

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility (Version 5)



## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: 26 February 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

### I. PIF Information

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:**

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** 3965

**COUNTRY(IES):** Viet Nam

**PROJECT TITLE:** Removing barriers hindering PA management effectiveness in Vietnam

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:**

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Biodiversity,

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** BD SO1/SP1

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:**

**Full size project      GEF Trust Fund**

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes this proposal on "Removing barriers hindering protected area management effectiveness in Vietnam. As UNDP develops the proposal, STAP encourages UNDP to specify further the activities in the pilot demonstration sites, particularly how strengthening protected area management will be tracked, and monitored.  
STAP encourages UNDP to specify how the PA manager incentive problem will be addressed in this project (p.5 "PA management authorities are not empowered nor have incentives to generate resources locally). If PA managers have no incentives to generate resources locally, why would knowledge and capacity building change the status quo? Even if the revenues generated are permitted to be used for PA management, would such revenue flows be sufficient incentive if wages remain the same? Information management systems by themselves cannot, as indicated in the proposal (p.6), "allow for better monitoring of conservation impacts per unit of investment so that future investments are more cost-effective." STAP encourages UNDP to consider the use of control sites to assist in evaluating the impact of investment at the demonstration sites (STAP would be willing to advise on this issue).

STAP also suggests that UNDP considers an assessment to estimate the costs of managing the protected area system, so that the proposed financial schemes are identified based on this scenario

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
<b>3. Major revision</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in

<b>required</b>	the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
-----------------	---