

Promote Wildlife Conservation and Responsible Nature Based Tourism for Sustainable Development in Vietnam

Basic Information

GEF ID

10787

Countries

Viet Nam

Project Title

Promote Wildlife Conservation and Responsible Nature Based Tourism for Sustainable Development in Vietnam

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6377

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

1.) Please better integrate and describe how the MPES activities (namely Outputs 1.6 and 2.6) fit into the project approach and contribute

to the project objective "to promote BD conservation and sustainable livelihoods through nature-based tourism." Some potential linkages could be hypothesized (developing the tourism industry as 'payers' in a MPES arrangement etc) but these linkages are not well described in the concept and those Outputs seem to be add-ons rather than clearly aligned with the project objective and outcomes. Please revise.

2.) What is the difference between capacity building activities in project component 2 (2.4) & 3 (3.4, 3.5)? Please clarify in PIF.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

1) Table B of the PIF did not adequately capture the link between tourism and the PMES mechanism. This has now been corrected in the revised PIF as follows:

Output 1.6 in Table B explicitly mentions that tourism revenues will be channeled into the PMES mechanism. (The more detailed description of Output 1.6 further on in the PIF has also been edited to clarify this.)

Output 2.6 in Table B makes the same clarification and also explains that in Phong Nha-Ke Bang, which is a fully terrestrial protected area, the existing PFES mechanism that channels revenues from tourism will be better targeted for improved ecosystem quality improvements. (The more detailed description of output 2.6 further on in the PIF has been edited to make explicit that tourism enterprises will be mobilized as 'payers' into the system.)

2) Difference between capacity building outputs: The noted overlap between the capacity building outputs (2.4, 3.3, 3.4) has been reviewed and addressed. Output 2.4 now focuses on capacity building of PA staff for improving conservation and management of PAs and effective monitoring, surveillance and prevention of illegal wildlife activities. Output 3.3 focuses on behavior change among communities to deter involvement in poaching and trafficking of wildlife, and increase awareness of the benefits of nature-based tourism, and payment for environmental services. Output 3.4 has been removed as the capacity building aimed at PA staff is covered under Output 2.4. (Due to the removal of old Output 3.4, Output 3.5 is now re-numbered to 3.4.)

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes. The Agency fee is calculated at 9.5% of the total project cost.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes, remaining STAR allocation is sufficient to cover the total project cost.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes, remaining BD STAR allocation is sufficient to cover the total project cost.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes. The proposed PPG is \$170,750 which below the \$200,000 limit for projects up to \$10 million.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

that need to be addressed.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

- 1.) Earlier on in the project justification please describe impacts of COVID-19 on the current biodiversity conservation and tourism industry status, to then foreshadow how the project plans to address/integrate these issues in the design and implementation.
- 2.) This section contains a helpful description of the 2030 tourism strategy that includes ecotourism. Please include a more complete picture of the overall tourism model that is planned (aside from the niche NbT/ecotourism)-is it high-volume, low-value, or something else? That will then better position/contextualize how this project's objective contributes to this overall strategy direction (also see comments on tourism vs NbT).

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

- 1) Additional information has been added in the PIF on the impacts of Covid-19 on biodiversity conservation and tourism industry status. Please see highlighted text on page 8.
- 2) More details on the overall tourism model that is planned under 2030 Tourism Strategy have been included on page 7.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

- 1.) Please include a few sentences up-front that describe how this project fits into the landscape of ongoing baseline projects included in the section.
- 2.) Table 4 from coordination section (first and second column) may fit better here?

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

- 1) Please see changes include in the PIF on page 18 to clarify how the proposed project looks to build on the baseline projects.
- 2) The projects mentioned in Table 4 under the coordination section are the same as those described in the baseline projects section. A table format was thought more useful to show the coordination potential for each initiative which is why the text in the baseline section is in narrative form, while that in the coordination section is in table format with the third column specifically highlighting coordination.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

- 1.) For figure 1: Please delete redundant texts and arrange in more readable and intuitive manner.
- 2.) Theory Of Change:
 - a.) Figure 2 is illegible in Portal, please submit as uploaded document.
 - b.) The section of text on TOC seems like a rehash (without the formatting) of the TOC diagram in Figure 2. Please revise/remove this text to contain a clear logic narrative statement describing the theory of change. All the detail of each of the outcomes and actions is not needed-that comes later and is already contained in the Section 3 of the PIF: Alternative scenario. ToC should provide logical flow how project activities would contribute to long-term systemic change of tourism sector and nature-dependent communities' livelihoods. As it is in PIF stage, suggest really focusing on key components and relationships between those key features to clearly emphasize in logical flow and then take a more comprehensive treatment during PPG. Also, please reference the STAP Theory Of Change Primer for more info on how to write a brief TOC narrative ([Theory of Change Primer_web.pdf \(stapgef.org\)](#))
 - c.) The first barrier described in this TOC section regarding policy harmonization: Isn't the project working to harmonize tourism with biodiversity conservation, rather than the other way around? This may seem like a subtle difference, but it is an important one.
- 3.) There are several places in the concept (including pg 19 of the PIF: "help use nature-based tourism to secure long-term revenue for PA management" as well as Output 1.5 that specifies the impact assessment tools would be for NbT) that seem to imply that only NbT (eco-tourism ventures/segment of the industry) would be termed as a source of conservation or broader environmental stewardship.

NbT/ecotourism ventures/segment of the industry would be tapped as a source of conservation or broader environmental stewardship finance (for PAs or beyond) . Is this the case? It would only seem logical that the tourism industry overall (rather than NbT only) would be

looked at as a critical revenue producer to fund critical conservation and environmental activities and institutions (e.g. going beyond just doing no harm). Please review and revise the concept to clarify how and where the project is working to: 1.) Mainstream BD into the broader tourism industry and strategy in Viet Nam; and 2.) Development of NbT segment and link closely to PA management finance etc.

4.) Directly related to point #2 above, Output 1.2 refers to "A standardized national nature-based tourism monitoring, verification and reporting system to monitor compliance will be developed on the basis of adopted standards and load limits." Shouldn't this Output apply to all tourism in Viet Nam that is impacting high biodiversity areas to reduce tourism-related threats? As it is currently worded it seems to refer only to "nature-based tourism". Please revise/clarify this in Output 1.2. and as previously requested, review and revise entire concept to ensure clarity.

5.) Output 3.3 contains "a provincial Centre for Environmental Education" on NbT. Please provide a bit more context/justification for this as it is not clear that it is a priority use of GEF grant funds within the TOC of this project.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

1) Figure 1 on the conceptual diagram: As advised, the conceptual diagram has been modified with the caveat that during the PPG phase this will be more comprehensively analyzed based on STAP guidance and through validation by stakeholders.

2a) Figure 2 Theory of Change diagram: An initial TOC diagram is included with the caveat that a more comprehensive analysis will be undertaken during the PPG based on STAP guidance and through discussion with stakeholders.

2b) Text on Theory of Change: As advised, the PIF has been revised to include a simple narrative of the logical reasoning underpinning the project. A more comprehensive analysis of the theory of change pathways will be developed during the PPG, on the basis of STAP guidance. Please see revised text on pages 20-21.

2c) Phrasing of barrier 1: The recommended change has been made to the phrasing of the barrier to clarify the intent to harmonize tourism with biodiversity conservation, rather than the other way around. Please see revisions on page 10.

3) The project's focus is on tourism in and around high-biodiversity areas (with a focus on two protected areas) and specifically on how to minimize the negative impacts of such tourism development while simultaneously maximizing its positive contribution to nature conservation and quality of life of the local people through nature-based tourism, and also to ensure that this is effectively reflected in the national tourism strategy and master plan. The aim is to tap into the potential for generating environmental stewardship finance from the segment of the tourism sector that relies on open-spaced, natural areas in and around high biodiversity destinations, with their being some overlap between nature-based and cultural tourism segments. For example, the PFES and PMES mechanisms would tap into the nature-based tourism operations to "pay" for these ecosystem services provided by protected areas. Please see corrections requested in Output 1.5, and changes have also been made to Outputs 1.1, 1.2.

4) The focus is primarily on tourism in and around high-biodiversity areas which tends to be based around the enjoyment of nature-based or biodiversity-based experiences and products. The quoted phrase from the description of Output 1.2 has been corrected to clarify this focus

on tourism in high-biodiversity areas.

5) In Viet Nam, Centers of Environmental Education are public-oriented business units legally established by provincial authorities (Provincial Peoples Committee) and operated under the guidance and management of the respective PA Management Boards. With the rationalization of the capacity building outputs (2.4, 3.3, 3.4), the PIF has been revised to clarify that capacity strengthening of these existing entities will be part of Output 2.4.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes. Though Table 1 is missing several hectareage figures related to indicator 4-see previous comment.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

Table 1: Summary of the incremental/additional cost reasoning for the project activities.

Table 1 has now been revised to include estimates of the area in hectares outside protected areas where the project's work to mainstream biodiversity conservation into tourism activities will have an impact.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comment cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

Given the scope of the project, including MPES policy and pilot work, please set a target for Indicator 4 if possible. Currently the project cost and hectare targets result in a fairly low project ROI based on those metrics.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

The GEF-7 core indicator worksheet has been revised to include initial estimates for indicator 4.1 to capture the area in hectares outside protected areas where the project's work to mainstream biodiversity conservation into tourism activities will have an impact. Concomitant changes have been made to Table B, Table F, and Table 1.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:
Yes.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

Maps are only attached to the word version. Please upload it to the portal PIF too.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

A separate word document (with maps only) and .rar files have been uploaded to the portal separately.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

- 1.) There are clear barriers for the engagement and participation of women stated in the PIF. During PPG and in the gender analysis, please include a treatment of how this project will work to remove these very real barriers. Providing opportunities for women to participate won't necessarily result in increased gender equity and women's empowerment, if they don't have the means to engage.
- 2.) While the list of potential key stakeholders, including some general references to women, the list could be better elaborated on (and possible include the Viet Nam Women's Union (VWU) the quasi-governmental body functioning at the national, provincial, district and communal level and is entitled to propose and submit bills, promote laws and policies that protect rights and promote women's interests). As applicable, please update stakeholders to include gender.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

- 1) Engagement of women: Text has been included in section "3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment" to make explicit the need to identify specific means for real engagement of women in specific opportunities provided to them by the project.
- 2) The stakeholder table has been updated to include VWU, and provincial, district and communal women's unions.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:

- a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).
- b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.
- c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).
- d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.
(<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>)

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

Climate screening: An initial assessment of climate and disaster risks has been provided, for Viet Nam and for the two target provinces, based on available information. Please see section "5. Risks".

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?

is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

April 1, 2021 HF:

- 1.) The PIF describes the MOCST as a "Responsible Partner". Please describe this role and the cooperation/engagement of the MOCST in the execution and planning for this project given the central role tourism plays in the project scope.
- 2.) Please address how the project will effectively coordinate two site-level investments, make sure they learn from each other and provide streamlined results as one project (could also be addressed in KM).

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

- 1) Role of MOCST: Clarification on the role of MOCST is now provided in section "6. Coordination".
- 2) Coordination between two sites: The detailed project management arrangements to be developed during the PPG will ensure that appropriate reporting lines are included such that project activities can be well-coordinated across the two sites/provinces. This clarification has been made in section "6. Coordination" of the PIF. In addition, clarification has been made in the description of Output 4.2 regarding exchange of knowledge and best practices between the two sites.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 2, 2021 HF:
Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

April 2, 2021 HF:

1.) Given the direct relevance of the scope of this PIF with GWP, engagement with the GWP Global Coordination Project seems like a logical part of the KM approach. Is engagement with GWP intended? During PPG please plan and budget for this engagement.

2.) Please revise the KM section to include:

- Overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept
- Plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations
- Indication of the processes to capture, access, and document information, lessons learned, best practice & expertise generated during implementation
- Tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites
- Knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders
- A discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project/program impact and sustainability
- Plans for strategic communications

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 19 April 2021

1) Engagement with GWP Global Coordination Project: Clarifications have been included in the PIF on engagement in knowledge management activities of the GWP. Please see revised section "8. Knowledge Management".

2) Please see revisions to section "8. Knowledge Management" that now follows the suggested sub-topics.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 2, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 2, 2021 HF:

Yes. Current LOE attached.

Agency Response

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:

Yes. PM recommends technical clearance of this PIF.

April 1, 2021 HF:

No, not yet. Please address comments/questions in review sheet.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

See points for inclusion in PPG in review sheet above.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/2/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

