### Revised Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and Summary of the Changes by the MTR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Green = Revised/Proposed change (New at MTR)** | **Yellow = PRF original indicators (Old at Inception Report)** | **Green = Explanations for changes** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):** Strategic Goal C (To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity), and Target 12 (By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has improved and sustained). | | | | | |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Program Document:** Outcome 1.1 Improved resilience, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environmental management, climate change adaptation/mitigation and disaster risk management | | | | | |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:**  Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.  Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation. | | | | | |
|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline**[[1]](#footnote-1) | **Mid-term Target**[[2]](#footnote-2) | **End of Project Target** | **Assumptions**[[3]](#footnote-3) |
| **Project Objective:**  To effectively mainstream biodiversity conservation and natural resources management objectives into governance, planning and management of socio-economic development and tourism in Biosphere Reserves | **Mandatory Indicator 1.3.1**[[4]](#footnote-4)**:** Area of sustainable management solutions at sub-national level for conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services that benefit from integrated landscape and seascape planning and management approaches | Approximately 0.367 million hectares (managed effectively)[[5]](#footnote-5) | At least 0.425 million[[6]](#footnote-6)hectares effectively managed through participatory approaches | At least 1.22 million hectares[[7]](#footnote-7)of BRs managed through participatory approaches that integrates biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resources use into BR planning and management | ***Assumptions:***   * Local communities understand livelihood benefits and ecological security from cooperation with and sustainable management of BR resources. Thus, they will participate in sustainable management and ecosystem restoration work. * The national and provincial governments give priority to support integrated planning of its landscape and seascape areas and implement target-oriented activities with local communities to improve conservation and sustainable use of such resources. * PPCs, DPCs, CPCs and CBOs would work in close collaboration for preparation of integrated BR management frameworks   ***Risks:***   * Natural disaster may affect the restoration work. * Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project. * Livelihood benefits from sustainable management may be low to give up current unsustainable practices * Conflicts over territorial issues between partner institutions at BR level could undermine efforts at promoting integrated planning approaches. |
| **Mandatory Indicator 1.3.2:** Number of households participating in improved and alternative livelihoods and sustainable resource management and best practice approaches | 0 (Baseline of households participating in improved and alternative livelihoods and sustainable resource management will be established through the commune/village microplanning process) | Old: At least 500 households are directly benefiting from sustainable natural resources management and improved and alternative livelihoods and incomes. At least 40% of the beneficiaries are women)  New[[8]](#footnote-8): (i) 500 households directly benefiting from sustainable natural resources management, improved alternative livelihoods and incomes.  (ii) 40% woman beneficiaries. | Old: At least 2,500 households directly benefit through sustainable natural resource management and livelihood improvement approaches and increase of 20% in average incomes. At least 40%) of the beneficiaries are women)  New: (i) 2,500 households directly benefiting from sustainable natural resources management, improved alternative livelihoods and incomes.  (ii) 20% increased average incomes.  (iii) 40% woman beneficiaries. |  |
| **Mandatory indicator 2.5.1:** Extent to which Institutional frameworks are in place for integration of conservation, sustainable natural resource use, biodiversity and ecosystems and improved livelihoods into BR planning and management | Multiple use sustainable BR planning and management approaches absent or limited within the country | Progress towards institutionalization of multiple use and sustainable BR planning and management approaches as measured by National MAB Committee formalized, legally mandated and functional as coordination body | Multiple use and sustainable BR planning and management approaches institutionalized in 3 BRs through strengthened national and provincial coordination mechanisms and related institutional agreements[[9]](#footnote-9) |
|  | **Mandatory Indicator 3.1 (NEW INDICATOR):**Number of direct beneficiaries (percentage of which are women) including provincial government staffs to be trained and new people participating in sustainable practices  **(GEF Core Indicator 11)** | 0 | 1,890 direct beneficiaries  756 women beneficiaries  Note: 1,890 (500 hh x 3.7 people/hh) + 40 (40 trained people)  Note: 740 (1,890x40% + 16 (40 trained people) of which at least 40% are women. | 9,350 direct beneficiaries  3.740 women beneficiaries  Note: 9,350 (2500 hh x 3.7 people/hh) + 100 (100 trained people)  Note: 3,700 (9,350 x 40%) + 40 (100 trained people) of which at least 40% are women | ***Assumptions:***   1. On an average 3.7 people per household is used to estimate the number of beneficiaries. The average is based on 2019 Viet Nam Census data.   ***Risks:***   * Sufficient trained and committed personnel unavailable to provide adequate coverage * Community diversity will not be a hindrance to outreach activities |
|  | **Mandatory Indicator 3.2 (NEW INDICATOR):** GHG benefits from improved management effectiveness of the protected areas, restoration, and implementation of sustainable practices in the PA buffer and transition zones.  **(GEF Core Indicator 6)**  ***Note:*** the TE target is estimated total GHG benefit from the project at end of the 20-Year period. Please refer to the EXACT file for more information and breakdown. | 0 | 0 | 17,157,547 tCO2eq. | ***Assumptions:***  1. All assumptions applicable to EXACT applies to the project GHG benefit estimates. |
| **Outcome 1**  Regulatory and institutional framework to avoid, reduce, mitigate and offset adverse impacts on biodiversity and reduced pressures on ecosystems in Biosphere Reserves in place. | **Indicator 4:** Extent to which legal or policy frameworks are in place for integration of socio-economic development and tourism into planning and management of Biosphere Reserves *(UNDP mandatory indicator: IRRF Output 2.5 indicator 2.5.1)* | Specific, targeted Biosphere Reserve planning and management legislation largely lacking | Revised Biodiversity Law/ Law on Environmental Protection adopted by Government for submission to National Assembly and Decrees, Circulars and Guidelines under preparation | Old: Revised legislation under Biodiversity Law/ Law on Environmental Protection[[10]](#footnote-10)and at least three legal instruments (decrees, circulars and guidelines)[[11]](#footnote-11) clarifying BR planning and management submitted to be adopted  New: (i) Revised Law on Environmental Protection;  (ii) Other instruments: 01 DecreeImplementing the Law on Environmental Protection  (iii) Guidelines clarifying BR nomination, planning and management submitted to be adopted[[12]](#footnote-12) | ***Assumption:***   * The national government will develop appropriate legislative, policy, institutional and technical measures that facilitate integrated BR planning and management in a timely manner. * Development strategies and BR management strategies and plans will be officially approved by provincial governments with allocation of appropriate staff and funding for their implementation * PPC will take active part in developing the strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project * Local communities are convinced mainstreaming biodiversity into key development sectors is in their long-term interests   ***Risks:***  Priorities of provincial governments and local communities might shift if development benefits take long to manifest |
| **Indicator 5:** Level of institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring integrated BR management as measured by UNDP’s capacity development scorecard | Limited institutional capacities for planning, implementation and, monitoring of multiple use landscape and seascapes in BRs as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard baseline values at National and Provincial levels as indicated below:   * National level: 39% * Quang Nam: 47% * Dong Nai: 36% * Nghe An: 38% | Increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 10% increase in UNDP National and Provincial Capacity Development Scorecard baseline value | Increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 30% increase in UNDP National and Provincial Capacity Development Scorecard of baseline values |
| **Indicator 6:** Increase ~~percentage~~ of new permitted developments in the identified key sectors that trigger requirement for environmental assessment and integrates relevant national policies and practices that mainstream biodiversity | BIA guidelines are developed, but not legally enforced resulting in unchecked threats and violations and illegal developments.  New: Source: number of development projects required to apply the BIA guidelines will be taken from MONRE | Requirements for BIA application are incorporated in the revised Biodiversity Law/ Law on Environmental Protection (LEP) and guidelines for its implementation to ensure environmentally sound development | Old: After the new LEP and guidelines for its implementation come into effect, at least 50% of new permitted developments in the identified key sectors in BRs that trigger requirement for environmental assessment integrates BIA guidelines  New: After the new LEP and BIA guidelines come into effect, at least 50% of newly-permitted development projects in the identified key sectors in 3 BRs that trigger requirement for environmental assessment integrates BIA guidelines[[13]](#footnote-13) | ***Assumptions:***   * Provincial environmental agencies effectively capacitated to develop, monitor and enforce regulations * National policies are in-place that provide specific direction to management priorities granting environmental agencies sufficient authority to manage environmental consequences of development.   ***Risks:***  Political patronage and interests can complicate the effective application of safeguard policies and practices as well as monitoring compliance with implementation of environmental safeguards. |
| **Indicator 7:** Increased financing for scaled up investment in BR management in Vietnam | Lack of adequate resources and commitment to conservation practice in BRs – 2017 baseline for 3 pilot BRs is USD 405,777 | Strategy and procedures agreed with national and provincial governments for improved financing for BRs | Old: 20% increase in funding over baseline for BR management in Vietnam (all BRs)  New: 20% increase in funding over baseline for BR management in 03 BR covered by the BR project[[14]](#footnote-14) | ***Assumptions:***   * Provincial environmental agencies effectively capacitated to develop, monitor and enforce regulations * National policies are in-place that provide specific direction to management priorities granting environmental agencies sufficient authority to manage environmental consequences of development.   ***Risks:***   * Political patronage and interests can complicate the effective application of safeguard policies and practices as well as monitoring compliance with implementation of environmental safeguards. |
| **Outcome 2**  Integrated multi sector and multi-stakeholder planning and management operational in three Biosphere Reserves that mainstreams protected area management, sustainable resource use and biodiversity-friendly development | **Indicator 8**: Improved management effectiveness of protected areas[[15]](#footnote-15) and biological rich areas within designated BRs  Includes 404,454 ha of core PAs corresponding to two GEF Core Indicator 1.2 and 2.2.  Management Improvement -Terrestrial (GEF Core Indicator 1.2):  393,856 ha  Management Improvement -Marine (GEF Core Indicator 2.2):  10,598 ha  ***Note 1:*** During the Core Indicator Transitions Core Areas for four PAs were updated to align with the establishment decisions as the sources for areas reported during the PPG were not verifiable. The four PAs are:  Pu Mat NP: 94, 715 ha (Data Source: Decision No.2434/QD-UBND of Nghe An PPC dated 3 June2014)  Pu Huong NP: 40,187 ha (Data Source: Decision No.4042/QD-UBND of Nghe An PPC dated12 November 2020)  Pu Hoat NR: 85,880 ha (Data Source: Decision No.590/QD-UBND of Nghe An PPC dated 19 February 2014)  Cu Lao Cham MPA: 10,598 ha (Data Source: Decision No.09/2020/QD-UBND of Quang Nam PPC dated 17 July 2020)  ***Note 2:*** PA areas (only PA core areas) do not align with WDPA areas and require updating in WDPA.  ***Note 3:*** Areas for Cat Tien NP and Dong Nai NR remain same from the PPG. | Baseline METT scores:   * Pu Mat NP: 37 * Pu Huong NR: 25 * Pu Hoat NR: 25 * Cat Tien NP: 38 * Dong Nai NR: 37 * Cu Lao Cham MPA: 41 | Average increase by at least 10 points in METT | Average increase by at least 30 points in METT | ***Assumptions:***   * Additional revenues can be developed to replication and scaling up throughout the country * Local actors understand the importance mainstreaming biodiversity and sustainable natural resource use into socio-economic planning * Buy-in at all levels of society, including timely dissemination and awareness of the benefits of conservation   ***Risks:***   * Adequate resources to replicate integrated approaches may not be identified due to competing government priorities * Sufficient trained and committed personnel unavailable to provide adequate coverage   ***Assumptions:***   * Development strategies and management plans will be officially approved by provincial governments with allocation of appropriate funding for their implementation * The provinces will take active part in developing the strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project * Local communities are convinced that critical habitats in their vicinities will benefit livelihoods and ecological security to them and they will participate in conservation and restoration work. * Local community based institutions would establish an effective institutional mechanism to facilitate conservation outcomes. * Restoration areas would correspond to degraded forests in BR Buffer Zones and Transition Zones, assuming 12.5% by MTR and 100% by TE.   ***Risks:***   * Administrative/political changes may undermine the implementation of the management plan strategies * Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project * Conflicts between national and provincial sectoral entities and local communities regarding management and access to natural resources may undermine integrated planning approaches |
| **Indicator 9:** Number of hectares high conservation value forests or coastal and marine ecosystems, including forests and coastal and marine areas set-aside for non-exhaustive use (includes new protected areas established)  ***Note:*** Includes 60,000 ha (10,000 ha at MTR and 60,000 ha at TE) of set-aside HCVFs, KBAs (proposed 40,000ha in Western Nghe An BR and 20,000ha Dong Nai BR) (GEF Core Indicator 4.1) | High Conservation Value Forests (dispersal corridors, biodiversity rich areas and buffer areas) outside protected area network are not formally recognized and lack appropriate management regimes | Areas for set-aside mapped, agreed with provincial governments and approved and 10,000 ha set-aside for non-exhaustive use (included within the BR buffer zone) | Set-aside areas (high conservation value forests and other ecosystems) for non-exhaustive use of at least 60,000 ha[[16]](#footnote-16) resulting in total avoided |
| **Indicator 10:** Number of hectares of degraded forests areas restored through sustainable community management regimes  **(GEF Core Indicator3.2)** | Over 40% forests in pilot BRs (DN and WNA BRs) under continued degradation through overuse | At least 500 ha of degraded forests (and other ecosystems) under improved restoration through assisted natural regeneration to improve connectivity  ***Note:*** 250 ha for each of Western Nghe An BR and Dong Nai BR (see GEF Core Indicator 4.1) | At least 4,000 ha[[17]](#footnote-17) of degraded forests (and other ecosystems) under improved restoration through assisted natural regeneration to improve connectivity resulting in total sequestrated  ***Note:***2,000 ha for each of Western Nghe An BR and Dong Nai BR (see GEF Core Indicator 4.1) |
| **Indicator 11:** Change in status of key indicator species as:   1. **Cu Lam Cham BR:** *Lobophyllia serratus, Porites ornate and land crab* 2. **Dong Nai BR:** Gaur (*Bos gaurus*), Yellow cheeked gibbon *(Nomascus gabriellae)* and Black Shank Douc (*Pygathrix nigripes*) 3. **Western Nghe An BR:** Barbe’s Langur and White cheeked crested gibbon (*Nomascus leucogenys*) | **Old: Baseline Values**[[18]](#footnote-18)**:**  **CLC BR**[[19]](#footnote-19)**:**  (i) Land crab (*Gecarcoide alalandii*) + 35,000  (ii) Coral reef 39% (live coral cover)  **Dong Nai BR**[[20]](#footnote-20)  (i) Gaur (*Bos gaurus*) + 200[[21]](#footnote-21)  (ii) Black Shank Douc (*Pygathrix nigripes*) + 37[[22]](#footnote-22)  (iii) Yellow-crested Gibbon (*Nomascus gabriellae*)+171[[23]](#footnote-23)  **Western Nghe An BR**[[24]](#footnote-24)**:**  (i) Barbe’s Langur (*Presbytis barbei*) + 40[[25]](#footnote-25)  (ii) White-cheeked crested gibbon (*Nomascus leucogenys*)+ 475[[26]](#footnote-26)  **New: Baseline Values [[27]](#footnote-27)**  ***Cu Lao Cham - Hoi An BR (Monitoring period: May-Jul 2021[[28]](#footnote-28)):***   * Land crab (*Gecarcoidea lalandii*): estimated 27,000 individuals * Coral reef (live coral cover): 53,2% ( ± 16,1%)   ***Dong Nai BR [[29]](#footnote-29)(Monitoring period: May-Jul 2021):***   * Gaur (*Bos gaurus*): 57 individuals (estimated 100 individuals). * Yellow-crested Gibbon (*Nomascus gabriellae*): 80 individuals (estimated 1.024 individuals) * Black Shank Douc (*Pygathrix nigripes*): 142 individuals (estimated 1.474 individuals)   ***Western Nghe An BR [[30]](#footnote-30)(Monitoring period: Q2 2021):***  - Barbe’s Langur (*Presbytis barbei*): 26 individuals (Estimated 58 individuals).  - White-cheeked crested gibbon (*Nomascus leucogenys*): 32 individuals | Baseline validated and monitoring in progress for selected indicator species. Monitoring trends indicate positive changes | Maintained or improved populations of key species in BRs from current baseline values | ***Assumption:***   * Adequate technical capacity available for undertaking monitoring species populations   ***Risk:***   * External factors beyond the control of the project (e.g. climate change) might effect species populations negatively |
| **Indicator 12:**Increase in percentage of hotels and tourism facilities in and around BRs meet biodiversity-friendly certification standards | No standards or certification procedures exists now | Training complete, Certification criteria approved and at least 10% of hotel and tourism facilities within selected BRs adopt biodiversity-friendly certification standards | At least 50% of sampled hotel and tourism facilities (to be identified during the baseline assessment) within selected BRs adopt biodiversity-friendly certification standards | ***Assumptions:***   * Adequate technical capacity available for undertaking monitoring species populations   ***Risks:***   * External factors beyond the control of the project (e.g. climate change) might effect species populations negatively |
|  | **Indicator 13 (NEW INDICATOR):** New area of landscapes (in BR buffer and transition zone) under sustainable management practices  Includes buffer and transition zones in Cu Lao Cham BR, Western Nghe An BR, and Dong Nai BR  Contributes to GEF Core Indicator 4 and GEF Core Indicator 9. Refer to notes below and to GEF-7 Core Indicators Worksheet  ***Note 1***: Core Indicator 4.1  Cu Lao Cham BR (MTR 20,350 ha, TE 21,915 ha); Western Nghe An BR (MTR 608,297 ha, TE 1,129,244 ha) Dong Nai BR (MTR349,745 ha, TE 794,670 ha)  ***Note 2:*** Excludes 60,000 ha (10,000 ha at MTR and 60,000 ha at TE) of set-aside HCVFs, KBAs, and biological (See Indicator 9 for this target)  ***Note 3:*** Deducted 4,000 ha of degraded forests under restoration through assisted natural regeneration to improve connectivity in Dong Nai BR and Western Nghe An BR (at MTR 250 ha each, and at TE 2,000 ha each); accounted under GEF Core Indicator 3.2 (See Indicator 10 for this target) | 0 | 978,392 ha  ***Note:*** 10,000 ha from the total 3 BRs is accounted in PRF indicator 9 (contributing ha for Indicator from 3 BRs is **968,392 ha (978,392-10,000 ha)** | 1,945,829 ha  ***Note:*** 60,000 ha from the total 3 BRs is accounted in PRF indicator 9 (contributing ha for Indicator from 3 BRs is **1,885,829 ha (1,945,829 ha - 60,000 ha)** |  |
| **Outcome 3**  Knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation contributes to equitable gender benefits and increased awareness of biodiversity conservation | **Indicator 14:**Increase in percentage of sampled community members, hoteliers, tour operators and sector agency staff aware of and taking action to address potential conservation threats and their adverse impacts on biodiversity within BRs as measured by KAP survey approach[[31]](#footnote-31) | Coordinated outreach on conservation threats lacking. Limited awareness  of impact unplanned development among general public. Baseline survey established in Year 1 | At least 10% sampled community members, hoteliers, tour operators and sector agency staff (at least 40% women) aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of unplanned developments | At least 50% (of which at least 40% women) of sampled community members, hoteliers, tour operators and sector agency staff aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of unplanned developments | **Assumptions:**   * Stakeholders willing to actively participate in the review process. * Project management will be able to identify, document and disseminate the best practices * Midterm and final evaluations of the project will also contribute to identifying the best practices * Best practices from sustainable resource management readily available to resource users   ***Risks:***   * Government priorities may change from due to political pressure from resource users * Actions among the assorted agencies and NGOs remain uncoordinated * Community diversity will not be a hindrance to outreach activities |
| **Indicator 15:**Number of additional best practices of sustainable land, coastal and marine resource use demonstrated, documented and disseminated and upscaled for replication | Old: Existing best practices include e.g. land crab, fishing set aside, # of boats, entry fees, enrichment planting, etc.  New: 0[[32]](#footnote-32) | At least three new best practices identified by the midterm for demonstration during the second term | At least eight new best practices demonstrated and lessons from project documented and disseminated and planning for replication in progress |

**Annex: Strategic Results Framework (SRF) in the ProDoc (Original)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):** Strategic Goal C (To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity), and Target 12 (By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has improved and sustained). | | | | | |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Program Document:** Outcome 1.1 Improved resilience, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environmental management, climate change adaptation/mitigation and disaster risk management | | | | | |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:**  Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.  Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation. | | | | | |
|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline**[[33]](#footnote-33) | **Mid-term Target**[[34]](#footnote-34) | **End of Project Target** | **Assumptions**[[35]](#footnote-35) |
| **Project Objective:**  To effectively mainstream biodiversity conservation and natural resources management objectives into governance, planning and management of socio-economic development and tourism in Biosphere Reserves | *Mandatory Indicator 1.3.1:* Area of sustainable management solutions at sub-national level for conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services that benefit from integrated landscape and seascape planning and management approaches | *Approximately 0.367 million hectares (managed effectively)[[36]](#footnote-36)* | *At least 0.425 million[[37]](#footnote-37) hectares effectively managed through participatory approaches* | *At least 1.22 million hectares[[38]](#footnote-38) of BRs managed through participatory approaches that integrates biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resources use into BR planning and management* | *Assumptions:*  *-Local communities understand livelihood benefits and ecological security from cooperation with and sustainable management of BR resources. Thus, they will participate in sustainable management and ecosystem restoration work.*  *-The National and Provincial Governments consider it their priority to support integrated planning of its landscape and seascape areas and implement target oriented activities with local communities to improve conservation and sustainable use of such resources.*  *-The PPCs, DPCs, CPCs and CBOs would work in close collaboration for preparation of integrated BR management frameworks*  *Risks:*  *-Natural disaster may affect the restoration work.*  *-Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project.*  *-Livelihood benefits from sustainable management may be low to give up current unsustainable practices*  *-Conflicts over territorial issues between partner institutions at BR level could undermine efforts at promoting integrated planning approaches.* |
| *Mandatory Indicator 1.3.2*: Number of households participating in improved and alternative livelihoods and sustainable resource management and best practice approaches | *0 (Baseline of households participating in improved and alternative livelihoods and sustainable resource management will be established through the commune/village microplanning process)* | *At least 500 households are directly benefiting from sustainable natural resources management and improved and alternative livelihoods and incomes (30% of the beneficiaries would be women)* | *At least 2,500 households directly benefit through sustainable natural resource management and livelihood improvement approaches and increase of 20% in average incomes (At least 30% of the beneficiaries would be women)* |
| *Mandatory indicator 2.5.1:* Extent to which Institutional frameworks are in place for integration of conservation, sustainable natural resource use, biodiversity and ecosystems and improved livelihoods into BR planning and management | *Multiple use sustainable BR planning and management approaches absent or limited within the country* | *Progress towards institutionalization of multiple use and sustainable BR planning and management approaches as measured by National MAB Committee formalized, legally mandated and functional as coordination body* | *Multiple use and sustainable BR planning and management approaches institutionalized in 3 BRs through strengthened national and provincial coordination mechanisms and related institutional agreements[[39]](#footnote-39)* |
| **Outcome 1**  Regulatory and institutional framework to avoid, reduce, mitigate and offset adverse impacts on biodiversity and reduced pressures on ecosystems in Biosphere Reserves in place. | *Indicator 4*: Extent to which legal or policy frameworks are in place for integration of socio-economic development and tourism into planning and management of Biosphere Reserves *(UNDP mandatory indicator: IRRF Output 2.5 indicator 2.5.1)* | *Specific, targeted Biosphere Reserve planning and management legislation largely lacking* | *Revised Biodiversity Law[[40]](#footnote-40) adopted by Government for submission to National Assembly and Decrees, Circulars and Guidelines under preparation* | *Revised legislation under Biodiversity Law[[41]](#footnote-41) and at least three legal instruments (decrees, circulars and guidelines)[[42]](#footnote-42) clarifying BR planning and management submitted to be adopted* | *Assumption:*  *-The national government will develop appropriate legislative, policy, institutional and technical measures that facilitate integrated BR planning and management in a timely manner.*  *-Development strategies and BR management strategies and plans will be officially approved by Provincial governments with allocation of appropriate staff and funding for their implementation*  *-The Provinces will take active part in developing the strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project*  *-Local communities are convinced mainstreaming biodiversity into key development sectors is in their long-term interests*  *Risks:*  *-Priorities of provincial governments and local communities might shift if development benefits take long to manifest* |
| *Indicator 5:* Level of institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring integrated BR management as measured by UNDP’s capacity development scorecard | *Limited institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring of multiple use landscape and seascapes in BRs as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard baseline values at National and Provincial levels as indicated below:*  National level: 39%  Quang Nham Province: 47%  Dong Nai Province: 36%  Western Nghe An Province: 38% | *Increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 10% increase in UNDP National and Provincial Capacity Development Scorecard baseline value* | *Increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 30% increase in UNDP National and Provincial Capacity Development Scorecard of baseline values* |
| *Indicator 6:* Increase percentage of new permitted developments in the identified key sectors that trigger requirement for environmental assessment and integrates relevant national policies and practices that mainstream biodiversity | *BIA guidelines are developed, but not legally enforced resulting in unchecked threats and violations and illegal developments.* | *Requirements for BIA application are incorporated in the revised Law on Biodiversity to ensure environmentally sound development* | *At least 50% of new permitted developments in the identified key sectors in BRs that trigger requirement for environmental assessment integrates BIA guidelines* | *Assumptions:*  -*Provincial environmental agencies effectively capacitated to develop, monitor and enforce regulations*  *-National policies are in-place that provide specific direction to management priorities granting environmental agencies sufficient authority to manage environmental consequences of development.*  *Risks:*  *- Political patronage and interests can complicate the effective application of safeguard policies and practices as well as monitoring compliance with implementation of environmental safeguards.* |
| *Indicator 7:* Increased financing for scaled up investment in BR management in Vietnam | *Lack of adequate resources and commitment to conservation practice in BRs – 2017 baseline for 3 pilot BRs is USD 405,777* | *Strategy and procedures agreed with national and provincial governments for improved financing for BRs* | *20% increase in funding over baseline[[43]](#footnote-43) for BR management in Vietnam (all BRs)* | *Assumptions:*  *-Additional revenues can be developed to replication and scaling up throughout the country*  *- Local actors understand the importance mainstreaming biodiversity and sustainable natural resource use into socio-economic planning*  *-Buy-in at all levels of society, including timely dissemination and awareness of the benefits of conservation*  *Risk:*  *-Adequate resources to replicate integrated approaches may not be identified due to competing government priorities*  *-Sufficient trained and committed personnel unavailable to provide adequate coverage* |
| **Outcome 2**  Integrated multi sector and multi-stakeholder planning and management operational in three Biosphere Reserves that mainstreams protected area management, sustainable resource use and biodiversity-friendly development | *Indicator 8:* Improved management effectiveness of protected areas and biological rich areas within designated BRs | *Baseline METT scores:*  *Dong Nai NR: 37*  *Cat Tien NP: 38*  *Pu Mat NP: 39*  *Pu Hoat NR: 24*  *Pu Huong NR: 25*  *Cu Lao Cham MPA: 41* | *Average increase by at least 10 points in METT* | *Average increase by at least 30 points in METT from current PAs baselines with avoided 6,292,067 tCO2 eq. over 10 year period in 6 core zones of 3 BRs (covering 367,209 ha)* | *Assumption:*  *-Development strategies and management plans will be officially approved by Provincial governments with allocation of appropriate funding for their implementation*  *The Provinces will take active part in developing the strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project*  *Local communities are convinced that critical habitats in their vicinities will benefit livelihoods and ecological security to them and they will participate in conservation and restoration work.*  *-Local community based institutions would establish an effective institutional mechanism to facilitate conservation outcomes*  *Risk:*  *-Administrative/political changes may undermine the implementation of the management plan strategies*  *-Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project*  *-Conflicts between national and provincial sectoral entities and local communities regarding management and access to natural resources may undermine integrated planning approaches* |
| *Indicator 9:* Number of hectares high conservation value forests or coastal and marine ecosystems, including forests and coastal and marine areas set-aside for non-exhaustive use (includes new protected areas established) | *High Conservation Value Forests (dispersal corridors, biodiversity rich areas and buffer areas) outside protected area network are not formally recognized and lack appropriate management regimes* | *Areas for set-aside mapped, agreed with provincial governments and approved and 10,000 ha set-aside for non-exhaustive use* | *Set-aside areas (high conservation value forests and other ecosystems) for non-exhaustive use of at least 60,000 ha,[[44]](#footnote-44) resulting in total avoided 6,501,363 tCO2 eq. over 10 year period* |
| *Indicator 10:* Number of hectares of degraded forests areas restored through sustainable community management regimes | *Over 40% forests in pilot BRs (DN and WNA BRs) under continued degradation through overuse* | *At least 500 ha of degraded forests (and other ecosystems) under improved restoration through assisted natural regeneration to improve connectivity* | *At least 4,000 ha[[45]](#footnote-45) of degraded forests (and other ecosystems) under improved restoration through assisted natural regeneration to improve connectivity resulting in total sequestrated 224,277 tCO2  eq. over 10 year period* |
| *Indicator 11:* Change in status of key indicator species as:   1. Cu Lam Cham BR: *Lobophyllia serratus, Porites ornate and land crab* 2. Dong Nai BR: Gaur (*Bos gaurus*), Yellow cheeked gibbon *(Nomascus gabriellae)* and Black Shank Douc (*Pygathrix nigripes*) 3. Western Nghe An BR: Gaur *(Bos gaurus)* and White cheeked crested gibbon (*Nomascus leucogenys*) | ***Baseline Values****[[46]](#footnote-46)****:***  ***Dong Nai****[[47]](#footnote-47)*  *(i)* Gaur *(Bos gaurus) + 200*[[48]](#footnote-48)  *(ii)* Black Shank Douc *(Pygathrix nigripes) + 37[[49]](#footnote-49)*  *(iii)* Yellow-crested Gibbon *(Nomascus gabriellae) +171[[50]](#footnote-50)*  ***CLC Baseline****[[51]](#footnote-51)****:***  *(i)* Land crab *(Gecarcoidea lalandii) + 35,000*  *(ii) Coral reef 39% (live coral cover)*  **WNA**[[52]](#footnote-52)**:**  *(i) Barbe’s Langur (*Presbytis barbei*) + 40[[53]](#footnote-53)*  *(ii) White-cheeked crested gibbon (Nomascus leucogenys) + 475[[54]](#footnote-54)* | *Baseline validated and monitoring in progress for selected indicator species. Monitoring trends indicate positive changes* | *Maintained or improved populations of key species in BRs from current baseline values* | *Assumption:*  *-Adequate technical capacity available for undertaking monitoring species populations*  *Risk:*  *-External factors beyond the control of the project (e.g. climate change) might effect species populations negatively* |
| *Indicator 12:* Increase in percentage of hotels and tourism facilities in and around BRs meet biodiversity-friendly certification standards | *No standards or certification procedures exists now* | *Training complete, Certification criteria approved and at least 10% of hotel and tourism facilities within selected BRs adopt biodiversity-friendly certification standards* | *At least 50% of hotel and tourism facilities within selected BRs adopt biodiversity-friendly certification standards* | *Assumptions*  *-Standards developed for certification would take time, but be accompanied by clear guidance and training to facilitate certification*  *Risks*  *-Lack of adequate of enforcement staff and technical capacity might negate achievement of proposed outcomes* |
| **Outcome 3**  Knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation contributes to equitable gender benefits and increased awareness of biodiversity conservation | *Indicator 13:* Increase in percentage of sampled community members, hoteliers, tour operators and sector agency staff aware of and taking action to address potential conservation threats and their adverse impacts on biodiversity within BRs as measured by KAP survey approach. *[[55]](#footnote-55)* | *Coordinated outreach on conservation threats lacking. Limited awareness of impact unplanned development among general public. Baseline survey established in Year 1* | *At least 10% sampled community members, hoteliers, tour operators and sector agency staff (at least 40% women) aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of unplanned developments* | *At least 50% (of which at least 40% women) of sampled community members, hoteliers, tour operators and sector agency staff aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of unplanned developments* | *Assumption:*  *-Stakeholders willing to actively participate in the review process.*   * -Project management will be able to identify, document and disseminate the best practices   *-Mid Term Review and End of Project Evaluation of the project will also contribute to identifying the best practices*  *-Best practices from sustainable resource management readily available to resource users*  *Risks:*  *-Government priorities may change from due to political pressure from resource users*  *-Actions among the assorted agencies and NGOs remain uncoordinated*  *-Community diversity will not be*  *a hindrance to outreach activities* |
| *Indicator 14:* Number of additional best practices of sustainable land, coastal and marine resource use demonstrated, documented and disseminated and upscaled for replication | *Existing best practices include e.g. land crab, fishing set aside, # of boats, entry fees, enrichment planting, etc.* | *At least 3 new best practices identified and demonstrated* | *At least 8 new best practices demonstrated and lessons from project documented and disseminated and planning for replication in progress* |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. This indicator presents original figures from the ProDoc, however, it should be noted that the Baseline, Midterm Target, and End of Project Targets for this objective level indicator in the ProDoc Results Framework were inaccurate and the source could not be verified. The data has now been corrected such that the baseline increased but the total target to be achieved by project end has also increased, and the net increase over the baseline is also higher after the corrections. Although this is a change to an objective level indicator, it is a net increase in what the project will deliver. The revised figures are as follows: (i) At Baseline, the area under improved management or landscape seascape biodiversity benefiting from sustainable management solutions is 404,454 ha (i.e. 393,856 ha terrestrial and 10,598 ha marine); (ii) At Mid-term, PAs targeted for improved management or landscape and seascape biodiversity benefiting from sustainable management solutions is 1,383,346 ha (i.e. 393,856 ha terrestrial and 10,598 ha marine, and Western Nghe An BR (BZ): 608,547 ha, Dong Nai BR (BZ): 349,995 ha, Cu Lao Cham - Hoi An BR (BZ): 20,350 ha); (iii) At End of Project, PAs targeted for improved management or landscape and seascape biodiversity benefiting from sustainable management solutions is 2,354,783 ha (i.e.393,856 ha terrestrial and 10,598 ha marine, and Western Nghe An BR (BZ+TZ): 1,131,494 ha, Dong Nai BR (BZ+TZ): 796,920 ha, Cu Lao Cham - Hoi An BR (BZ+TZ): 21,915 ha). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. This figure specifically includes the areas under PAs within the three BRS where there is sufficient institutional and staffing arrangements and management in place [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The additional extent from baseline includes the approximately 60,000 hectares will be proposed to be included in PA network [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Area of core and buffer zones of the 3 BRs, which are likely to benefit from the integrated approach [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. New: Divided the one indicator into 03 Sub-indicators at the advice from MTR without any change in substance. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Old: As measured by National MAB Committee embedded, legally mandated and functional as coordination body; revised Law on Biodiversity; Legal document on BR establishment and management; Legal document on budget financing for BRs; National strategy and Action Plan on BR management

   New: Including: Mandate of the National MAB Committee is legally embedded; revised Law on Environmental Protection; Legal document/ guidelines on BR establishment and management; Regulations on budget financing for BRs; National strategy and Action Plan on BR management [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. This specifically includes revised Biodiversity Act that incorporates guidance on BR establishment and management, institutional arrangements for BR coordination and planning; defined relationship between national and provincial entities relating to BR planning and management [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Specifically includes decrees, circulars or guidelines to incorporate Biodiversity consideration in socio-economic development planning, mainstreaming biodiversity into tourism, forestry and other relevant sectors, BR zoning, and differentiation of EIA and BIA application in different zones of BR [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. New: The government does not have a plan to revise the Biodiversity Law. The Law on Environmental Protection was revised instead, and legal instruments for BRs were defined for development in this project period. Divided indicators into 03 Sub-indicators at the advice of the MTR team. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. New: By June 2024 (TE timing), 50% of projects requiring BIA integration (from the date of BIA guidelines coming into effect) will have BIA requirements integrated within them. The BR Project contributed to the development of BIA guidelines, but the BR Project only supports interventions at 03 BRs therefore this indicator should only focus on three BRs covered by the BR Project. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. New: The regulations on budget for BRs was approved at the end of 2021 year. The project contributed to strengthening the related legal framework, but increasing 20% for all BRs depends mainly on the corresponding Provincial People Committees’ own budget and not particularly related to BR Project impacts. Further, the target at TE should only relate to the 03 piloted BRs as stated in the 2017 baseline. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The sought increase in METT scores for the six protected areas at MTR and TE should be reassessed at project Mid Term Review to determine if given average METT points to be reached are feasible. It should be noted that METT scores given in the GEF METT tables, and included in the GEF-07 Core Indicators for each of the protected areas at MTR and TE should also be reviewed by the project Mid Term Review. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. The 60,000 ha of new set-asides will be established following the mapping exercise (Output 2.2) and be achieved through (i) re-zoning of BRs, including expansion of core zones; and (ii) expansion of BRs. Proposed 60,000 ha distribution is WNA BR 40,000 ha and DN BR 20,000 ha. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Degraded forest areas to be restored to be identified through mapping exercise (Output 2.2) and include areas in Dong Nai BR and Western Nghe An BR [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. All baseline values to be further validated in Year 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Data provided by CLC BR for 2014 for Land Crab and 2015 for coral cover [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Data provided by DN BR for 2013 for Black shank douc and Yellow crested gibbon and 2016 for gaur. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Includes 96 individuals in Dong Nai NR and 104 individuals in Cat Tien NP making total of 200 individuals [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. A total of + 37 individuals on Dong Nai NR and Cat Tien NP [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Only accounted from Cat Tien NP [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Data from FFI for 2011 for White-cheeked gibbon within Pu Mat National Park [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Only in Pu Huong NR (40) [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Approximately 455 from Pu Huong NR and 20 from Pu Mat NP [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. New: The target species baselines, originally stated in the ProDoc and restated in the Inception Report, were based on rather out of date data (e.g. from 2011, 2013, 2014.) and the estimations were provided with unclear data sources and dates (e.g. the data for Barbe’s Langur in Tay Nghe An BR, White-cheeked crested gibbon in Pu Huong BR, etc.). The proposed updates of the target species baselines at 03 BRs are based on the results of most updated monitoring in 2021, which is one year after project commencement, as suggested in the ProDoc. In addition, the estimated number of individuals of each targeted species depends on the approach and methods applied in the monitoring process. The estimated populations for target species between the new 2021 baselines and old baselines in the ProDoc are not technically comparable because of the different methods applied. Therefore, the project contends that the seeming reduction of estimated populations does not reflect reality, and that the decrease of reported populations is the result of the different approaches used to estimate them. The monitoring of target species at post-MTR (2023) and at TE (2024) will be done using the same measuring methods/ approaches used for the new baselines (in 2021), and therefore changes in population figures will be easily compared. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. New: Source: [Report on targeted species monitoring in Cu Lao Cham - Hoi An BR 2021 under package 15](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-kyeTUQeL166bB1MO7LawfmcentyPh9b/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=107017788783673008547&rtpof=true&sd=true). [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. New: Source: [Report on targeted species monitoring in Dong Nai BR 2021](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-fxVAf-0Sq87LE6-MlJmXmlhEaZCDMj1/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=107017788783673008547&rtpof=true&sd=true) under package 14. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. New: Source: [Report on targeted species monitoring in Tay Nghe An BR 2021](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_S9x5MZ4Nj1WAsRjhumC2YNYnAKmj2hr/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=107017788783673008547&rtpof=true&sd=true) under package 16. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. The Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices (KAP) approach will collect reference qualitative and quantitative declarative information on misunderstanding and barriers to behavior change, using appropriate tools including survey questionnaires, Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews, among others. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. New: The baseline is 0 because the Indicator is “new” best practices, as recommended by the MTR. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. This figure specifically includes the areas under PAs within the 3 BRS where there is sufficient institutional and staffing arrangements and management in place [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. The additional extent from baseline includes the approximately 60,000 hectares to be included in PA network [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Area of core and buffer zones of the 3 BRs, which are likely to benefit from the integrated approach [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. As measured by National MAB Committee embedded, legally mandated and functional as coordination body; revised Law on Biodiversity; Legal document on BR establishment and management; Legal document on budget financing for BRs; National strategy and Action Plan on BR management; [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Biodiversity Law legally recognize BRs as category of PAs, assign responsibilities for BR management to MONRE; responsibilities and procedures for BR planning; coordinating role of role of MAB Committee, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. This specifically includes revised Biodiversity Act that incorporates guidance on BR establishment and management, institutional arrangements for BR coordination and planning; defined relationship between national and provincial entities relating to BR planning and management [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Specifically includes decrees, circulars or guidelines to incorporate Biodiversity consideration in socio-economic development planning, mainstreaming biodiversity into tourism, forestry and other relevant sectors, BR zoning, and differentiation of EIA and BIA application in different zones of BR [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Baseline financing for BRS will be established in Year 1 [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. The 60,000 ha of new set-asides will be established following the mapping exercise (Output 2.2) and be achieved through (i) re-zoning of BRs, including expansion of core zones; and (ii) expansion of BRs. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Degraded forest areas to be restored to be identified through mapping exercise (Output 2.2) and include areas in Dong Nai BR and Western Ngha An BR [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. All baseline values to be further validated in Year 1 [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Data provided by DN BR for 2013 for Black shank douc and Yellow crested gibbon and 2016 for gaur. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Includes 96 individuals in Dong Nai NR and 104 individuals in Cat Tien NP making total of 200 individuals [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. A total of + 37 individuals on Dong Nai NR and Cat Tien NP [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Only accounted from Cat Tien NP [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Data provided by CLC BR for 2014 for Land Crab and 2015 for coral cover [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. Data from FFI for 2011 for White-cheeked gibbon within Pu Mat National Park [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Only in Pu Huong NR (40) [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Approximately 455 from Pu Huong NR and 20 from Pu Mat NP [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. The Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) approach will collect reference qualitative and quantitative declarative information on misunderstanding and barriers to behavior change, using appropriate tools including survey questionnaires, Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews, among others. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)