people in the project is not sufficiently described.</p> <p>Furthermore, please outline cooperation with NGOs, which are listed as co-financers.</p> <p>4 JAN 2012 UA: This is still not sufficient. Please elaborate on the statements: "The project will build on good work being promoted at the two sites by NGOs." and "The project will also build on good work being done in Vietnam by local and international NGOs". A few more details would be very helpful to substantiate these statements. Especially as NGOs are listed as co-financers of this projects.</p> <p>20 JAN 2012 UA: Has been adequately addressed.</p>	<p>26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Among others, involvement of several international and national NGOs and local community organizations.</p>
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes.</p>	<p>26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. Main co-ordination will be done and synergy achieved with ongoing GEF-UNDP project.</p>	<p>26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/</p>	<p>12 DEC 2011 UA:</p>	<p>26 Nov 2013 UA:</p>

		<p>- It is not clear why Quang Ninh Province is mentioned as a lead agency to implement the component 2?</p> <p>- Please refer to earlier questions about community based resource management arrangements, which are not clear in this context.</p> <p>4 JAN 2012 UA: Addressed.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>12 DEC 2011 UA: This is difficult to assess without more information on how much is going towards enabling frameworks and how much towards PA establishment and management. The impression right now is that this is not very well balanced and that the enabling framework and capacity building part is over-funded.</p> <p>4 JAN 2012 UA: Has been addressed.</p>	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>12 DEC 2011 UA: - Which NGOs are indicative co-financers? - Please explore ways to leverage higher</p>	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. All co-financing commitment letters provided in separate Annex to the prodoc.

		<p>amount of GEF funding and focus the project on the essential key issues in the enabling framework and only select the lagoon as a new PA area for wetland protection.</p> <p>4 JAN 2012 UA: Has been addressed. 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.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	12 DEC 2011 UA: Yes. UNDP provides \$1 million in grant.	26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		No. Comments from STAP have not been responded to because the agency claims not having received them. All FSPs are screened by STAP. The PM will forward the STAP screen separately for the agencies information and perusal in project implementation. As the STAP screen result was a "Consent" I will accept the lack of

	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• Council comments?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	12 DEC 2011 UA: No. Please address clarification requests in this review. 4 JAN 2012 UA: No. Please provide further information as requested above. 20 JAN 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends PIF for CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		26 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. PM recommends the project for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 12, 2011	November 26, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 04, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	4 JAN 2012 UA: All proposed activities are eligible, except No. 1 (Capacity Assessment), in light of previous GEF support for such activities. Priority of GEF support should be on the proposed activities 2, 3, and 5 to 10.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	4 JAN 2012 UA: Table C states a different amount of co-financing than in Table E. Please check. 20 JAN 2012 UA: Has been corrected.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	4 JAN 2012 UA: No. Please address comments to PIF and PPG. 20 JAN 2012 UA: Yes. PPG is recommended for CEO approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 04, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 20, 2012

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.