

# 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: May 10, 2012

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking; Hindrik Bouwman  
Consultant(s): Margarita Dyubanova

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4766

**PROJECT DURATION :** 3

**COUNTRIES :** Vietnam

**PROJECT TITLE:** Implementation of Eco-industrial Park Initiative for Sustainable Industrial Zones in Vietnam

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNIDO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** National executing agencies:  
Ministry of planning and investment (MPI)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Multi Focal Area

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

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Minor revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

UNIDO's proposal "Implementation of eco-industrial park initiative for sustainable industrial zones in Vietnam" has the objective to increase transfer, deployment and diffusion of clean technologies and practices for the minimization of hazardous waste, GHG emissions, POPs and other pollutants as well as sound management of chemicals in industrial zones of Vietnam.

While STAP welcomes this initiative, it suggests that the project framework needs to be revisited as it fails to adequately capture the environmental changes being sought by project investments. Expected Outputs and Outcomes are largely descriptors of activities, rather than changes brought about by the project. Some outcomes are almost identical to their respective outputs. Under Expected Outputs STAP would like to see the actual project deliverables and substantive and measurable indicators, rather than a list of project activities. Under Expected Outcomes, STAP would expect to see the major changes to which the project will contribute, including the delivery of GEBs. This is a key element of the project strategy which must be clarified.

The proposal makes it clear that GHG mitigation potential and chemicals reduction and elimination are important national priorities. However, for eligibility for GEF finance, the proposal needs to elaborate on several items that are currently missing from Section B2 to B5 and the Project Framework:

- global environmental benefits. As noted above, these need to be explicitly identified and related to the GEF-5 focal area strategies;
- impact and tracking indicators. These need to be part of the monitoring structure of the project, with identified criteria for choice of indicator and methods of measurement;
- a realistic risk analysis. For example, STAP identifies the need for quantitative data on direct and indirect avoidance of GHG emission, amount of un-intentionally produced dioxins and furans reduced using the Dioxin Toolkit, and improvements in water use efficiency and quality. Previous GEF and UNEP efforts have supported capacity development for POPs analyses in Vietnam. This capacity could be used to track actual reductions in emissions.
- Furthermore, in Section B4 risks need to be rated and mitigation measures clearly identified.

In summary, STAP believes that while project activities are well-described and justifiable, given the fact that the PIF states that "a serious barrier for technology transfer is the lack of information on clean&low-carbon technologies", the STAP must also comment that it finds that the context of the project and its source of finance have not been clearly addressed. It might be wise to look at lessons learned from other Focal Areas where similar barriers arise (eg. Climate Change Mitigation), and see what can be replicated in this project. It is vital that the activities relate to the project objective and that systems are in place to identify, track and monitor the contribution of the project to global environmental benefits. The above weaknesses need to be addressed as the project develops to a full proposal.

The risk analysis also needs to be broadened during project development. For example, noting that 70% of industrial workers in the industrial zone are immigrants, and that 60% of them are women, there is a sociocultural risk associated with how these workers will be integrated into project activities and share in benefits. What might the potential barriers be to this? Where in the infrastructural hierarchy do these workers exist? Would they be fully integrated and viewed as equal stakeholders in the project? Are there language barriers to consider? Will they easily take up new approaches and technologies? In addition, there are clear gender implications that accompany this. The STAP therefore urges a wider consideration of risk categories during the project development phase.

<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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 required</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in 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.