

Comments

Progress of Joint Research Activities



Research No.: ②8 E		E-4 ODA Loan Joint Research	Date:14/Oct/2020	
1	General Title	Analysis of economic efficiency of natural resources uses and problems in natural resource uses and management		
CTU: Huynh Viet Khai (Project Leader), Truong Hoang Dan, Vo Quoc Tuan, Lo Le Van Du			ı, Le Tan Loi,	
2	Core Members	Japanese Universities: Yuzuru UTSUNOMIYA (Nagasaki University), Mitsuyasu YABE (Kyushu University)		
3	Duration	April 2017 – (3 years)		
4	Main Objectives	Developing natural resources management tools while applying economic tools: payment for ecosystem services and cost-benefit analysis		
5	Focal Points	Figure 1. Spatial distribution of surveyed points classified by total area Table 1. Results of evaluating the important level of Melaleuce cajuputy ecosystem services		
		Interviewee's job/farming models Melaleu cajuputy Interviewee 's job/farming models Interviewee 's job/farming models Melaleu cajuputy Interviewee 's job/farming models Interviewee 's job/farming models Melaleu cajuputy Interviewee 's job/farming models Interviewee 's job/farming models Melaleu cajuputy Interviewee 's job/farming models Interviewee 's job/far	Mean by Cultural servies 1,32 3,14	
		Acacia Hybrid 3,67 3,40 3,13	1,23 2,86	
		Legends Two rice crop 3,37 3,70 3,80 Silinity concentration (concentration (conce	1,00 2,97 1,00 1,53	
		Mean by column 3,04 3,16 3,16 1,14 Figure 2. Correlations between different variables at the district level UMd fishminseason		
		Figure 3. Interpolation map on saline concentration in April 2018 at research area Table 2. Marginal Willingness to pay (MWTP) for U Minh forest ecosystem conservation Unit: VND		
		Attribute Model 1 Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at sampling points at differ Model 2 Figure 4. Similarity by wild fish species at		
			95% Confident interval	
		Air 738.0** 153.1 1,323.0 727.0** 152.5 1,301.6 Product 577.6** 13.8 1,141.5 528.5* -5.5 1,062.5 All respondents included 85.515	78.172 93.021 0.0000	
		StudyHigh 17,882.0*** 9,602.3 26,161.8 17,377.1*** 9,631.6 25,122.5 Protest bids excluded 130.000 Re-training 216.6*** 99.3 333.9 217.0*** 103.4 303.6	113.646 147.699 0.0000	
		Note: ASL: Achieved Significance Level for testing H0: WTP < 0 vs H1: WTP > 0. Confidence intervals are estimated by the Krinsky and Robb (1986) method. Note: "," and 'significant at 1%, 5% and 10%. Confidence intervals are estimated by the Krinsky and Robb (1986) method. Economic Value of an Ecosystem Conservation Project: A Case Study of U Minh National Forest in the Vietnamese Mekong Delta, Journal of the		
		Faculty of Agriculture, Kyushu University (ISI journal). Willingness to pay of urban residents in Kien Giang for the ecosystem conservation of U Minh national park, Journal of Economic Studies Assessment of Can Tho Residents on the Economic Value of Ecosystem Conservation In U Minh Forest, Journal of Economics and Development Evaluation of the Willingness to Pay of Local Residents In Khanh Lam Commune for U Minh Ha Forest Protection, Thu Dau Mot University Journal of Science Khanh An Resident's Willingness to Pay for U Minh Ha Forest Conservation Project, Journal of Science, Can Tho University		
		 Estimating Kien Giang Urban Residents' Willingness to Pay for The U Minh Conservation Project, HUAF Journal of Agricultural Science & Technology Identification of ecosystem services of Melaluca forest in the buffer zone of the U Minh Ha National Park - Ca Mau province Using multivariate statistical analysis for surface water quality assessment in U Minh Ha National Park - Ca Mau Province Application of Primer software to evaluate the distribution of natural fishes at the buffer zone of U Minh Ha National Park - Ca Mau Province Evaluation of zooplankton diversity in the buffer zone of U Minh Ha National Park, Ca Mau province 		

This research continues towards finalizing papers to submit Journals.