



CTB

**AGENCE BELGE
DE DÉVELOPPEMENT**

ANNUAL REPORT 2010

PROJECT : VIE0403011

**PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REFORM AND
ROLL OUT OF CPRGS IN HAU GIANG
PROVINCE**

Table of contents

1 PROJECT FORM.....	3
2 SUMMARY	4
2.1 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION	4
2.2 KEY POINTS.....	4
2.3 LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS	5
3 EVOLUTION OF THE CONTEXT	8
4 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION.....	10
4.1 INSTITUTIONAL ANCHORING AND EXECUTION MODALITIES.....	10
4.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE.....	10
4.2.1 Indicators.....	11
4.2.2 Analysis of progress made.....	11
4.2.3 Risks and Assumptions	13
4.2.4 Quality criteria	14
4.2.5 Impact	14
4.2.6 Lessons learned and recommendations	14
4.3 RESULTS & INDICATORS	16
4.3.1 Evaluation of activities.....	18
5 ANNEXES	22

1 Project form

BTC project number	VIE 0403011
Partner institution	The People's Committee of Hau Giang Province
Start up date	July 2007
Estimated duration	4 years
Contribution of project beneficiaries	250,000 EUR
Contribution of Belgium	2,500,000 EUR
Sector and sub-sector	Public administration reform

Summary Project Description

The Public Administration Reform & Roll Out of CPRGS (PARROC) is the second phase of Belgium support to the provincial PAR and CPRGS roll out. It aims at strengthening the capacity of the various levels of local government (Provincial, District, commune) of Hau Giang province in inclusive participatory planning and budgeting (IPPB) and improved service delivery. The project will establish a Commune Development Fund that will enable local authorities to strengthen their ability to conduct IPPB and to deliver better quality services to the population. In order to broaden its impact, the project will closely liaise with the numerous related donor support projects so as to share and incorporate experiences. Despite being provincial based, the PARROC will closely liaise with the central level in order to ensure adequacy and sharing of experience with the policy framework. The project will also contribute to the building up of institutional training capacity to continue training in participatory planning and service delivery on a sustainable basis.

2 Summary

2.1 Analysis of the intervention

Intervention logic	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Sustainability
Specific objective:			
Result 1 : Improvement of the planning and budgeting process and system at the provincial, district and commune level	B	B	C
Result-area 2 : Improvement of the local administrative and socio-economic service delivery systems	B	B	C
Result 3 : Improvement of the capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project-related training	C	C	D
Result-area 4 : Dissemination of the lessons learned from the project	C	C	C

Budget	Expenditure per year				Total expenses as of 31/12/2010	Balance of the budget	Execution rate (%)
	2007	2008	2009	2010			
2,470,499.26	50,367.69	243,181.39	655,425.18	497,023.87	1,445,998.16	1,024,501	58,53

2.2 Key points

Specific Objective	Comment
Result 1 : Improvement of the planning and budgeting process and system at the provincial, district and commune level	Two participatory planning and budgeting cycles have been completed in six pilot communes and required capacity building training has been delivered at the commune and district level (in three pilot districts). A SEDP Planning Manual has been prepared and is now in the process of final revision and province-wide adoption. CDF was used as the main vehicle for decentralized budgeting and investment ownership. PPC plans to adopt this

	modality through government funding for the New Rural Communes and subsequent roll out to all communes.
Result-area 2 : Improvement of the local administrative and socio-economic service delivery systems	Main achievements in this result area include preparation of a CDF Manual, establishment of computerised planning database in all districts and communes of the province (now in the process of finalization), One Stop Shop model in 6 pilot communes which is now being scaled up to all communes, ISO certification for three pilot districts (now in the process of expansion to all districts), improvements in poverty and women focus in commune development planning and implementation of pro-poor investments, and introduction of participatory M&E
Result 3 : Improvement of the capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project-related training	Overall progress and outcomes have remained below par due to absence of a holistic action plan and road map for the capacity building of provincial training institutions. Activities carried out so far are sporadic and disjointed with little synergy between government and project resource allocations.
Result-area 4 : Dissemination of the lessons learned from the project	It remains the weakest of all project components and outcomes/impacts. It is primarily due to wrong assumptions and expectations from a provincial pilot project that is being expected to not only inform central level policy making but also promote forums for exchange of experience and knowledge sharing with other similar projects in other provinces. This kind of lead and initiative can only come from a higher central agency like MPI.

2.3 Lessons learned and recommendations

Project's major weakness has been an inappropriate management structure and

its over-emphasis on contribution to formulation of a National Planning Decree and roll out of this decree into the province. On the first count, the project relied heavily on the inputs of a STA who was supposed to provide split-mission inputs. The second key figure in the project was a National BTC Coordinator who was supposed to provide the continuity in the absence of a part-time STA and also the required facilitating interface between the PPC and STA. From the provincial side, the project was supposed to be looked after by a NPD and three Deputy NPDs who were all part-time and all happened to be occupying key busy positions in the provincial set-up. This automatically meant very little practical presence, participation or oversight of the project by the provincial managers and hence little ownership as well. The project was left to two outsiders. On the second count, it was highly ambitious on the part of project designers to expect a provincial pilot project to guide the formulation of a central level decree formulation and link project's final performance and outcomes to a process over which it had no control.

In order to enable the project to continue assisting the province in roll out and replication of the successfully piloted initiatives, the project would need to be extended. An extension up to December 2012 would allow sufficient time to expand the coverage to all the communes in three Pilot districts plus some communes under the New Rural Communes Programme and allow these communes to complete at least two cycles of SEDP formulation.

For an enhanced project impact, project resources during the extended period should be focused on such areas of policy and regulatory framework which have greater chance the potential for absorption in the provincial planning and service delivery systems. Result Areas 3 and 4 have remained comparatively weak in implementation and would also need to be priority areas of focus during the extended period. One of the primary reasons for slow progress in Results Area 3 is absence of a good capacity training provider in the province for PPB and PAR. Sporadic efforts were made to build capacity of Provincial Political School and Community College for this purpose but these efforts lacked a comprehensive vision and action plan. This should happen now during the extended period and

project resources should be aligned with greater effort and resources from the provincial government to build the required capacity in these institutions. In information dissemination and linkages, the project would need active handholding from the central level to make a meaningful contribution and BTC's SPR Project in MPI can provide that support to PARROC.

For a greater provincial ownership of the project and better prospects for the project interventions to be mainstreamed into provincial systems, the current management structure of the project needs serious revamping. . The idea of one NPD and three DNPD, all part time and all holding very important and busy assignments, has not worked. There is a need to have a more dedicated presence from the province in the PMU to lead the management decision-making on behalf of the province.

3 Evolution of the context

Project achieved reasonably good progress during the initial three years of project implementation. However, during the critical third year when the project was expected to go into a rollout/scaling up phase, a perceptible difference of opinion emerged between STA and province over questions of sustainability of project interventions. Lack of direct communication between STA and provincial leader, largely due to obstructive approach adopted by the Project Coordinator, led to an impasse. Since then, the STA has not been called back and BTC Coordinator has also resigned. So the project, in the absence of a STA and BTC Coordinator, and in the presence of only part time directors, went into a period of uncertainty during 2010.

Finalization of a planning decree/law by MPI by 2009 was cited as one of the key supporting development for this project in TFF. Project was supposed to both contribute to the formulation process of this decree and subsequently contribute to its implementation/roll out in Hau Giang. The decree has been delayed and project's linkages to national policy formulation have remained weak. However, project's objectives remain valid in the context of government's approach and commitment to CPRGS agenda, grassroots democracy, strengthening of Communes' administration, and Public Administration Reform. Project's direct and indirect contributions are strengthening provincial government's capacity, resolve and understanding in further deepening the aims and objectives of these national policy reforms in PPB and PAR. In any case, linking project's outcomes with a policy initiative at central level, over which it had no control, was overly ambitious.

There appears to be a degree of difference in perceptions about the ultimate vision and outcome of the project. Is this a pilot that would test certain approaches and its final outcome would be a tested model for possible adoption by the provincial and central government? If one goes by project's budgets and inputs, then that is the final output of the project i.e. replication strategy for future adoption by the government. A second interpretation is that it is a pilot which would demonstrate a model during initial phase and help the government replicate it at larger scale during

later half of project. If one goes by the narrative of the TFF, then this perception is also valid. Seeds of this confusion about the project's ultimate aim were sown in TFF itself which says different things at different places e.g.

- *“Project aimed at piloting and testing policy implementation – provide feedback and lessons learned for further policy refining...”*
- *“Project will prepare a replication strategy...”*
- *“Project as this one require longer perspective – Institutional and organizational change needs 10-15 year support horizon. Important for both partners to see it as a part of longer term process of capacity building”*

4 Analysis of the intervention

Viewed from a purely input/output aspect, the project has made reasonably good progress for a project of this nature. Its progress under the first two result areas, out of total 4, has been quite robust. As for the remaining two, the progress can be further improved through better management and approach. Judged from impact aspect, the project also has achieved considerable success despite a short period of actual implementation and the reversal experienced during 2010. It has introduced number of initiatives in PPB and PAR which has a wider provincial ownership and the province is taking several practical steps for wider replication/main streaming of these initiatives not only through project budget but also through own sources. Cases in point are SEDP Manual, CDF manual, One Stop Shop, ISO certification for Districts and Planning Databases. Sustainability of the intervention however is still questionable.

4.1 Institutional anchoring and execution modalities

The project is implemented under Co-Management modality.

PMU of PARROC has a very skeletal structure. According to TFF, this was so to ensure greater mainstreaming of project into existing government management structure.

The Project management is composed of PPC, districts and communes civil servants, which will dedicate part of their time to the project. If the project management structure was kept very thin on the assumption that assigning additional charge to PPC and DPI/DOHA officers would ensure greater ownership and mainstreaming, then the idea has not worked very well. Those officers are already overstretched and can spare only limited time for project. In any case, having a project structure with separate management and financial procedures means that it would remain a parallel entity and not as such part of regular government system.

4.2 Specific objective

The Specific objective of PARROC Hau Giang is to improve the institutional and

human capacities, the organizational set-up and the performances of the relevant local governments in the fields of development planning and budgeting and public service delivery.

4.2.1 Indicators

Specific objective:					Progress:
Indicators	E	G	Baseline	Progress year N	Comments
There're no Indicator available for the Specific Objectives in the TFF					

4.2.2 Analysis of progress made

The project progress slow down in 2010 due to uncertainties thrown up by the departure of both STA and BTC Coordinator. The Strategic Reflection Mission (SRM) arrived in Q4 and an updated preliminary Annual Work Plan and Budget was suggested.

- Commune Development Fund: Some good initiatives, apart from construction of rural infrastructure, were implemented in the pilot communes through the CDF. The CDF now stands almost exhausted (projected balance of the CDF by the end of 2010 at about Euro 60,000). It would however be useful to continue a degree of support to the original six pilot communes for those soft initiatives. project should assist the province in developing a framework for replacement of project funding in CDF with funding from State Budgets and National Target Programmes on regular basis, especially to the communes in phase one of replication.
- Capacity Building: The delivery of capacity building on PPB and PAR by project and government is constrained by lack of adequate relevant training capacity within the province. Project's existing interventions

with provincial training institutions (Political School and Community College) to develop their capacity for PPB and PSD related training delivery have been limited in scope and ambition. In the remaining period, the project will focus its attention on Political School and help it develop a proper plan for its capacity building.

In late Quarter 4, a new national BTC TA (Project Office Manager, not BTC Coordinator as suggested by the SRM) was selected. The BTC national TA will be deployed to the Project in February 2011 and is expected to support the PMU to finalize the draft Annual Budget & Work Plan based on the suggestion by the SRM.

4.2.3 Risks and Assumptions

Item	Comments	Level	Assumptions
Legal and Institutional risks			
<p>The project may not be relevant to National and local Planning and budgeting and PAR Reform Agenda. The project's linkages to national policy formulation have remained weak</p>	<p>The promulgation of the planning decree which is the key supporting development for PARROC has been delayed whilst the Project was supposed to both contribute to the formulation process of this decree and subsequently contribute to its implementation/roll out in Hau Giang.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Submission of the draft planning decree for approval by the government is included in the annual work plan of the project VIE 0703311-SPR-MPI. The PMU of SPR-MPI will be more proactive in sharing lesson learn and policy development information to PARROC through consultation workshops held by MPI.</p>
<p>Ownership and mainstreaming of project into existing government management structure is not ensured</p>	<p>The current project structure with separate management and financial procedures means that it would remain a parallel entity and not as such part of regular government system.</p> <p>For mainstreaming, the first basic requirement is use of existing government structures and fund management mechanisms for implementation of activities and, for that, the only appropriate vehicle is budgetary support. That being the case, the project would have been better off with more regular management capacity in-house.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Based on the recommendation of the SRM, the PMU together with the Representation will discuss how best to integrate the Project Annual Plan into the agenda of the relevant provincial agencies and that the regular management capacity in-house is improved.</p>

4.2.4 Quality criteria

Quality Criteria	Score	Comments
Effectiveness	B	Will be further evaluated in 2011 when following up the SRM's recommendations
Efficiency	B	Will be further evaluated in 2011 when following up the SRM's recommendations
Sustainability	C	Will be further evaluated in 2011 when following up the SRM's recommendations
Relevance	B	

4.2.5 Impact

Despite its relatively small size and limited coverage, PARROC has already made visible impact both in terms of PPB as well as PAR in Hau Giang. This impact is more visible at commune and provincial level and less at district and central policy level. This uneven spread of the impact is due to a combination of factors including relative focus of project resources and activities, design inadequacies and constraints in terms of objectives and TA support, inadequate focus on capacity building and relatively short period for the successes to spread and take root. The most important impact of the project, which is the change in thinking at all levels, particularly provincial level, in terms of decentralized planning and implementation and quality of service delivery, is still questionable.

4.2.6 Lessons learned and recommendations

The following recommendations take into account the fact that the basic requirement of project rationale i.e. finalization of a National Planning Decree, is yet to materialize and, therefore, these recommendations are aimed at maximizing project's outcomes and impacts within the prevailing national and provincial PPB and PAR environment.

Stakeholders' Perceptions: In order to prevent any repeat of experience during 2010 in terms of stakeholder perceptions about project's aims and objectives and its performance, PPC in collaboration with the Representation shall adopt measures to ensure greater and in-depth interaction during the remaining project period. Quarterly visit to the Project is made by the Representation staff to discuss on Annual Plan progress, issues and impediments and possible way forward with the PMU.

Project Extension: Project implementation period should be extended to December 2012 to cover for the time lost during 2010 in terms of scaling up/roll out and enable the new communes to complete at least two SEDP formulation cycles and their implementation. This extended period will also

allow the project to assist the provincial government in mainstreaming some of the successful SEDP/PPB and PAR practices into government systems including implementation through government budgets.

4.3 Results & Indicators

Result area 1: Improvement of the planning and budgeting process and system at the provincial, district and commune level					Progress:
Indicators	E	G	Baseline	Progress year N	Comments
- breadth of participation from stakeholders at different levels and impact of their participation on planning decisions taken				- 100% relevant holders at commune level participate and contribute their opinions into the SEDPs' design and implementation stages. - A 5 year strategy for rural development on socio-economic for the whole province was developed, achieving 100% progress as target.	
- improvement of planning methods as evidenced by quality of plan docs and data used				- 70% of work on refining the SEDP for communes was completed, waiting for the approval of provincial leaders, planning to issue the manual in 2010.	
- degree of prioritization achieved				- 100% of solutions in SEDPs in pilot communes were chosen from PRA survey by prioritized ranking in order that priority needs of the communes can be achieved.	
- rate of integration of plans into budget system				- 100% of activities planned are estimated budget clearly and indicated sources of budget, such as government budget, community contribution, or PARROC funded through CDF mechanism.	
- quality of indicators for monitoring				- Most of (about 80-90%) of indicators in the SEDPs of pilot communes are utilized the SMART criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound)	

Result area 1: Improvement of the planning and budgeting process and system at the provincial, district and commune level					Progress:
Indicators	E	G	Baseline	Progress year N	Comments
- use of indicators in monitoring				- 100% of SEDPs' Reports used indicators to evaluate their achievement.	
- adoption of replication plan for pilots				- No planning for adoption of SEDPs in pilot communes to other communes in 2010	

Result area 2: Improvement of the local administrative and socio-economic					Progress:
Indicators	E	G	Baseline	Progress year N	Comments
- priority services identified in local plans and budgets				- 100% of pilot communes' SEDPs were identified priority services which calculated budgets accordingly	
- key constraints identified and measures adopted in action plans				- 100% of pilot communes' SEDPs were apply SWOT analysis to analyse Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities and Threats of the planning period	
- CDF support for implementation mobilized				- 100% of CDF integrated into SEDPs was disbursed in the timely manner.	
- key pro poor related services delivered to users on time in cost effective manner				- 100% activities in SEDPs are viewed in the lenses	
- user feedback mechanisms providing usable data for further service improvement				- No survey implemented to evaluate this indicator yet. This can be done in the end of 2011, after follow up the recommendation from the Mission Strategy Report conducted in Oct. 2010.	

Result area 3: Improvement of the capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project-related training					Progress:
Indicators	E	G	Baseline	Progress year N	Comments

Result area 3: Improvement of the capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project-related training					Progress:
Indicators	E	G	Baseline	Progress year N	Comments
- training plan in place incorporating needs assessment and resource requirements				- 70%-80% training courses related to computerization the OSS and SEDPs are organized against planning. However, a comprehensive capacity building plan for staff and government officials as the demand of SEDP and public service delivery did not design in 2010. Most of training are implemented as on the job trainings to meet the requirement of SEDPs establishment. An overall training program will be designed in 2011.	
- local providers endowed with training resources and materials to conduct quality training on continuing basis					

Result area 4: Dissemination of the lessons learned from the project					Progress:
Indicators	E	G	Baseline	Progress year N	Comments
incorporation of lessons from other pilots and projects into ongoing improvements of planning and service delivery				<p>Most of existing format of SEDPs in pilot communes (about 90% of annual planning) was adapted from the application of other projects which are reviewed and introduced to PARROC project by the Consultant and the form regulated in Hau Giang Provincial People's Committee – Decree 3090</p> <p>80-90% OSSs' services in pilot communes are adapted modalities learned from other projects on study tours. However, the OSSs operation is also accordance with the Provincial Department of Home Affair regulations.</p>	

4.3.1 Evaluation of activities

Ref. No.	Activities	Progress:				Commentaires (only if the value is -)
		++	+	+/-	-	
	Result Area #1					
	Sub-result Area 1.2: Participatory planning materials and data available					
1.2.1.a	National study visits (continued and combined with Result Area # 2)					No planning for study visits in 2010

Ref. No.	Activities	Progress:				Commentaires (only if the value is -)
		++	+	+/-	-	
1.2.2.e	Refinement of annual commune planning manual (continued with 6 pilot communes)		x			
1.2.2.f	Annual planning manual for district level (started at Nga Bay Town)				x	Due to the departure of STA & BTC Coordinator, these activities could not be implemented
1.2.2.g	5-year planning manuals for 6 pilot communes and 3 districts				x	
1.2.2.h	Provincial 5-year SEDP improvement (rural development/ economic planning/ PAR)		x			
1.2.2.i	Support to institutionalization of planning manuals			x		The planning manual are finalized the draft but did not issue the official version yet
1.2.3.c	Build up software of database system including training (continued)		x			
1.2.3.e	Continue support to consolidate planning database (annual and 5-yr SEDPs)			x		Slow because the province did not finalize which kinds of indicators should be input to the databases
	Sub-result Area 1.3: Training delivered to key stakeholders					
1.3.2	Training based on planning manuals (<i>implemented in the pilot communes</i>)		x			
	Sub-result Area 1.4: Planning is used as an effective Management Tool					
1.4.3	Strengthen M&E system of 5-year and annual SEDPs including indicators and targets			x		The input related to mobilize the activities to support the designing of 5 year planning for districts and communes is postponed to 2011
	Sub-result Area 1.5: Lessons drawn and incorporated into replication strategy for whole Province					
1.5.1.a	Assess the implementation (6 pilot communes) and develop the next phase design				x	Slow down due to the departure of STA and BTC Coordinator & political transition year (party congress & elections)
1.5.1.b	Assess the implementation of Nga Bay Town (commune and district) and develop the next phase design.				x	
1.5.2.a	Replicate the model to all communes in Nga Bay Town				x	
1.5.2.b	Replicate the model to 2 remaining districts (commune and district levels)				x	
	Result Area # 2					
	Sub-result Area 2.1: Building on/completing phase 1 administrative service delivery					
2.1.3.b	Support IT application (hardware and software) in 3 pilot districts (started with Nga Bay)			x		Slow down due to have time for the assessment of the model applied in Nga Bay Town
2.1.4.h	Capacity building for computerisation of OSS in 3 pilot districts		x			
	Sub-result Area 2.2: Piloting approaches to social and economic PSD at sub-provincial					

Ref. No.	Activities	Progress:				Commentaires (only if the value is -)
		++	+	+/-	-	
	level					
2.2.4.c	Preparation of 5-year and annual SEDPs			x		Inputs related to 5 year planning of districts and communes are postponed to 2011
2.2.5	Train officials in implementation of their SEDPs		x			
2.2.7	CDF support to 6 pilot commune SEDPs		x			
2.2.8	Technical support during implementation of SEDPs		x			
	Result Area # 3					
	Sub-result Area 3.1: Training areas and delivery arrangements identified					
3.1.2	Overall Training Plan from 2010 to mid-2012				x	Slow down due to the departure of STA and BTC Coordinator
	Sub-result Area 3.2: Training resources developed					
3.2.1	Prepare training materials (including training manuals) (continued)			x		Slow down due to the departure of STA and BTC Coordinator The Political School has limited teacher resources in order to meet the demand of project trainings.
3.2.2	Training of Trainers (continued)			x		
3.2.3	Support necessary IT (continued)					No plan in 2010
	Sub-result Area 3.3: Training related to participatory planning and improved PSD delivered					
3.3.1	Series of training courses conducted by local training institutions (continued)			x		The local training institutions are short of teachers to meet the demand of trainings.
	Sub-result Area 3.4: Sustainable training delivery					
3.4.1	Assess local training institution capacity building for sustainable results		x			
3.4.2	Continue support to local training providers for sustainable results			x		Slow down due to the departure of STA
	Result Area # 4					
	4.2: Establish network of pilots					
4.2.2	Receiving of study visits from other projects/provinces		x			
	4.3: Web design and other communication tools					
4.3.2	Maintain and improve the project web-pages		x			
4.3.3	Publish project quarterly newsletters		x			
4.3.4	Cooperate with local & regional TVs and Newspapers to operationalise the Com.Strategy		x			

Ref. No.	Activities	Progress:				Commentaires (only if the value is -)
		++	+	+/-	-	
	4.4: Prepare best practice cases studies for publication/distribution					
4.4.1	Prepare case studies and best practices, and illustrated by video clips				x	Postponed to 2011
	4.5: National workshops for experience sharing					
4.5.1	National Dissemination Workshops					No planning in 2010

5 Annexes

SRM Mission report inclusive operational planning 2011 – 2012

“Budget versus current (y – m)” Report

MISSION REPORT
STRATEGIC REFLECTION MISSION
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REFORM
AND
ROLL-OUT OF CPRGS
IN
HAU GIANG PROVINCE
(“PARROC”)

30 November 2010

Rab Nawaz & Phan Duy Toan

CONTENTS

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1-1
2	INTRODUCTION.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1	The Project	
2.2	Purpose of Strategic Reflection Mission.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3	Mission Terms of Reference	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.4	Mission Process and methodology	
2.4.1	Meetings at National Level	
2.4.2	Meetings at Provincial Level	
2.4.3	Meetings at District and Commune Level	
3	MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.1	PARROC Objectives and Expected Results	4-18
3.1.1	Development objective.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.1.2	Project purpose	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.1.3	Expected results	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2	Current Project Status	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.3	Key Issues and Options	
3.4	CONCLUSIONS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4.1	Project Relevance	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4.2	Perceptions of Stakeholders	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4.3	Project Efficiency	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4.4	Project Impact	
3.4.5	Case for Extension	
3.4.6	Management and Provincial Ownership	
3.4.7	Capacity Building	
3.4.8	Information Dissemination	
3.4.9	Priorities for Extended Period	
4	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.1	Project Relevance	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2	Sharing of Project Goals by Stakeholders	
4.3	Project Efficiency	
4.4	Project Impact	
4.5	Project Extension.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.6	Management and Provincial Ownership.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.7	Capacity Building	
4.8	Information Dissemination/Linkages	
4.9	Priorities for Extended Period	
4.10	Draft Work Plan and Budget for 2011-2012	
5	ANNEXES.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.1	Mission TOR and Schedule	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.2	Working Paper for Provincial Workshop	
5.3	Aide Memoir and List of Persons Met.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.4	Debriefing to PSC Members in Hanoi	
5.5	Draft Work Plan and Budget 2011-2012	
5.6	TOR for Permanent Vice Director, PMU and Project Manager	

- 6.7 TOR for Project Manager
- 6.8 Revised Logframe

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. (PARROC) project was signed between Kingdom of Belgium and Socialist Republic of Vietnam on 17 June 2007. This Euro 2,750,000 (Belgian 2,500,000 and GoV 250,000) four year project (June 2007-June 2011) is aimed at promoting pro-poor socio-economic development and poverty reduction through public administration reform at the provincial, district and commune levels. Towards that end, it is aimed at improving capacity and performance of local governments in development planning, budgeting and public service delivery. The project is also expected to contribute through its pilot interventions and lessons learnt to the formulation of new policy decree at central level, formulation of SEDP for 2011-2015 and next round of PAR. To achieve these aims, the project focuses on four result areas, namely:

- ***Result Area 1: Improvement of planning and budgeting process and systems at provincial, district and commune level***
- ***Result Area 2: Improvement of local administrative and socio-economic service delivery systems***
- ***Result Area 3: Improvement of capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project related training***
- ***Result Area 4: Dissemination of lessons learned from the project***

2. Project achieved reasonably good progress during the initial three years of project implementation. However, during the critical third year when the project was expected to go into a rollout/scaling up phase, a perceptible difference of opinion emerged between STA and province over questions of sustainability of project interventions. Lack of direct communication between STA and provincial leadership, largely due to obstructive approach adopted by the Project Coordinator, led to an impasse. Since then, the STA has not been called back and BTC Coordinator has also resigned. There was also a perceptible feeling that the province and BTC probably had different perceptions about the project's ultimate aims. While BTC looked at the project as a means to assisting the province in mainstreaming the PPB and PAR initiatives into provincial systems and bringing this experience in national policy making and formulation of national Planning Decree, the province perceived this project as an end into itself i.e. drawing lessons from pilot implementation for possible future replication. So the project, in the absence of a STA and BTC Coordinator, and in the presence of only part time directors, went into a period of uncertainty during 2010. The Project Steering Committee finally decided to mobilize an external mission to carry out a strategic reflection and review of the project and help determine the future of this project. Hence a Strategic Reflection Mission was mobilized and this report presents the key findings and recommendations of the mission on project's progress, stakeholders' perceptions and future course to achieve the project's agreed aims and objectives.

3. The Strategic Reflection Mission worked at all levels connected directly or indirectly with the project implementation and results including Hanoi, provincial level and participating districts, communes and villages. The mission adopted a very participative and dialogue based approach to garner the opinions and inputs on project's past, present and future. A provincial Stakeholders' Workshop capped the initial consultative process and resulted in a clear set of recommendations on the key questions confronting the project and its future. A provincial wrap up, based on an Aide memoir circulated by the Mission, concluded the work at provincial level and the mission recommendations and findings were endorsed by the province. A Debriefing Session was held with the PSC members at the central level as well as BTC's SPR project and again there was a by and large consensus on Mission's findings and recommendations.

Mission Findings

4. Project is expected to achieve 64% financial progress against BTC costs and 80% progress against counterpart funding by December 2010. Viewed from a purely input/output aspect, the project has made reasonably good progress for a project of this nature. Its progress under the first two result areas, out of total 4, has been quite robust. As for the remaining two, the progress can be further improved through better management and approach. Judged from impact aspect, the project also has achieved considerable success despite a short period of actual implementation and the reversal experienced during 2010. It has introduced number of initiatives in PPB and PAR which has a wider provincial ownership and the province is taking several practical steps for wider replication/main streaming of these initiatives not only through project budget but also through own sources. Cases in point are SEDP Manual, CDF manual, One Stop Shop, ISO certification for Districts and Planning Databases.

5. Project's major weakness has been an inappropriate management structure and its over-emphasis on contribution to formulation of a National Planning Decree and roll out of this decree into the province. On the first count, the project relied heavily on the inputs of a STA who was supposed to provide split-mission inputs. Eventually the project ended up with two different STAs during its first three years of implementation with understandable differences in personalities and approach. The second key figure in the project was a National BTC Coordinator who was supposed to provide the continuity in the absence of a part-time STA and also the required facilitating interface between the PPC and STA. But ultimately the coordinator grew bigger than the STA and a preferred trusted choice for the province. From the provincial side, the project was supposed to be looked after by a NPD and three Deputy NPDs who were all part-time and all happened to be occupying key busy positions in the provincial set-up. This automatically meant very little practical presence, participation or oversight of the project by the provincial managers and hence little ownership as well. The project was left to two outsiders. On the second count, it was highly ambitious on the part of project designers to expect a provincial pilot project to guide the formulation of a central level decree formulation and link project's final performance and outcomes to a process over which it had no control.

6. The project aims and objectives remain valid despite the slow progress on formulation of a national Decree on Planning. There is still considerable legal space available to the provinces to make meaningful progress in PPB and PAR if there is will. Project has introduced a number of initiatives in participatory planning & budgeting and public administration reform through its pilot work in 6 communes and 3 pilot districts they appear to have a considerable buy in and ownership at the provincial, district and commune level. These include SEDP manual, CDF manual and decentralized investment ownership, Planning database, one Stop Shop, ISO certification for the districts, capacity building of provincial training institutions and training in PPB and OSS etc. Province is well on its way to adopt and mainstream number of these initiatives into regular government planning, implementation and service delivery systems.

7. In order to enable the project to continue assisting the province in roll out and replication of the successfully piloted initiatives, the project would need to be extended – more so to overcome the slag during 2010 due to management issues. An extension up to December 2012 would allow sufficient time to expand the coverage to all the communes in three Pilot districts plus some communes under the New Rural Communes Programme and allow these communes to complete at least two cycles of SEDP formulation. This will require amendment in the existing Financing Agreement between Belgium and Vietnam.

8. For an enhanced project impact, project resources during the extended period should be focused on such areas of policy and regulatory framework which have greater chance the potential for

absorption in the provincial planning and service delivery systems. These priorities were discussed and agreed during the provincial workshop and are incorporated in the work plan suggested for 2011-2012. Result Areas 3 and 4 have remained comparatively weak in implementation and would also need to be priority areas of focus during the extended period. One of the primary reasons for slow progress in Results Area 3 is absence of a good capacity training provider in the province for PPB and PAR. Sporadic efforts were made to build capacity of Provincial Political School and Community College for this purpose but these efforts lacked a comprehensive vision and action plan. This should happen now during the extended period and project resources should be aligned with greater effort and resources from the provincial government to build the required capacity in these institutions. In information dissemination and linkages, the project would need active handholding from the central level to make a meaningful contribution and BTC's SPR Project in MPI can provide that support to PARROC.

9. For a greater provincial ownership of the project and better prospects for the project interventions to be mainstreamed into provincial systems, the current management structure of the project needs serious revamping. The idea of one NPD and three DNPD, all part time and all holding very important and busy assignments, has not worked. This made the project over-reliant on two external persons – STA and BTC National Coordinator, and pushed the provincial government into a passive and sometimes only reactive role. There is a need to have a more dedicated presence from the province in the PMU to lead the management decision-making on behalf of the province. The BTC Coordinator position also needs to be reoriented to a more management support position with appropriate change in the title to reflect its status and purpose.

Key Recommendations:

10. The project should be extended to December 2012 and the project management should be revamped including elimination of STA position, changing of BTC Coordinator's position to Project Manager and positioning of a more full-time Vice Director by PPC. Project should focus on replication/scaling up of successful interventions during the remaining two years in an incremental manner, starting with scaling up in three pilot districts and then expanding both horizontally and vertically. A reasonable indication of success would be the extent to which provincial government allocates its own resources in this scaling up and especially adopts the CDF modality in the pilot and New Rural Communes for up-front allocation of budgets for planning purpose.

11. The misunderstandings and differences experienced among various partners during 2010 can be greatly reduced through a more structured and regular interaction between BTC, project and PPC. This should be in addition to the regular PSC meetings and much more elaborate and frequent. The BTC Programme Manager should have an in-depth quarterly interaction with the project which should include detailed review of project progress and a joint effort at resolving issues and removing impediments. The effort should be to work towards a trust based partnership.

12. Successful scaling up in a reasonable timeframe would largely depend on capacity building/training at all levels and that is largely constrained by absence of a capable training institution within the province. So early building of such capacity within the province is of utmost importance and should be a primary area of focus during 2011. Information Dissemination and linkages with other provinces and central level would be greatly facilitated if it is underpinned by a proper action plan and supported by a central level entity like SPR/MPI.

2 INTRODUCTION

This Mission Report reflects the main findings and recommendations of the 2-member Strategic Reflection Mission (01 Nov to 21 Nov 2010), mobilized by BTC and Peoples Committee of Hau Giang, to carry out an in-depth review of PARROC project's progress against stated objectives and define options for its future. The SRM started as scheduled on 01 November and concluded with a debriefing meeting for the PSC members in Hanoi on 17 November 2010.

2.1 **The Project:** Public Service Reform and Roll out of CPRGS in Hau Giang Province (PARROC) project was signed between Kingdom of Belgium and Socialist Republic of Vietnam on 17 June 2007. This Euro 2,750,000 (Belgian 2,500,000 and GoV 250,000) four year project (June 2007-June 2011) is aimed at promoting pro-poor socio-economic development and poverty reduction through public administration reform at the provincial, district and commune levels. Towards that end, it is aimed at improving capacity and performance of local governments in development planning, budgeting and public service delivery. The project is also expected to contribute through its pilot interventions and lessons learnt to the formulation of new policy decree at central level, formulation of SEDP for 2010-2015 and next round of PAR. To achieve these aims, the project focuses on four result areas, namely:

- ***Result Area 1: Improvement of planning and budgeting process and systems at provincial, district and commune level***
- ***Result Area 2: Improvement of local administrative and socio-economic service delivery systems***
- ***Result Area 3: Improvement of capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project related training***
- ***Result Area 4: Dissemination of lessons learned from the project***

2.2 **Mission Background:** PARROC MTE was carried out in early 2009 by the incumbent International STA and the report contained a broad outline of roll out of project's pilot interventions in PPB and PAR. The MTE was endorsed by PSC and all stakeholders. This broad outline was further refined and spelled out in greater detail by the STA in Annual Progress Report of 2009 and proposed work plan for 2010. Although this detailed roll out plan was largely based on the outline contained in MTE Report, an impression soon emerged as if the provincial government did not agree to this roadmap and wished to stick to a narrow pilot domain and wanted to divert funds to the CDF of existing pilot communes rather than on scaling up/roll out. The very structure of PMU revolved everything around STA (part-time) and a BTC National Coordinator and this entire issue was also presented by them to various levels as per their own views and interpretation. There was no direct in-depth dialogue or interaction between direct stakeholders i.e. PPC and BTC during this entire episode and entire reliance remained on the reports, both verbal and written, of STA and Coordinator, who had their separate views and interpretation about project's approach and future course. Though STA still has a contract with BTC but the province has not expressed the desire to have him back and BTC Coordinator has also resigned from his post. In view of the resultant uncertainty, the PSC in its last meeting finally decided to bring in an external mission to facilitate a reflective dialogue on the project's progress and its future among the key stakeholders and assist them in charting the future course. Hence this SRM.

2.3 **Mission Purpose:** The purpose of Strategic Reflection Mission (SRM) was to facilitate a participative and constructive reflection on the way forward, by facilitating and nourishing dialogue and reflection between the key stakeholders on:

- (i) How relevant and consistent the project activities are to the overall priorities of the authorities (central, provincial, district and commune level) and how its activities and objectives are perceived by different stakeholders;
- (ii) Possible improvements in approach and the logical framework for the balance of the project – inclusive a possible prolongation of the time frame considering the remaining budget of the project - to further strengthen the ownership and integration of the project within the three local administrative levels as well as capacity building at the three levels.
- (iii) Possible linkages with other programs working on the same objectives.

- 2.4 **Mission Terms of Reference:** The mission is expected to facilitate a participative review and reflection by all stakeholders to ascertain as what went well under the project and what need to be improved upon. It will also identify what didn't go well and why and how it could be improved and what needed to be done to ensure that the identified improvements lead to improved impact and remain sustainable beyond the project life. This would require updating the project logical framework as well as identification of inputs for remaining/extended project life and their phasing. The mission will also help identify impediments to development of local ownership of project interventions and internalization of the project approaches in the wider working of the government at provincial, district and commune level. In order to achieve all this, the Mission would also help the stakeholders to agree on exact length of project's extension and time bound action plans to implement the revised list of inputs and actions during the remaining period. One important aspect of this reflection mission would be to identify practical ways and means to link the project with other national and donor funded initiatives in PAR for sharing of successful approaches and their adoption at wider-scale.
- 2.5 **Mission Process and Methodology:** The Mission adopted a very participative approach to carry out the purposes of the Mission and held extensive discussions and dialogues with all key stakeholders at central, provincial, district, commune and village level. Mission Schedule and list of persons met is attached as Annex 5.2. This dialogue process encompassed central, provincial, district, commune and village level. At the Central level, meetings were held with BTC country office, MPI, MOHA, UNDP and World Bank. These initial meetings were primarily used as a sounding board for the Mission TOR and objectives and to garner views of the current national and donor thinking on PAR, with particular emphasis on decentralized planning and its implications for PARROC. At provincial, district and commune levels, detailed discussions were held with all the key stakeholders, implementers and beneficiaries. One non-project district and one non project communes was also covered to assess the difference that the project has made in terms of PAR, participatory planning and poverty reduction.

Provincial Stakeholder Workshop: The dialogue process of SRM was capped by a full day consultative stakeholders' workshop at Vi Thanh Town with participation from BTC, MPI, PPC, Provincial PAR Task Force, all the districts and six pilot and three non-project communes. Workshop Working Paper/Brief is attached as Annex 5.2. Specific questions related to Mission TOR were placed before the workshop participants for an open and frank discussion in two sessions steered jointly by the Mission and DNP. Third session was dedicated to consensus building on key findings of the workshop and recommendations. The findings and recommendations contained in this report are largely guided by the findings and recommendations and consensus reached during the provincial workshop.

Provincial Wrap-Up meeting was held in Vi Thanh Town on 15th November, based on an Aide Memoir circulated by the Mission on 13 Nov 2010. Meeting was attended by NPD, Deputy NPDs, PAR Task Force Members and BTC. Following a detailed presentation by Mission leader on key issues, findings and recommendations on key areas identified in the TOR, the provincial government and BTC representation offered their views, comments and suggestions which were responded and noted for incorporation in conformed version. Copy of conformed version of Aide Memoir is attached as Annex 5.3.

Hanoi Debriefing was organized by BTC for the central level members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) on 17 Nov 2010. STA for SPR Project in MPI and BTC Head Quarter Representative also attended the Hanoi debriefing. The participants were given a detailed debriefing on Mission's work, methodology, salient points of Aide Memoir, main

agreements reached at provincial level and next steps. Outline of De-briefing presentation is attached as Annex 5.4.

- 2.6 This report reflects Mission's main findings on project's status and main issues in its implementation and also contains a set of recommendations to address the existing issues and provide a clear roadmap for the future. Maximum effort was made in the course of Mission's work to achieve consensus of all the stakeholders on Mission's findings and recommendations and this report largely reflects ideas based on the broad consensus achieved during the wrap up and final debriefing to PSC members in Hanoi. However, the report is being presented to BTC and PSC members as a draft for their feedback and comments. The final version of report will be prepared after the receipt of feedback and comments to ensure that the reports findings and recommendations have a maximum buy-in and ownership among all the stakeholders.
-

3 MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

3.1 PARROC Objectives and Expected Results:

3.1.1 **Development Objective:** The development objective of PARROC is to promote pro-poor socio-economic development and poverty reduction through public administration reform at provincial, district and commune levels.

3.1.2 **Project Purpose:** The project purpose is to improve the institutional and human capacities, the organizational set-up and the performances of local governments in the fields of development planning and public service delivery, management and monitoring.

3.1.3 **Expected Results:** The focus of PARROC is on strengthening local government capacity to promote pro-poor growth, poverty reduction and socio-economic development through the reform of the planning system and management of public service delivery. There are four Result Areas including (1) Improvement of planning and budgeting process at provincial, district and commune level; (2) improvement of local administrative and socio-economic delivery systems; (3) Improvement of the capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project related training; (4) Dissemination of lessons learned from the project;

3.2 **Current Project Status/Overall Progress:** The project started in July 2007 and has been under implementation for over three years now. Project MTE was conducted in June 2009 and its findings and recommendations ratified by the partners. MTE specifically emphasized that sustainability and impact aspects of the project needed to be addressed during the balance life of project through greater attention at district and provincial levels. Towards this end, Project's Annual Progress Report 2009 included a road map for enhanced project impact and sustainability and also proposed an extended project life till June 2012 with increased focus on provincial and district level to help the province replicate/roll out planning, budgeting and service delivery improvements piloted under the project. The report however was not formally ratified due to subsequent management issues. This also resulted in a relative loss of momentum, particularly with regard to the replication, roll out and sustainability aspects. Project has however continued with its regular 2010 plan activities.

3.3 **Progress against Result Areas:** Project progress against four main result areas has been as following:

Result Area 1: Physical and financial progress and outcomes have been quite satisfactory. Two participatory planning and budgeting cycles have been completed in six pilot communes and required capacity building training has been delivered at the commune and district level (in three pilot districts). A SEDP Planning Manual has been prepared and is now in the process of final revision and province-wide adoption. CDF was used as the main vehicle for decentralized budgeting and investment ownership. PPC plans to adopt this modality through government funding for the New Rural Communes and subsequent roll out to all communes.

Result Area 2: Physical and financial progress and outcomes have been quite satisfactory. Main achievements in this result area include preparation of a CDF Manual, establishment of computerised planning database in all districts and communes of the province (now in the process of finalization), One Stop Shop model in 6 pilot communes which is now being scaled up to all communes, ISO certification for three pilot districts (now in the process of expansion to all districts), improvements in poverty and women focus in commune development planning and implementation of pro-poor investments, and introduction of participatory M&E.

Result Area 3: Overall progress and outcomes have remained below par due to absence of a holistic action plan and road map for the capacity building of provincial training institutions.

Activities carried out so far are sporadic and disjointed with little synergy between government and project resource allocations.

Result Area 4: It remains the weakest of all project components and outcomes/impacts. It is primarily due to wrong assumptions and expectations from a provincial pilot project that is being expected to not only inform central level policy making but also promote forums for exchange of experience and knowledge sharing with other similar projects in other provinces. This kind of lead and initiative can only come from a higher central agency like MPI.

3.3.1 **Project Management:** Though the Project notionally boasts of an NPD and three Deputy NPDs to manage its affairs but in reality they are all part-time and holding very important responsibilities within provincial set-up and with very little time to spare for the project. The project thus became heavily reliant/dependent initially on International STA and subsequently the National BTC Coordinator managed to temporarily monopolise the management of PMU's day to day affairs including work planning, financial requests, procurements, progress reports, coordination among/between implementing agencies and districts etc. Other than these two positions, the PMU's structure is pretty thin in terms of management staffing and this kind of structure had serious implications for the project ownership and mainstreaming. Discontinuation of STA's inputs during 2010 and resignation of BTC Coordinator left the project without any full time leader to guide its activities, and the crucial third year of implementation, when the key aims like replication, consolidation, and sustainability were to be addressed, was not fully exploited. The project currently continues to operate in an ad-hoc environment with little certainty about future. This has demoralized the remaining PMU staff as well as implementing partners at provincial, district and commune level.

3.3.2 **Overall financial progress by end 2010:** Overall financial progress is projected to be Euro 1,593,000 by end 2010 against the total Belgian Contribution of Euro 2,500,000 or 64% while the progress against Vietnamese contribution is VND 4.317 billion against the budgeted contribution of VND 5.375 billion or 80%. The progress is quite good despite the lag suffered due to TA Management issues during 2010. After a slow start in the first year (2007 & 2008), the project progress picked up considerably during year 2 (2008-09) and has maintained the same level during year 3 with identification of activities for enhanced impact and rolling out. However this momentum suffered a bit after the departure of both STA and BTC National Coordinator around mid-2010 and subsequent slow down in disbursements due to uncertainties thrown up by their departure. Though the routine activities continued in a somewhat subdued manner, the previous vigour was no more there. Timely filling of the vacuum would have quickly arrested the situation. The physical and financial progress under four result areas has been as following:

- **Result Area 1:** Against a total revised budget of Euro 257,500, the financial progress is expected to be Euro 194,369 or 75%. In terms of physical progress, project has fared well in all inputs except for two inputs i.e. Assessment of implementation & development and Replication of PPB model.
- **Result Area 2:** Total revised budget for this result area is Euro 1,145,500 and expected progress till end 2010 is Euro 819,951 or 72%. Best progress has been against the CDF budget (87%) where as progress on training and various evaluations has been slow.
- **Result Area 3:** With a revised budget of Euro 74,000, this Result area has registered an expenditure of Euro 41,916 or 57% of the total. Substantial savings remain in preparation of training materials, IT equipment and training evaluation.

- **Result Area 4:** This result area has the revised budget of Euro 97,000 and total expenditure is only Euro 21,711 or 28% and is the slowest moving component. Notable achievement has been preparation of a communication strategy while substantial unutilized funds remain in “Networking with other pilot districts”, Web Portal, case studies and workshops.
- **General Means Budget:** The component covers project management, equipment and M&E and has a total budget of Euro 896,499 and the overall progress is Euro 510,368 or 57%. Bulk of unspent amount is under STA and Coordinator’s budget and Communication Expert Budget.

Summary Financial Progress Since Start (Euro)

	Planned Budget	Actual Expenditure	Disbursement Rate	Note
2007	216,000	50,370	23%	
2008	730,050	243,170	33%	
2009	916,180	655,425	72%	
2010	812,490	644,352	79%	Including projected expend in Nov-Dec 2010
Total Expend 2007-2010		1,593,317	64%	
Total Grant		2,470,500		
Balance		877,183	36%	

3.4 **Critical Questions:** Based on the Mission TOR and subsequent interaction with all stakeholders, the mission formulated following questions to guide the Mission’s work:

- Is project still relevant to National and local Planning and budgeting and PAR Reform Agenda:
- Are all stakeholders on same page in terms of Project’s ultimate Objective and Vision:
- How efficient the project has been thus far in attaining its targets and creating the desired impact:
- Is an extension in project implementation period desirable to improve project attainments, impact and sustainability?
- If such an extension is desirable and practicable, then what should be the priorities and focus of the project on all three levels of intended reform and what should be the scope and range of each to ensure better impact of the project?
- What financial and management adjustments would be required to make optimal use of the extended period for an enhanced impact and sustainability including any changes in Log-frame and performance indicators? Can CDF modality as a vehicle for decentralized PPB be adopted by provincial government?

3.5 **Key Findings:** Based on the fore-mentioned questions, the mission's main findings are as following:

3.5.1 **Project Relevance to National and Local Context:** Finalization of a planning decree/law by MPI by 2009 was cited as one of the key supporting development for this project in TFF. Project was supposed to both contribute to the formulation process of this decree and subsequently contribute to its implementation/roll out in Hau Giang. The decree has been delayed and project's linkages to national policy formulation have remained weak. However, project's objectives remain valid in the context of government's approach and commitment to CPRGS agenda, grassroots democracy, strengthening of Communes' administration, and Public Administration Reform. Project's direct and indirect contributions are strengthening provincial government's capacity, resolve and understanding in further deepening the aims and objectives of these national policy reforms in PPB and PAR. In any case, linking project's outcomes with a policy initiative at central level, over which it had no control, was overly ambitious. There are number of on-going and new Government programmes and initiatives which have direct relevance to project's aims and objectives. These include:

- National Target Programme for New Rural Development 2010-2020 to be implemented through a decentralized implementation approach. The capacities and guidelines being developed under PARROC will directly contribute to it.
- Development of SEDP 2011-2015 and its implementation
- Provincial Commitment to roll out PPB, PAR/PSD initiatives of the project to additional communes and districts starting 2011.

3.5.2 **Project Vision and Objectives – Sponsors and Government Perceptions:** There appears to be a degree of difference in perceptions about the ultimate vision and outcome of the project. Is this a pilot that would test certain approaches and its final outcome would be a tested model for possible adoption by the provincial and central government? If one goes by project's budgets and inputs, then that is the final output of the project i.e. replication strategy for future adoption by the government. A second interpretation is that it is a pilot which would demonstrate a model during initial phase and help the government replicate it at larger scale during later half of project. If one goes by the narrative of the TFF, then this perception is also valid. Seeds of this confusion about the project's ultimate aim were sown in TFF itself which says different things at different places e.g.

- *“Project aimed at piloting and testing policy implementation – provide feedback and lessons learned for further policy refining...”*
- *“Project will prepare a replication strategy....”*
- *“Project as this one require longer perspective – Institutional and organizational change needs 10-15 year support horizon. Important for both partners to see it as a part of longer term process of capacity building”*

This confusion had not happened had the project and BTC TA attempted to develop a shared vision for the project. Instead the project was implemented in line with TFF inputs mechanically. While the project name emphasizes reform at three levels, both in objectives and subsequent narrative, but then doesn't provide any specific activities, budgets and milestones for that to happen during the Phase II. The MTE did spell out required provincial level reform and steps for greater ownership but again did not provide the required roadmap,

budgets and steps for that to happen. The 2009 Progress Report provided a more elaborate Action Plan and targets along with proposed extension to 2012 but it never got formalized due to management issues mentioned before and lack of effective follow up by PPC or BTC. So, in absence of any formally adopted action plan for a roll out, the project, in provincial government's perception, remains what it provides for in TFF in terms of activities and budgets.

Phase I or II? One reason for higher expectations from project is its naming as Phase II whereas actually, for Hau Giang Province, it is Phase I since all the capacity and experience of previous project had stayed in Can Tho City after the split of Can Tho.

3.5.3 **Project Efficiency:** If judged purely from project inputs and outputs angle, the project has been quite efficient in its implementation till the middle of 2010. Project's financial progress and physical achievements have been quite satisfactory for a project of this nature. The recent slag during 2010 has more to do with the management problems rather than any lack of effort or resolve on the part of provincial government. Given the very thin management structure of the project, government deserves credit for still managing to keep the project going in the absence of external technical assistance during 2010. However, a major opportunity for rolling out the successful practices to more communes and at other levels was missed during 2010 which brought into play the question of extension. Some significant factors which contributed to recent adverse developments in terms of project efficiency in terms of the four result areas are:

- **Communication Gaps:** The project suffered from major communication gaps between and among partners at all levels and root-cause of that is the very structure of the PMU. Top management of PMU is all part-time, backed by positions of part-time STA, a full-time BTC Project Coordinator (who later acted as co-signatory as well on behalf of BTC) and support staff like accountant, facilitators and interpreter cum communication officer. The project thus became over-reliant on STA and Coordinator for all its vertical and horizontal reporting and communications and subsequent blocking of STA's dialogue with PMU and PPC by BTC Coordinator seriously affected PMU's communication with outside world and led to many misunderstandings - mostly ill founded - especially with regard to project progress and provincial commitment and ownership. STA was also totally dependent on the BTC Coordinator for his interaction with the provincial authorities both in terms of access as well as interpretation and the subsequent lack of trust between the two greatly constrained STA's ability to work effectively. The BTC Coordinator conveyed an impression to BTC and PSC Central membership that the province was not ready for a roll out and any balance savings should be diverted to the existing CDF fund for the pilot communes. Mission findings are to the contrary.
- **Management Structure:** PMU of PARROC has a very skeletal structure. According to TFF, this was so to ensure greater mainstreaming of project into existing government management structure. If the project management structure was kept very thin on the assumption that assigning additional charge to PPC and DPI/DOHA officers would ensure greater ownership and mainstreaming, then the idea has not worked very well. Those officers are already overstretched and can spare only limited time for project. In any case, having a project structure with separate management and financial procedures means that it would remain a parallel entity and not as such part of regular government system. For mainstreaming, the first basic requirement is use of existing government

structures and fund management mechanisms for implementation of activities and, for that, the only appropriate vehicle is budgetary support. That being the case, the project would have been better off with more regular management capacity in-house.

- **PAR Task Force, Staff Turnover etc:** PAR Task force is supposed to lead and coordinate the PAR related initiatives of the project and, by extension, province. However, the Task Force has mostly remained a peripheral institution due to absence of a strong leadership, a proper work methodology and a junior level membership from the concerned departments. It had no definite meeting schedule and no annual target oriented agenda. The Task Force meets whenever told to do so by PMU and without any independently developed strategy or work process of its own. High staff turnover at all levels remained another major challenge with no visible steps from the project or province to arrest this trend. So whatever capacity was built in pilot districts and communes in terms of SEDP formulation, bottom planning and implementation and PAR approaches was very quickly dissipated due to high turn-over of the trained staff.
- **Capacity Building:** Project lays considerable emphasis on capacity building at all levels however the overall success in this direction has been constrained by absence of a capable provincial service provider to bring the capacity building activities to a scale in both focal areas of PPB and PAR. Project attempted to build capacity of Provincial Political School and Community College to act as service providers in this field but both the institutions are still in their infancy in a newly created province and project interventions were also not backed by a holistic longer term action plan bringing together project resources and government resources and policy interventions.
- **Information Dissemination/Linkage to central Policy Formulation:** Project contribution to central policy formulation on PPB and PAR remained non-existent both in terms of linkages as well as information dissemination. The reason lies in the very nature of central-provincial relationship which still remains largely top-down. Expecting a small pilot project in a province to engage the big central level ministries in sharing of experience and adoption of this experience into central level policy formulation was a bit ambitious. A better option would have been to give a more effective coordinating and hand-holding role to the BTC's SPR Project in MPI in providing the requisite avenues and foras to make this happen.

3.5.4 **Sustainability:** While sustainability of project specific institutions like PMU, S-PMUs is neither expected nor feasible, the sustainability of project approach and interventions holds lot of promise if the issues related to project duration and future management structure are quickly addressed. This will enable both the provincial government and BTC to put in place the required support mechanisms for internalization of successful project approaches and interventions into provincial systems. If that happens, then some of the key project interventions that are likely to become sustainable over the long term, and reasons thereof, are as following:

- SEDP Planning Manual has been piloted and is now being finalized. PPC has expressed its strong commitment to adopt it in all the districts and communes for the next five year phase of SEDP planning and implementation.
- Planning Database is in the process of final fine-tuning now and is being supported by the project for adoption in the entire province. The criteria for New Rural Communes programme has also been imbedded in the database to ensure its wider future

usefulness and application. PPC has again expressed its strong resolve for its adoption and further development.

- ISO Certification for Districts has been attained for three pilot districts and is now being expanded province wide to other districts and provincial government is willing to chip in its own resources for this purpose.
- One-Stop-Shops (OSS) in pilot communes are considered to be much better functioning and equipped in pilot communes and are becoming a bench mark for the rest of the province. With project support, the provincial government is geared to bring further improvements in terms of capacity and performance of all OSS at commune level.
- Capacity built at commune and district level for decentralized investment management and SEDP formulation would probably be most lasting contribution of the project to both participatory planning approach and overall reform in the provincial planning process.

3.5.5 Project Impact: Despite its relatively small size and limited coverage, PARROC has already made very visible impact both in terms of PPB as well as PAR in Hau Giang. This impact is more visible at commune and provincial level and less at district and central policy level. This uneven spread of the impact is due to a combination of factors including relative focus of project resources and activities, design inadequacies and constraints in terms of objectives and TA support, difference in perceptions between implementers and sponsors, inadequate focus on capacity building and relatively short period for the successes to spread and take root. But still, some of the changes that have already taken place, and are being picked up for replication by the province, would in the long run prove to be a much bigger in their impact than the project's scale now suggests. These include SEDP Manual and its province-wise adoption, planning databases, strengthened One Stop Shops and adoption of CDF modality for the New Rural Communes Programme and expansion to other communes. The most important impact of the project is the change in thinking at all levels, particularly provincial level, in terms of decentralized planning and implementation and quality of service delivery.

3.5.6 Rationale/Justification for an Extension: An implicit understanding, and expectation, existed at provincial level for eventual extension of the project since the formulation of Annual Progress Report 2009 which contained a detailed future plan on the premise of an extended implementation period up to end 2012. The subsequent dip in project progress during 2010 due to management problems and lack of communication between partners meant that some of the main actions related to replication and increased provincial ownership (finalization of Planning Manual and its notification, roll out to additional communes, support to provincial SEDP 2010-2015 etc.) did not progress as per schedule. This has also slowed down the financial delivery during 2010. Preparation of 2011 SEDPs in pilot communes also remains on hold. If an extension is not agreed now, there is little time for addition of any new communes in roll out plan for this year and the existing pilot communes may only be barely able to complete their SEDPs for 2011. An extension up to June 2012 would not require any amendment in the financing agreement and can therefore be readily implemented. However, extension by this much would mean only one cycle of SEDP formulation for new communes/districts included in the coverage who should have ideally got two chances to further hone their skills. An extension up to December 2012 would allow the new communes at least two cycles of SEDP preparation but this would require amendment in the existing Financing Agreement and the provincial government does not appear to be keen on this due to fear of possible attendant delays. However, MPI and BTC are both confident that an

amendment in Financing Agreement would not pose much problems/delays and therefore extension up to December 2012 should be contemplated provided the available resources allow that. Considering all the prevailing circumstances and Provincial Government's keen commitment to scale up the project's successful approaches, an extension in Project period up to December 2012 is desirable and justified on following grounds:

- To build on some of the very good and solid work done by the project in pilot communes and districts and Provincial Government's commitment to scale up this good beginning;
- To utilize the available balance budget for scaling up the successful approaches and enhancing the project impact;
- To further invest in supportive institutional and regulatory activities for enhancing the sustainability prospects of the project, including development of a transition strategy for gradual takeover of PMU/project functions and activities by relevant government departments.

3.5.7 Priorities for the Extended Period: Based on a replication/roll out plan prepared earlier by STA as part of 2009 Progress Report, and on mission's field work and meetings with stakeholders, and based on the consensus recommendations of provincial stakeholders' workshop, following priorities have emerged for the balance extended period:

3.5.7.1 Priorities in Planning Reform, PAR, Capacity Building and Sustainability:

- Finalize and issue SEDP Manual immediately;
- Finalize and put in operation the planning database;
- Continue the PPB and CDF in piloted communes;
- Scale up PPB in the whole province in incremental manner, starting with implementation in all communes in three pilot districts in 2011;
- Provide targeted support for implementation of New Rural Development Strategy including development of provincial guidelines and linkages to PPB;
- Decentralization of fund management and investment ownership be institutionalized for government budgets also.
- Scale up the improved standard OSS to the whole province, starting with implementation in all communes in three pilot districts in 2011;
- Scale up ISO certification for all districts;
- Equip OSS offices with adequate facilities office equipment;
- Computerize public administration services in 03 piloted districts and communes (currently being piloted in Nga Bay Town)

3.5.7.2 Project Activities that are proven success and should be scaled up:

- Participatory Planning and Budgeting;
- Decentralized financial management and commune investment ownership;
- Further strengthening of ISO and OSS through training and provision of equipment for better service provision.

3.5.7.3 The level, range and timeframe for scaling up:

- Start with scaling up of PPB and OSS in districts and communes in three pilot districts in 2011 and then scale up to whole province;

- Start from lower level to higher level and from simple easy to do things to more complex ones;
- Complete scaling up of PPB and OSS/PSD in all communes of three districts by June 2012.

3.5.7.4 Ways to improve Sustainability of project interventions:

- Early issuing of MPI Decree on PPB/SEDP;
- Finalize the issue Provincial SEDP Manual;
- Clarify and issue guidelines for PPC Decision 3090;
- Build additional capacity at all three levels in PPB;
- Integrate all development resources (central, provincial and peoples' contribution) and allocate funds to 6 pilot communes in CDF mode for SEDP 2011; Government budget be considered to replace CDF fund;
- Planning cycle for SEDP of communes be shortened and it should cover Sept to January from plan submission to approval.
- Strengthen provincial training institutions capacity for delivery of PPB and PAR related training programmes.

3.5.7.5 Additional Capacity required for scaling up of PARROC Model

- Early recruitment of a full time Coordinator/Project Manager in PMU and drop STA Position.
- Improved provincial control and ownership of PMU/Project operations including simplified co-management system
- Train at least two or three staff members at each implementing institution in PPB
- Create full time planner's position at commune/ward level
- Scale up OSS staff capacity building through proper training especially skills in effective public dealing
- Expand the scope of training for PPB and include other departments, mass organizations and Village Heads in its coverage.

3.5.8 **Provincial Ownership and Mainstreaming:** The existing PMU structure is heavily reliant on the positions of STA and BTC Coordinator for the implementation of project activities which limits provincial oversight and ownership. Given the past experience, and the difficulties in securing services of an International STA quickly, and the limited implementation period available at the fag end of the project for such high cost STA, recruitment of another STA is not a sound option and the balance funding for this position should be reallocated. As for the BTC Coordinator position, the nomenclature of the post and its TOR need a revisit to align them more with local institutional culture and project's management needs. A serious consideration needs to be given to assumption of a more hands on responsibility by a government appointed Vice Director in the PMU rather than the current arrangement of part-time Deputy Directors. It could be a junior/newly promoted Vice Director from either DOHA or DPI.

3.5.9 Information Dissemination/Linkage with Central Policy Formulation on PPB and PAR:

A provincial pilot project is not an appropriate vehicle for influencing central level policy formulation through its own initiatives. It needs a central level institution's support for this purpose – an institution that owns the project objectives and its outcomes and creates the required forums for the project to share and disseminate its experiences and successes with other central policy making forums and peer provinces. In terms of PPB and PAR, the two

central level institutions with the required influence and clout are MPI and MOHA and both of them are represented on PARROC Steering Committee. They should create the enabling environment for the project to do the information sharing for central policy formulation. An important guidance and technical back-stopping role in this regard can be played by BTC's SPR project at MPI which has the requisite presence and expertise to link up PARROC experience with central policy making.

- 3.6 **CONCLUSIONS:** Based on Mission's findings, following conclusions are drawn:
- 3.6.1 **Relevance:** PARROC remains very much relevant to national and provincial context despite delays in finalization of Planning Decree. Even without such a decree, provinces have sufficient space for adoption of decentralized planning and implementation approaches and improvement of service delivery. SEDP has become main vehicle for development planning at the central and provincial level and PARROC can greatly help the province in next five year cycle formulation as well as supportive guidelines and capacity building across the province.
- 3.6.2 **Perceptions:** The difference in perceptions between province and BTC about the ultimate objective and outcome of the project was more due to communication gaps and inappropriate management structure. Better quality communication on regular basis would have helped both sides to reach a consensus quickly. As things stand now, province seems to be committed to rolling out the successful practices of the project both in PPB and PAR and initial steps in this regard have already been taken.
- 3.6.3 **Efficiency:** Project has been quite efficient in achieving its physical and financial targets in the first two result areas and General Means Budget. However it has not been that efficient in Result areas 3 and 4 and it would require considerable effort during the remaining project period to improve performance in these two result areas. Appropriate changes in project management structure would greatly help in this regard.
- 3.6.4 **Sustainability:** Project specific institutions like PMU, SPMU and PAR Task Force will not last beyond project however many of the project initiated practices and tools hold great promise in terms of sustainability because they are already in the process of large scale replication/adoption by provincial government.
- 3.6.5 **Impact:** Project's has had a very positive impact in number of areas in a short period of time in number of areas. Most important is the change in thinking and approach to PPB and PAR at all levels and PPC's resolve to adopt many of these practices and approaches under provincial budget.
- 3.6.6 **Extension:** PARROC type projects that aim at larger policy and regulatory reform need a much longer time frame than the current four year life of the project. Further, the management problems encountered by the project in its most critical year of potential scaling up also calls for rethinking about project duration. Keeping these two factors in view plus the amount of available balance, there is a very strong case for extension of project up to December 2012.
- 3.6.7 **Priorities During Extension:** Main priorities of the project during the extended period should be improved management structure, focus on scaling up the successes under both project and government budgets and increased focus on result areas 3 and 4.
- 3.6.8 **Provincial Ownership:** The management structure of the project should be revamped to increase government oversight and ownership of the project. This may also require simplifying the co-management regulations to give more control and say to province.

4 MISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 **Mission Recommendations:** The Mission recommendations are anchored in the main mission findings and the broad agreements reached during the provincial Wrap Up and Debriefing to the PSC Members in Hanoi. These recommendations also take into account the fact that the basic requirement of project rationale i.e. finalization of a National Planning Decree, is yet to materialize and, therefore, these recommendations are aimed at maximizing project's outcomes and impacts within the prevailing national and provincial PPB and PAR environment.
- 4.1.1 **Stakeholders' Perceptions:** In order to prevent any repeat of experience during 2010 in terms of stakeholder perceptions about project's aims and objectives and its performance, BTC and PPC shall adopt measures to ensure greater and in-depth interaction during the remaining project period. Apart from the two regular PSC meetings, BTC Programme Manager shall have one detailed visit of the province every quarter to review project progress and have detailed discussions on Annual Plan Progress, issues and impediments and possible way forward.
- 4.1.2 **Project Extension:** Project implementation period should be extended to December 2012 to cover for the time lost during 2010 in terms of scaling up/roll out and enable the new communes to complete at least two SEDP formulation cycles and their implementation. This extended period will also allow the project to assist the provincial government in mainstreaming some of the successful SEDP/PPB and PAR practices into government systems including implementation through government budgets.
- 4.1.3 **Project Priorities during Extended Period:** Following shall be the project priorities during the extended period and work plan and budget for 2011-2012 shall reflect these priorities:
- Finalize and notify SEDP Manual before January 2011 through a provincial decision as the legal basis for SEDP formulation;
 - Finalize and put in operation the planning database by January 2011;
 - Continue the PPB and CDF in pilot communes and consider provision of provincial budgets in CDF mode where project CDF budget has exhausted;
 - Scale up PPB in the whole province in incremental manner, starting with implementation in all communes in three pilot districts in 2011; Build additional capacity at all three levels in PPB;
 - Integrate all development resources (central, provincial and peoples' contribution) and allocate funds to 6 pilot communes in CDF mode for SEDP 2011; Government budget be considered to replace CDF fund;
 - Planning cycle for SEDP of communes be shortened and it should cover Sept to January from plan submission to approval.

- Provide targeted support for implementation of New Rural Development Strategy including development of provincial guidelines and linkages to PPB;
- Decentralization of fund management and investment ownership will be pilot tested under government budget in New Rural Communes (12) plus some additional communes.
- Create full time planner's position at commune/ward level from provincial budget.
- Scale up the improved standard OSS to the whole province, starting with implementation in all communes in three pilot districts in 2011; scope of training for the related staff shall be expanded to cover for the high turnover of staff and focus on effective public dealing skills;
- Scale up ISO certification for all districts;
- Expand the scope of training for PPB and include other departments, mass organizations and Village Heads in its coverage.
- Equip OSS offices with adequate facilities and office equipment. Project to support remaining communes in three pilot districts while government budgets will be deployed for rest of communes in other districts;
- Computerize all public administration services in 03 piloted districts and communes (currently being piloted in Nga Bay Town).
- Strengthen provincial training institutions' capacity for delivery of PPB and PAR related training programmes.
- Put more emphasis on experience sharing with other provinces through purpose oriented visits to provinces that are known for meaningful progress in decentralized planning and implementation.
- Early recruitment of a full time Project Manager in PMU. The positions of STA and BTC Coordinator be dropped (which would require revisiting the existing STA contract with BTC).
- Improved provincial control and ownership of PMU/Project operations including simplified co-management system. Place a Vice Director as head of PMU from either DOHA or DPI.

4.1.4 **Replication and Roll Out Approach:** Replication and roll during the balance extended period should be based on following principles:

- The roll out of successful PPB and PAR initiatives under PARROC will be incremental starting in three pilot districts during 2011 and then to all communes in remaining districts from 2012.

- Finalizing of the regulatory and process framework to support this roll out shall be the first priority i.e. finalization and formal notification of Planning Manual, early completion and operation of planning database, defining the linkage with New Rural Communes Programme and preparation of guidelines for its implementation including decentralized planning and investment ownership.
- Revamping of existing **CDF Manual** into a comprehensive decentralized investment management guidelines for adoption during the rollout phase for both the additional communes under the project as well as New Rural Communes Programme. This should be linked to a comprehensive training/capacity building programme for the key commune and district staff and building of required capacity of the Provincial Political School and Community College to deliver the required training.
- Provincial Government shall pilot test **provision of state budgets in communes** of three pilot districts in CDF mode with an upfront indicative commitment for planning purpose. Project shall assist the government through appropriate TA to develop required provincial decrees, regulations and guidelines.
- An action plan shall be prepared, along with requisite budgets, for **building capacity of Provincial Political School** to become the premier service provider for all PPB and PAR capacity building trainings for the provincial, district and commune functionaries.
- PMU shall prepare a proper **action plan for information dissemination and linkages** with other provinces and central level through study tours and information exchanges. BTC's SPR project in MPI shall assist the PMU in organizing central level information exchange opportunities and forums. PARROC shall bear the cost for these events whereas technical support and facilitation shall come from SPR Project.
- A **Transition Strategy** will be developed, with assistance from National TA, for the gradual transfer of project responsibilities to relevant government agencies during the last year of project implementation.

4.1.5 **Commune Development Fund:** Some good initiatives, apart from construction of rural infrastructure, were implemented in the pilot communes through the CDF. The CDF now stands almost exhausted (projected balance of the CDF by the end of 2010 at about Euro 60,000). It would however be useful to continue a degree of support to the original six pilot communes for those soft initiatives. The project shall divert additional Euro 30,000 to CDF for support to soft initiatives of 6 pilot communes in the 2011 work plan for capacity building, job creation, poverty reduction etc. More importantly, project should assist the province in developing a framework for replacement of project funding in CDF with funding from State Budgets and National Target Programmes on regular basis, especially to the communes in phase one of replication. Any future savings in General Means Budget be diverted to CDF as well.

4.1.6 **Provincial Task Force on PAR:** Rather than a project specific body for reform, this should be converted into a Provincial spearhead for PAR and its leadership and membership be enhanced to give it the required influence and clout for meaningful contribution to PAR policy making and its effective implementation even beyond project life. It should become an effective implementation and oversight/steering instrument for the National PAR Policy. To give it that kind of capacity and clout, the Task Force should be headed by a Vice Chairman of PPC and its members should include Provincial Directors of all the key Departments and

Chairmen of District PPC. PMU should provide the required TA and secretarial support during the remaining period of project including support in development of an Action Plan for Provincial PAR and tools to guide its implementation and oversight.

- 4.1.7 **Capacity Building:** Province spends about VND 20 billion annually from state budget for capacity building. However, the delivery of capacity building on PPB and PAR by project and government is constrained by lack of adequate relevant training capacity within the province. Project's existing interventions with provincial training institutions (Political School and Community College) to develop their capacity for PPB and PSD related training delivery have been limited in scope and ambition. In the remaining period, the project will focus its attention on Political School and help it develop a proper plan for its capacity building. The school shall be assisted in creation of a Public Sector Management Department catering to training needs of government sector in PPB, PAR and Financial Management. The project may contribute in shape of equipment and assured supply of trainees during the initial phase and the School should develop the curricula and engage required human resource. It can start as a dedicated cell within the School to manage and coordinate such training and gradually develop into a full fledged department. A proper action plan will be prepared for this purpose in close interaction with the Provincial Political School. Appropriate TA shall be recruited to assist in this plan formulation and approved plan should be financed by Project as well as provincial government. Current cost norms of the political school shall also be revised to enable the school to charge for various training programmes in a flexible manner so as to enable it to engage quality trainers.
- 4.1.8 **Information Dissemination/Linkages:** PMU shall develop a clear strategy, as part of AWP 2011, for information dissemination and outward linkages for experience sharing with other provinces and central level. It should request required guidance and support from BTC's SPR project in MPI in this regard. The strategy should cover three distinct areas i.e. provincial level dissemination to provincial government and public at large; inter-provincial with other progressive provinces who are known for making meaningful progress in PPB and PAR; and Central level covering central Ministries related to PPB and PAR and donor agencies. The provincial level activities currently cover newspaper articles and videos/TV programmes. This needs to be expanded to include periodic information sharing lessons with PPC key staff, Party key staff and Provincial peoples Council reps. Inter-provincial visits should focus on provinces with similar projects and provinces with relatively longer history of decentralization reform e.g. Tuyen Quang. For central level, the project should benefit more from available assistance in BTC SPR project and give them lead in organizing appropriate events for information sharing.
- 4.1.9 **Management and Provincial Ownership:** To improve project management and efficiency and to ensure greater provincial ownership of the project and its activities, following changes shall be made in the extended period:
- PPC shall appoint a young Vice Director from either DOHA or DPI who shall assign 70% of his time to project/PMU activities and also act as Secretary to the PSC.
 - Positions of STA and BTC Coordinator shall be dropped for the remainder of the project and instead a National Project Manager shall be recruited to provide assistance to the Vice Director in managing the project.
 - Current Co-Management regulations will be reviewed so as to give greater control and responsibility to Project Director/Provincial Government in management of project resources. This may also provide a model for future BTC projects.
 - All future PMU recruitments and TA engagement shall be done with full involvement of PMU and PPC.

- 4.2 **Draft Work Plan and Budget 2011-2012:** Based on the agreements reached during the mission, priorities identified during the provincial stakeholders' workshop and mission recommendations listed above, the Mission has prepared an indicative work plan for 2011-2012. The plan prepared by PMU for 2011 was also taken into consideration in this exercise. The draft work plan is attached as **Annex 5.5**.
- 4.3 **Follow Up Actions:** Based on the agreements reached during the mission and recommendations listed above, following follow up actions would be required on part of the project partners:
- 4.3.1 **Financing Agreement Amendment:** Current financing agreement for PARROC expires in June 2012. However, the project is recommended to be extended up to December 2012 so there would be a need to amend the existing Financing Agreement between governments of Vietnam and Belgium to provide the extended cover up to December 2012.
- 4.3.2 **TFF Amendment and Simplified Co-Management Arrangements:** BTC would be required to consult BTC Head Office on the level and extent of Co-Management simplification that could enable greater delegation of financial management and decision making to the PMU and Vice Director/PPC. TFF will need to be amended for following aspects:
- Duration of the project up to December 2012
 - Project Management structure reflecting induction of a full time Vice Director of PMU and Project Manager (instead of BTC Coordinator)
 - Dropping/curtailment of STA Position and reallocation of balance budget to CDF
 - Revamped Task Force Composition
 - Incremental induction of state/NTP budgets into pilot and roll-out communes to finance CDF
- 4.3.3 **Approval of Draft Work Plan and Budget for 2011:** The draft AWP/B for 2011 and 2012, attached to Mission Report need to be reviewed quickly and formally approved by PSC so that the PMU can quickly proceed with the priority actions.
- 4.3.4 **Recruitment of Project Manager instead of BTC Coordinator:** BTC and PPC hau Giang should quickly finalize the recruitment of a Project Manager for PMU, instead of BTC Coordinator, so that the PMU has full time capable support available quickly.
- 4.3.5 **Appointment of a Vice Director in PMU:** PPC should quickly identify a suitable young Vice Director, in consultation with BTC, to be the head of PMU. The Vice Director shall spend at least 70% of his time for the project and rest in his parent organization. In selection, due weight should be given to candidates potential for future growth so that province has someone capable and experienced for future donor funded projects.

5 ANNEXES

5.1 Mission TOR and Schedule

**PARROC HAU GIANG
TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF THE STRATEGIC REFLECTION MISSION
(FIELD VISIT FROM 4 -19 NOVEMBER 2010)**

NOV 2010	Activity	Responsibility	Venue/Location
26/10 to 31/10	Desk Review of Project Documents	Team Leader and National Consultant	Home based plus Hanoi BTC
01/10	Meeting with Res Rep BTC PM: Meeting with Poverty Cluster of UNDP PM: Meeting with MPI	BTC/ Team Leader	Hanoi
02/10	AM: Meeting with Mr. Olivier Donnet PM: Meeting with Technical Support Team for UNICEF Project on Strengthening Capacity and M&E in An Giang province PM: Meeting with Mr. Luyen, MOHA Meeting with Mr. Quang World Bank	BTC Team Leader	Hanoi
03/11	Travel to Hau Giang	BTC/Mission	Hau Giang
Thu 4/11	7:30-11:00: Meeting provincial PSC members and PMU 13:30 -15:00: Introduction the coordination/collaboration between DPI, DOH, DOF and DARD.	The team/BTC RR/PMU Director or Standing Vice Director Representatives of the Task Force (Task Force Team Leader)	Meeting room no.2 – PPC Office PMU Office
Fri 5/11	7:30-11:00: Visit Nga Bay Town; meet with town's PMU, Finance-Planning Division, planning staff to discuss	The team/PMU. <i>Nga Bay Town's PC to prepare for the meeting.</i>	Office of the Town's PC

Mission Report: PARROC Strategic Reflection Mission

	<p>about project progress, outcomes and results, advantage and challenges and future orientation.</p> <p>13:30 -15:00: Visit Hiep Loi commune and discuss in details about planning method and implementation, its impact as well as advantages & challenges, future orientation.</p> <p>The team stays in Vi Thanh city.</p>	<p>The team/PMU. <i>Hiep Loi CPC to prepare for the meeting.</i></p>	<p>Hiep Loi CPC office and sites</p>
Sat 6/11	<p>7:30-11:00: Visit Phung Hiep district ; meet with district PMU, Finance-Planning Division, planning staff to discuss about project progress, outcomes and results, advantage and challenges and future orientation.</p> <p>13:30-17:00: Visit Hiep Hung commune, Phung Hiep district ; discuss with CPC and beneficiaries. Stay in Vi Thanh City</p>	<p>The team/PMU. <i>Phung Hiep DPC to prepare for the meeting.</i></p> <p>The team/PMU. <i>Hiep Hung CPC to prepare for the meeting.</i></p>	<p>Phung Hiep DPC office</p> <p>Hiep Hung CPC office and sites</p>
Sun 7/11	<p>13:30-17:00: Visit Long My district ; meet with district PMU, Finance-Planning Division, planning staff to discuss about project progress, outcomes and results, advantage and challenges and future orientation.</p> <p>13:30-17:00: Visit Thuan Hung commune, Long My district ; discuss in details with CPC and beneficiaries about progress, impact, challenges and future orientation.</p>	<p>The team/PMU. <i>Long My DPC to prepare for the meeting.</i></p> <p>The Team/PMU Thuan Hung CPC to prepare for the meeting</p>	<p>DPC Office</p> <p>CPC Office and sites</p>

Mission Report: PARROC Strategic Reflection Mission

	The team stays in Vi Thanh city		
Mon 8/11	0730-1100 Visit one non-project district (Vi Thanh City) 13.30- 17.00 Visit one non-project commune (Tan Tien Commune)	To be decided in consultation with PMU	
Mon 9/11	The team works in the PMU Office 1330 to 1730: Visits to Political School and Community College	Complete update on results and proposals for future project work/duration/ budgets Present capacity and role in capacity building activities and potential for future development of these training institutions	
Tue 10/11	Mission work and circulation of workshop agenda and invitations	The Mission/PMU	PMU
Wed 11/11	07-30 – 1730 Stakeholders workshop	PMU/PPC The team/BTC/PMU/relevant departments/ representatives of three pilot districts and six communes	PMU
Thurs 12/11	Prepare Workshop report and update Aide Memoire	The team	Hau Giang PPC
Sat 13/11	Prepare Workshop report and update Aide Memoire; Translations	The team	Hau Giang PPC
Sun 14/11	Submit draft Aide Memoire to PSC and BTC for comments	The team/BTC/PMU	Hau Giang
Mon 15/11	0730-1100 Wrap up Meeting 1230 Depart for Hanoi	BTC, PPC, Mission	Vi Thanh Hau Giang
Tue 16/11	Debriefing and Report writing	The team	Hau Giang
Wed 17/11-22/11	Report Writing – Furnish first draft for comments	The Team	Hanoi- Lahore

5.2 **STAKEHOLDERS' WORKSHOP – 12 NOV 2010**

1. **SRM Mission Purpose:** The purposes of the Strategic Reflection Mission (SRM) is to facilitate a participative and constructive reflection on the way forward, by facilitating and nourishing dialogue and reflection between the key stakeholders on:
 - (i) how relevant and consistent the project activities are to the overall priorities of the authorities (central, provincial, district and commune level) and how its activities and objectives are perceived by different stakeholders;
 - (ii) Possible improvements in approach and the logical framework for the balance of the project – inclusive a possible prolongation of the time frame considering the remaining budget of the project - to further strengthen the ownership and integration of the project within the three local administrative levels as well as capacity building at the three levels.
 - (iii) Possible linkages with other programs working on the same objectives;
2. **Main Issues and Concerns:** Main issues and concerns identified so far by the Mission in its interaction at all levels are:
 - (i) Slow progress against agreed timelines with only 52% of budget disbursement and about seven months of project period remaining;
 - (ii) A difference in perceptions about projects ultimate aim and objective;
 - (iii) Impediments to scaling up project's successful interventions and lack of progress on district and provincial level PPB and PAR reform;
 - (iv) Ownership and sustainability issues during and beyond project life;
 - (v) Lack of progress on some of the key MTE and 2009 Progress Report recommendations;
 - (vi) Lingering staffing and management issues;
3. **Workshop Purpose:** The main purpose of the workshop is to facilitate dialogue between all stakeholders for a critical evaluation of the performance of PARROC till date, draw lessons from the successes and failures, and think objectively about the project's future direction and scope. A subsidiary objective is to engage all stakeholders in collective thinking about the project's future so that the mission concludes its work on the basis of a consensus framework.
4. **Workshop Venue and Timing:** PPC Office, Vi Thanh Town, Hau Giang Province. It would be a whole day workshop starting at 0800 hours and finishing at 1630 hrs with breaks in between for lunch and tea/coffee breaks. Schedule of workshop sessions is attached in Annex I. Workshop will be chaired by the PPC leader/NPD.

5. **Workshop Organization and Structure:** The Workshop will be organized in three distinct working sessions, each covering a critical aspect of this strategic reflection. The workshop sessions and subject matter for each session is attached as Annex I.
6. **Workshop Participants:** The Workshop will involve all key stakeholders of PARROC, managers and implementers. This will include PMU, key Steering Committee Members and Task Force Members from the province. Districts will be represented by heads of District PMUs in 3 pilot districts. Chairman CPC of the six pilot communes will represent the communes. 3 additional commune chairmen will be invited from non-participating communes in the pilot districts to get their perspective in discussions on key PPB and PAR issues. Heads of Provincial Political School and Community College will also participate. BTC will be represented by its Programme Officer. SRM members will participate as well as facilitate the discussions and consensus building. List of Participants is attached as Annex II.
7. **Workshop Output:** Workshop output is expected to be a set of consensus based recommendations about the projects future direction and approach including duration, priority focus areas for consolidation/replication and revised target/resource allocation. It is also expected to contribute, though indirectly, to the future direction of PPB and PAR in Hau Giang Province.

Appendix I

WORKSHOP ORGANIZATION, STRUCTURE AND SCHEDULE

Session I:		Time: 0800 to 0945	
<u>Time</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>By</u>
0730-0800		Participant Registration	PMU
0800-0810	Plenary Session	Workshop Introduction	PMU
0810-0835	Plenary Session	Reflection on Project Progress	PMU
		- Physical and financial so far	
		- By end 2010	
		- Successes, issues and challenges	
		- Options beyond Dec 2010	
0835-0935	Plenary Session	Open discussion on PMU Presentation	
0935-0945	Plenary Session	Conclusion	
	Mission/NPD		
0945-1000	Tea/Coffee Break		
Session II:		<u>Time: 1000 to 1530 (including lunch break)</u>	
1000-1015	Plenary Session	Planning for future – Project and beyond	Mission
		- What the project objective says	
		- Options for scaling up	
		- Sustainability questions	
		- Questions for the Group Work	
1015-1130	Group Work on flip charts	Group 1: Commune Chairmen Plus 2 members of Task Force Group 2: District PMUs plus 2 members of Task force Group 3: Province + PMU+ PPS/College plus remaining members of task force	

Each Group will select a chairman/facilitator and a secretary/note taker and prepare their recommendations in writing on flip charts or PP slides on the questions presented in the plenary session. The Chairman will present the findings in plenary session in afternoon.

(Session II continues)

1330-1450	Group 1 Presentation
1350-1400	Q&A
1400-1420	Group 2 Presentation

1420-1430 Q&A
1430-1450 Group 3 Presentation
1450-1500 Q&A

1500-1530 *Coffee/Tea Break*

Session III

1530-1630 Key findings/recommendations of workshop
Mission/NPD

Discussion and consensus building

16h30-16h45 Conclusion

NPD/BTC

Appendix II

LIST OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

<u>Level</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Nos</u>
Provincial Level		
	- PSC members	3
	- PMU	7
	- PAR Task Force	7
	- PPS, Community College	2
District Level		
	- Head District PMU	5
	- District Planning off	5
	- Head District DOHA	5
	- Chief Administration	5
Commune Level		
	- Chairmen PPC (Pilot)	6
	- Chairmen other communes	3
BTC and Mission		4

5.3 Conformed Aide Memoir and List of Persons Met

**PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REFORM AND ROLLOUT OF CPRGS IN
HAU GIANG PROVINCE (VIE 004 03 01)
STRATEGIC REFLECTION MISSION**

**AIDE MEMOIR
(Conformed/Agreed Version)¹**

17 NOVEMBER 2010

13. **The Project:** Public Service Reform and Roll out of CPRGS in Hau Giang Province (PARROC) project was signed between Kingdom of Belgium and Socialist Republic of Vietnam on 17 June 2007. This Euro 2,750,000 (Belgian 2,500,000 and GoV 250,000) four year project (June 2007-June 2011) is aimed at promoting pro-poor socio-economic development and poverty reduction through public administration reform at the provincial, district and commune levels. Towards that end, it is aimed at improving capacity and performance of local governments in development planning, budgeting and public service delivery. The project is also expected to contribute through its pilot interventions and lessons learnt to the formulation of new policy decree at central level, formulation of SEDP for 2010-2015 and next round of PAR. To achieve these aims, the project focuses on four result areas, namely:

- ***Result Area 1: Improvement of planning and budgeting process and systems at provincial, district and commune level***
- ***Result Area 2: Improvement of local administrative and socio-economic service delivery systems***
- ***Result Area 3: Improvement of capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project related training***
- ***Result Area 4: Dissemination of lessons learned from the project***

14. **The Mission Objectives and TOR:** The purpose of Strategic Reflection Mission (SRM) is to facilitate a participative and constructive reflection on the way forward, by facilitating and nourishing dialogue and reflection between the key stakeholders on:

- (iv) How relevant and consistent the project activities are to the overall priorities of the authorities (central, provincial, district and commune level) and how its activities and objectives are perceived by different stakeholders;
- (v) Possible improvements in approach and the logical framework for the balance of the project – inclusive a possible prolongation of the time frame considering the remaining budget of the project - to further strengthen the ownership and integration of the project within the three local administrative levels as well as capacity building at the three levels.
- (vi) Possible linkages with other programs working on the same objectives.

¹ Incorporating agreements reached on key recommendations and follow up actions during Wrap up meeting on 15th Nov at Hau Giang and debriefing to PSC members at Central on level on 17 Nov 2010.

15. **Mission Process and Methodology:** The Mission adopted a very participative approach to carry out the purposes of the Mission and held extensive discussions and dialogues with all key stakeholders at central, provincial, district, commune and village level. Mission Schedule and list of persons met is attached as Annex 1. This dialogue process was capped by a full day consultative stakeholders' workshop at Vi Thanh Town with participation from BTC, MPI, PPC, Provincial PAR Task Force, all the districts and six pilot and three non-project participating communes. Specific questions related to Mission TOR were placed before the workshop participants for an open and frank discussion. Key recommendations of the workshop have contributed to Mission's recommendations contained in this aide memoir.

16. **Current Status of the Project:** The project started in July 2007 and has been under implementation for over three years now. Project MTE was conducted in June 2009 and its findings and recommendations ratified by the partners. MTE specifically emphasized that sustainability and impact aspects of the project needed to be addressed during the balance life of project through greater attention at district and provincial levels. Towards this end, Project's Annual Progress Report 2009 included a road map for enhanced project impact and sustainability and also proposed an extended project life till June 2012 with increased focus on provincial and district level to help the province replicate/roll out planning, budgeting and service delivery improvements piloted under the project. The report however was not formally ratified due to subsequent management issues involving STA and BTC National Coordinator which eventually led to departure of both. This also resulted in a relative loss of momentum, particularly with regard to the replication, roll out and sustainability aspects. Project has however continued with its regular 2010 plan activities.

17. With NPD and three Deputy NPDs all being part-time, the project was heavily reliant on STA and BTC Coordinator for managing its day to day affairs including work planning, financial requests, procurements, progress reports, coordination among/between implementing agencies and districts etc. Departure of those two left the project without any full time leader to guide its activities, and the crucial third year of implementation, when the key aims like replication, consolidation, and sustainability were to be addressed, was not fully exploited. The project currently continues to operate in an ad-hoc environment with little certainty about future. This has demoralized the remaining PMU staff as well as implementing partners at provincial, district and commune level.

18. **Overview of Project Progress:** Project's overall financial progress by end 2010 is projected to be Euro 1,593,000 against the total Belgian Contribution of Euro 2,500,000 or 64% while the progress against Vietnamese contribution is VND 4.317 billion against the budgeted contribution of VND 5.375 billion or 80%. The progress is quite good despite the lag suffered due to TA Management issues during 2010. After a slow start in the first year (2007 & 2008), the project progress picked up considerably during year 2 (2008-09) and has maintained the same level during year 3 with identification of activities for enhanced impact and rolling out. However this momentum suffered a bit after the departure of both STA and BTC National Coordinator around mid-2010 and subsequent slow down in disbursements due to uncertainties thrown up by their departure. Though the routine activities continued in a somewhat subdued manner, the previous vigour was no more there. Timely filling of the vacuum would have quickly arrested the situation. The physical and financial progress under four result areas has been as following:

- **Result Area 1:** Against a total revised budget of Euro 257,500, the financial progress is expected to be Euro 194,369 or 75%. In terms of physical progress, project has

fared well in all inputs except for two inputs i.e. Assessment of implementation & development and Replication of PPB model.

- **Result Area 2:** Total revised budget for this result area is Euro 1,145,500 and expected progress till end 2010 is Euro 819,951 or 72%. Best progress has been against the CDF budget (87%) where as progress on training and various evaluations has been slow.
- **Result Area 3:** With a revised budget of Euro 74,000, this Result area has registered an expenditure of Euro 41,916 or 57% of the total. Substantial savings remain in preparation of training materials, IT equipment and training evaluation.
- **Result Area 4:** This result area has the revised budget of Euro 97,000 and total expenditure is only Euro 21,711 or 28% and is the slowest moving component. Notable achievement has been preparation of a communication strategy while substantial unutilized funds remain in “Networking with other pilot districts”, Web Portal, case studies and workshops.
- **General Means Budget:** The component covers project management, equipment and M&E and has a total budget of Euro 896,499 and the overall progress is Euro 510,368 or 57%. Bulk of unspent amount is under STA and Coordinator’s budget and Communication Expert Budget.

Summary Financial Progress Since Start (Euro)

	Planned Budget	Actual Expenditure	Disbursement Rate	Note
2007	216,000	50,370	23%	
2008	730,050	243,170	33%	
2009	916,180	655,425	72%	
2010	812,490	644,352	79%	Including projected expend in Nov-Dec 2010
Total Expend 2007-2010		1,593,317	64%	
Total Grant		2,470,500		
Balance		877,183	36%	

19. **Critical Questions and Issues:** Based on the Mission TOR and subsequent interaction with all stakeholders, following critical questions emerged in the course of mission’s work:

- *Is project still relevant to National and local Planning and budgeting and PAR Reform Agenda:*
- *Are all stakeholders on same page in terms of Project’s ultimate Objective and Vision:*
- *How efficient the project has been thus far in attaining its targets and creating the desired impact:*
- *Is an extension in project implementation period desirable to improve project attainments, impact and sustainability?*

- *If such an extension is desirable and practicable, then what should be the priorities and focus of the project on all three levels of intended reform and what should be the scope and range of each to ensure better impact of the project?*
- *What financial and management adjustments would be required to make optimal use of the extended period for an enhanced impact and sustainability including any changes in Log-frame and performance indicators? Can CDF modality as a vehicle for decentralized PPB be adopted by provincial government?*

20. **Mission Findings:**

- **Project Relevance to National and Local Context:** Finalization of a planning decree/law by MPI by 2009 was cited as one of the key supporting development for this project in TFF. Project was supposed to both contribute to the formulation process of this decree and subsequently contribute to its implementation/roll out in Hau Giang. The decree has been delayed and project's linkages to national policy formulation have remained weak. However, project's objectives remain valid in the context of government's approach and commitment to CPRGS agenda, grassroots democracy, strengthening of Communes' administration, and Public Administration Reform. Project's direct and indirect contributions are strengthening provincial government's capacity, resolve and understanding in further deepening the aims and objectives of these national policy reforms in PPB and PAR. In any case, linking project's outcomes with a policy initiative at central level, over which it had no control, was overly ambitious. There are number of on-going and new Government programmes and initiatives which have direct relevance to project's aims and objectives. These include:

- National Target Programme for New Rural Development 2010-2020 to be implemented through a decentralized implementation approach. The capacities and guidelines being developed under PARROC will directly contribute to it.
- Development of SEDP 2010-2015 and its implementation
- Provincial Commitment to roll out PPB, PAR/PSD initiatives of the project to additional communes and districts starting 2011.

- **Project Vision and Objectives – Sponsors and Government Perceptions:**

There appears to be a degree of difference in perceptions about the ultimate vision and outcome of the project. Is this a pilot that would test certain approaches and its final outcome would be a tested model for possible adoption by the provincial and central government? If one goes by project's budgets and inputs, then that is the final output of the project i.e. replication strategy for future adoption by the government. A second interpretation is that it is a pilot which would demonstrate a model during initial phase and help the government replicate it at larger scale during later half of project. If one goes by the narrative of the TFF, then this perception is also valid. Seeds of this confusion about the project's ultimate aim were sown in TFF itself which says different things at different places e.g.

- *“Project aimed at piloting and testing policy implementation – provide feedback and lessons learned for further policy refining...”*
- *“Project will prepare a replication strategy....”*
- *“Project as this one require longer perspective – Institutional and organizational change needs 10-15 year support horizon. Important for both partners to see it as a part of longer term process of capacity building”*

This confusion had not happened had the project and BTC TA attempted to develop a shared vision for the project. Instead the project was implemented in line with TFF inputs mechanically. While the project name emphasizes reform at three levels, both in objectives and subsequent narrative, but then doesn't provide any specific activities, budgets and milestones for that to happen during the Phase II. The MTE did spell out required provincial level reform and steps for greater ownership but again did not provide the required budgets and steps for that to happen. The 2009 Progress Report provided a more elaborate Action Plan and targets along with proposed extension to 2012 but it never got formalized into an agreed action plan. So, in absence of any formally adopted action plan for a roll out, the project, in provincial government's perception, remains what it provides for in TFF in terms of activities and budgets. However, it has to be noted that the province has given its unequivocal commitment to rolling out of some of the successful initiatives, as outlined in 2009 Progress Report, during the extended period of the project.

One reason for higher expectations from project is its naming as Phase II whereas actually, for Hau Giang, it is Phase I since all the capacity and experience of previous project has stayed in Can Tho City.

- **Project Efficiency:** If judged purely from project inputs and outputs angle, the project has been quite efficient in its implementation till the middle of 2010. The recent slag has more to do with the management problems related to STA and BTC Coordinator rather than any lack of effort or resolve on the part of provincial government. Given the very thin management structure of the project in the absence of STA and BTC Coordinator, government deserves credit for still managing to keep the project going in their absence. However, a major opportunity for rolling out the successful practices to more communes and at other levels was missed during 2010 which brought into play the question of extension. Other significant weaknesses in project management which contributed to adverse developments in 2010 are:

- **Communication Gaps:** The project suffers from major communication gaps between and among partners at all levels and root-cause of that is the very structure of the PMU. Top management of PMU is all part-time, backed by positions of part-time STA, a full-time BTC Project Coordinator (who later acted as co-signatory as well on behalf of BTC) and support staff like accountant, facilitators and interpreter cum communication officer. The project thus became over-reliant on STA and Coordinator for all its vertical and horizontal reporting and communications and subsequent differences between STA and Coordinator seriously damaged PMU's communication with outside world and led to many misunderstandings - mostly ill founded - especially with regard to project progress and provincial commitment and ownership.
- **Management Structure:** PMU of PARROC has a very skeletal structure. According to TFF, this was so to ensure greater mainstreaming of project into existing government management structure. If the project management structure was kept very thin on the assumption that assigning additional charge to PPC and DPI/DOHA officers would ensure greater ownership and mainstreaming, then the idea has not worked very well. Those officers are already overstretched and can spare only limited time for project. In any case, having a project structure with separate management and financial procedures means that it would remain a parallel entity and not as such part of regular government system. That being the case, the project would have been better off with more regular management capacity in-house.
- **PAR Task Force, Staff Turnover etc:** PAR Task force is supposed to lead and coordinate the PAR related initiatives of the project and, by extension, province. However, the Task Force has mostly remained a peripheral institution

due to absence of a strong leadership and direction and junior level membership. It had no definite meeting schedule and no annual target oriented agenda. High staff turnover at all levels remained another major challenge with no visible steps from the project to arrest it.

- **Linkage to central Policy Formulation:** Project contribution to central policy formulation on PPB and PAR remained non-existent both in terms of linkages as well as information dissemination.
- **Provincial Task Force on PAR:** The Provincial Task Force on PAR has not been able to provide the kind of strategic thinking and leadership expected of it in leading PAR process in the province. This is because of the lack of required senior level representation and leadership in the TF and lack of any defined work culture and annual plans. The Task Force meets whenever told to do so by PMU and without any independently developed strategy or work process of its own.
- **Sustainability:** While sustainability of project specific institutions like PMU, S-PMUs is neither expected nor feasible, the sustainability of project approach and interventions holds lot of promise. Some of key interventions that are likely to be sustainable over the long term, and reason thereof, are as following:
 - Planning Manual:
 - Planning Database are being sponsored by project for entire province. The criteria for New Rural Communes programme has also been imbedded in the database ensure wider application.
 - ISO Certification for Districts has been attained for three pilot districts and is now being expanded province wide.
 - One Stop Shops in pilot communes are considered to be much better functioning and equipped in pilot communes and are becoming a bench mark for the rest.
 - Capacity built at commune and district level for decentralized investment management and SEDP formulation
- **Rationale/Justification for an Extension:** An implicit understanding, and expectation, existed at provincial level for eventual extension of the project since the formulation of Annual Progress Report 2009 which contained a detailed future plan on the premise of an extended implementation period up to end 2012. The subsequent dip in project progress during 2010 due to management problems and lack of communication between partners meant that some of the main actions related to replication and increased provincial ownership (finalization of Planning Manual and it's notification, roll out to additional communes, support to provincial SEDP 2010-2015 etc.) did not progress as per schedule. This has also slowed down the financial delivery during 2010. Preparation of 2011 SEDPs in pilot communes also remains on hold. If an extension is not agreed now, there is little time for addition of any new communes in roll out plan for this year and the existing pilot communes may only be barely able to complete their SEDPs for 2011. An extension up to June 2012 would not require any amendment in the financing agreement and can therefore be readily implemented. However, extension by this much would mean only one cycle of SEDP formulation for new communes/districts included in the coverage who should have ideally got two chances to further hone their skills. An extension up to December 2012 would allow the new communes at least two cycles of SEDP preparation but this would require amendment in the existing Financing Agreement and the provincial government does not appear to be keen on this due to fear of possible attendant delays. Considering all the prevailing circumstances and Provincial Government's keen commitment to scale up the project's successful approaches, an extension in Project period up to June 2012 is desirable and justified on following grounds:

- To build on some of the very good and solid work done by the project in pilot communes and districts and Provincial Government's commitment to scale up this good beginning;
- To utilize the available balance budget for scaling up the successful approaches and enhancing the project impact;
- To further invest in supportive institutional and regulatory activities for enhancing the sustainability prospects of the project, including development of a transition strategy for gradual takeover of PMU/project functions and activities by relevant government departments.
- **Priorities for the Extended Period:** Based on a replication/roll out plan prepared earlier by STA as part of 2009 Progress Report, and on mission's field work and meetings with stakeholders, and based on the consensus recommendations of provincial stakeholders' workshop, following priorities have emerged for the balance extended period:

Priorities in Planning Reform, PAR, Capacity Building and Sustainability:

- Finalize and issue SEDP Manual immediately;
- Finalize and put in operation the planning database;
- Continue the PPB and CDF in piloted communes;
- Scale up PPB in the whole province in incremental manner, starting with implementation in all communes in three pilot districts in 2011;
- Provide targeted support for implementation of New Rural Development Strategy including development of provincial guidelines and linkages to PPB;
- Decentralization of fund management and investment ownership be institutionalized for government budgets also.
- Scale up the improved standard OSS to the whole province, starting with implementation in all communes in three pilot districts in 2011;
- Scale up ISO certification for all districts;
- Equip OSS offices with adequate facilities office equipment;
- Computerize public administration services in 03 piloted districts and communes (currently being piloted in Nga Bay Town)

What Project Activities are proven success and should be scaled up:

- PPB;
- Decentralized fund management and commune investment ownership;
- Further strengthening of ISO and OSS through training and provision of equipment for better service provision.

What should be the level, scale and timeframe for scaling up:

- Start with scaling up of PPB and OSS in districts and communes in three pilot districts in 2011 and then scale up to whole province;
- Start from lower level to higher level and from simple easy to do things to more complex ones;
- Complete scaling up of PPB and OSS/PSD in all communes of three districts by June 2012.

How can the Sustainability of project interventions be improved:

- Early issuing of MPI Decree on PPB/SEDP;
- Finalize the issue Provincial SEDP Manual;
- Clarify and issue guidelines for PPC Decision 3090;
- Build additional capacity at all three levels in PPB;

- Integrate all development resources (central, provincial and peoples' contribution) and allocate funds to 6 pilot communes in CDF mode for SEDP 2011; Government budget be considered to replace CDF fund;
- Planning cycle for SEDP of communes be shortened and it should cover Sept to January from plan submission to approval.
- Strengthen provincial training institutions capacity for delivery of PPB and PAR related training programmes.

What additional Capacity would be required for scaling up of PARROC Model

- Early recruitment of a full time Coordinator/Project Manager in PMU and drop STA Position.
- Improved provincial control and ownership of PMU/Project operations including simplified co-management system
- Train at least two or three staff members at each implementing institution in PPB
- Create full time planner's position at commune/ward level
- Scale up OSS staff capacity building through proper training especially skills in effective public dealing
- Expand the scope of training for PPB and include other departments, mass organizations and Village Heads in its coverage.
- **Project Management:** The existing PMU structure is heavily reliant on the positions of STA and BTC Coordinator for the implementation of project activities which limits provincial oversight and ownership. Given the past experience, and the difficulties in securing services of an International STA quickly, and the limited implementation period available at the fag end of the project for such high cost STA, recruitment of another STA is not a sound option and the balance funding for this position should be reallocated. As for the BTC Coordinator position, the nomenclature of the post and its TOR need a revisit to align them more with local institutional culture and project's management needs. A serious consideration needs to be given to assumption of a more hands on responsibility by a government appointed Vice Director in the PMU rather than the current arrangement of part-time Deputy Directors. It could be a junior/newly promoted Vice Director from either DOHA or DPI.

21. **Mission Recommendations:** Mission recommendations are predicated on the fact that the basic requirement of project rationale i.e. finalization of a Planning Decree, is yet to materialize and try to maximize the project's impact within the prevailing national and provincial PPB and PAR environment.

- **Project Extension:** Mission recommends that the project should be extended till June 2012 (the actual duration of the implementation agreement) to allow scaling up of the priorities identified and agreed during the mission and further strengthen sustainability aspects. This extension should be subject to assumption of greater implementation responsibility by the provincial government through a beefed up PMU.
- **Project Priorities during remaining period:** Mission recommends the priorities agreed during the Provincial Stakeholders' Workshop, and as outlined in the paragraph 8(f) above, and detailed in Mission Report, should be the basis for the project work plan for 2011 and 2012. An indicative work plan will be furnished as part of Mission report. Other areas where Project can assist the provincial government are (a) implementation of Decision 60/2010/QĐ-TTg by Prime Minister regarding quantitative criteria for allocation of resources from province to districts and, (b) Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) which is now compulsory for all province to complete prior to development of Master Plan for Development.

- **Replication and Roll Out Approach:** Replication and roll during the balance extended period should be based on following principles:
 - Finalizing of the regulatory and process framework should be first priority i.e. finalization and formal notification of Planning Manual, early completion and operation of planning database, defining the linkage with New Rural Communes Programme and preparation of its guidelines etc.
 - Revamping of existing CDF Manual into a comprehensive decentralized investment management guidelines for adoption during the rollout phase and linked to a comprehensive training programme.
 - Local Government should pilot test provision of state budgets in communes of three pilot districts in CDF mode with an upfront indicative commitment for planning purpose.
 - The roll out to be incremental starting in three pilot districts during 2011 and then to all communes in remaining districts.
 - Greater attention to information dissemination and linkages with other provinces and central level through study tours and information exchanges.
 - A Transition Strategy be developed, with assistance from National TA, for the gradual transfer of project responsibilities to relevant government agencies.
 - Priority attention to building capacity of Provincial Political School for becoming the premier service provider for all PPB and PAR capacity building trainings.
- **Provincial Task Force for PAR:** Provincial Task Force for PAR in its current constitution and mandate is of little value. The PMU should rather take direct charge of the PAR targets and coordinate their annual planning and the targets be assigned directly to the concerned departments with PSC performing the review, oversight and accountability functions.
- **Linkages with other Programmes and Project with Similar Objectives:** A dedicated short-term national consultant be engaged to prepare an Action Plan and schedule for greater interaction with other pilot programmes and provinces with advanced PPB and PAR initiatives and to develop a programme for periodic Exchange Workshops at central level. More proactive support in this regard from BTC SPR Project with MPI would have a salutary impact in this regard. The project action plan be prepared in coordination with SPR and SPR should be given a lead role in its implementation especially the central level activities.
- **Commune Development Fund:** Some good initiatives, apart from construction of rural infrastructure, were implemented in the pilot communes through the CDF. The CDF now stands almost exhausted (projected balance of the CDF by the end of 2010 at about Euro 60,000). It would however be useful to continue a degree of support to the original six pilot communes for those soft initiatives. The project/BTC should consider diverting additional Euro 30,000 to CDF for support to soft initiatives of 6 pilot communes in the 2011 workplan on capacity building, job creation, poverty reduction etc. More importantly, project should assist the province in developing a framework for replacement of project funding in CDF with funding from State Budgets on regular basis, especially to the communes in phase one of replication.
- **Capacity Building:** Province spends about VND 20 billion annually from state budget for capacity building. However, the delivery of capacity building on PPB and PAR by project and government is constrained by lack of adequate relevant training capacity within the province. Project's existing interventions with provincial training institutions (Political School and Community College) to develop their capacity for PPB and PSD related training delivery have been limited in scope and ambition. In the remaining period, the project should focus its attention on Political School and help it develop a proper plan for its capacity building. The school should be assisted in creation of a Public Sector Management Department catering to training needs of government sector in PPB, PAR and Financial Management. The project may contribute in shape of equipment and assured supply of trainees during the initial phase and the School should develop

the curricula and engage required human resource. It can start as a dedicated cell within the School to manage and coordinate such training and gradually develop into a full fledged department.

- **Enhanced Impact of Project:** The pending finalization of Planning Manual and finalization of Planning databases in all districts and communes will go a long way in enhancing project impact on planning and development in the province. District and provincial level should be focused more in terms of PPB process and approach including budget allocations. For further enhanced impact of the project, more attention needs to be paid to information dissemination activities of the project both at provincial and national level. The information dissemination strategy formulated earlier needs to go through a thorough review and proper action plan needs to be developed for disseminating information to different levels of clientele at local and central/donor level with appropriate information products.
- **Improved Management and Provincial Ownership:** Following recommendations are made for the improved management and provincial ownership of the project and to avoid recurrence of 2010 problems:
 - Recruitment of key staff, especially TA, should be a joint participative exercise by BTC and PPC. Co-management of resources be delegated to PMU to maximum possible extent.
 - BTC Coordinator's nomenclature should be changed to Project Manager and the TOR for the position should be revised in line with project focus and approach during the extended period.
 - Position of STA should be dropped and balance funding be reallocated.
 - PPC should assumed greater responsibility in day to day management of project and consider positioning a junior Vice Director from DPI or DOHA for this purpose in PMU.
 - 2011 Work Plan and budget should be quickly finalized on the basis of agreements reached in this Aide Memoir and BTC should extend assistance to PMU in this regard. Draft work plan and budget is presented in Mission report for 2011-2012
 - BTC and PMU should hold a detailed quarterly progress review for the balance of the project to ensure that project progress remains on track and issues are resolved quickly.
- **Project Work Plan 2011-2012:** Based on priorities agreed for the extended period, the PMU prepared a very rough work plan for the year 2011 and year 2012. It requires considerable refinement in terms of quantities and unit costs as well as balance in allocations between the two years on the basis of actual intervention logic and time needed for completion of each activity as well as its sequencing with other activities. It would be difficult for PMU to quickly complete this exercise on their own, especially in the absence of any professional support like a STA or Project Coordinator. The Mission would prepare an indicative workplan and budget for 2011-2012 and furnish the same as part of detailed report. It is however recommended that PMU and BTC should organize a annual planning workshop and workout a detailed plan and budget on the basis of agreements reached during the mission.

22. **Key agreements Reached:** As an outcome of Mission Wrap Up meeting with provincial authorities, BTC and debriefing to PSC members at Hanoi, following agreements were reached for the future of PARROC:

- **Project Duration:** Project may be extended up to December 2012 to allow at least two cycles of SEDP formulation in newly inducted communes in three districts.
- **Project Vision and Objective:** Project/province will roll out the model developed in 6 pilot communes in an incremental manner in entire province, starting with all communes in three pilot districts
- **Project Priorities:** Following shall be the project priorities during the extended period:
 - i. SEDP manual shall be immediately finalized and notified by PPC

- ii. Planning Database at all levels will be finalized within Dec 2010 and made operational.
 - iii. Recruitment of Project Manager shall be finalized within Dec 2010 in consultation with PPC/PMU
 - iv. ISO certification for all districts will be completed in 2011
 - v. OSS model developed in project communes will be adopted for the remaining communes with emphasis on training and required equipment.
 - vi. CDF modality shall be adopted for provincial budgets for the roll out communes.
 - vii. An action plan for developing capacity of Provincial Political School for quality training in PAR and SEDP related disciplines will be prepared and implemented.
 - viii. A Transition strategy will be developed during 2011 for the handover of project outputs to concerned departments during 2012.
 - ix.
- **CDF:** Province will incrementally adopt CDF modality and processes for the provision of development budgets to the communes from provincial sources and project will provide required national TA for development of required guidelines.
 - **STA and BTC Coordinator:** An international STA shall not be recruited and savings thereof shall be placed in CDF. The BTC Coordinator shall henceforth be called Project Manager and suitable amendments in TOR shall be made to reflect supportive nature of the job and leadership of province in project implementation.
 - **Project Management:**
 - i. PPC shall immediately appoint a Vice Director from DOHA or DPI to assume leadership in project management and this person will devote 50% of his working time to the project.
 - ii. BTC and PMU/PPC shall carryout joint quarterly progress reviews regularly till end of project
 - iii. All project related recruitments in future will be joint BTC/PMU exercise
 - iv. BTC and PPC shall ensure more direct and deeper communication in future on all implementation aspects.
 - v. BTC shall develop a simplified co-management procedures allowing greater control at provincial/PMU level.
 - **Project Work Plan/Budget 2011-2012:** Mission will furnish a draft Work Plan budget covering 2011-2012 as part of Mission Report on 30 November 2010.
 - **Amendments in TFF:** Necessary amendments in TFF will be affected by BTC and agreed by all stakeholders based on agreements reached during the mission.

23. **Next Steps:** Following the wrap up meeting at Vi Thanh and agreements reached therein, the Mission will debrief the PSC Members, Belgian Embassy and BTC at central level about main mission findings and recommendations. The Mission would furnish a detailed draft report by 30 November for the comments of PSC members who will have ten days to furnish their comments to the Mission. Final report will be furnished within one week of the receipt of comments./.

Annex 1:

LIST OF PERSONS MET

Place and Name

Designation/Organization

Hanoi:

Mr. Dirk Deprez	Country Representative, BTC
Mr. Tran Le Nam	Programme Officer, BTC
Mr. Olivier Donnet	STA, BTC SPAR Project, MPI
Mr. Luong Quang Luyen	Vice Director, Foreign Relation Dept, MOHA
Mrs. Binh	Ex-Vice Director/PSC member, MPI
Mr. Nguyen Tien Phong	Head, Poverty Cluster, UNDP
Mr. Doan Hong Quang	Sr. Economic Expert, World Bank

Hau Giang/Vi Thanh:

Mr. Tran Thanh Lap	Vice Chairman PPC/NPD
Mr. Vo Minh Tam	Deputy NPD, PPC Chief Administrator
Mr. Nguyen Quyet Thang	Ex-Director, DOHA
Mr. Tran Minh Hoang	Director, Dept. Of Finance
Mr. Pham Hong Thai	Vice Director, DPI/Vice Director PMU
Mr. Ngo Van Gam	Vice Director, DOHA
Mr. Nguyen Ngoc Dien	Vice Director, DPI/Head of Provincial Inter-Dept Task Force

Provincial PAR Task Force

Provincial Political School and Community College

Districts and City:

S-PMU, Phung Hiep district

S-PMU, Long My district

S-PMU, Nga Bay Town

People's Committee, Vi Thanh City

Communes:

CPC and village heads, Hiep Loi commune, Nga Bay Town

CPC and village heads, Hiep Hung commune, Phung Hiep district

CPC and village heads, Thuan Hung commune, Long My district

CPC, Tan Tien commune, Vi Thanh City

5.4 Debriefing to PSC Members in Hanoi – Presentation Outline

PARROC STRATEGIC REFLECTION MISSION DEBRIEFING TO PSC, HANOI. 17 NOV 2010

MISSION PURPOSE & TOR

To facilitate a participative and constructive reflection on way forward, focusing on:

- How relevant and consistent the project activities are to overall priorities of the authorities and how its activities and objectives are perceived by stakeholders;
- Possible prolongation of the project and possible improvements in approach to further strengthen ownership and integration
- Possible linkages with other programmes working on same objectives

PROJECT STATUS

- Project started in July 2007. Project MTE conducted in June 2009 and ratified
- 2009 progress report included a detailed roadmap for project roll out and extension up to June 2012 but not ratified due to management issues
- Departure of STA and Project Coordinator has created an air of uncertainty about project future and roll out
- Remaining PMU staff and pilot districts/ communes demoralized and uncertain

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT PROGRESS **Financial Progress (end Dec):**

- Belgium: Euro 1,593,000 (64%)
- Vietnam: VND 4.317 billion (80%)
- Result Area 1: 194,369/257,500 (75%)
- Result Area 2: 819,951/1,145,500 (72%)
- Result Area 3: 41,916/74,000 (57%)
- Result Area 4: 21,711/97,000 (28%)
- General Means: 510,368/896,499 (57%)

Overall progress is quite satisfactory and would had been much better but for management issues in 2010

KEY QUESTIONS

- Is project still relevant to National and local Planning and budgeting and PAR Reform Agenda:*
- Are all stakeholders on same page in terms of Project's ultimate Objective and Vision:*
- How efficient the project has been thus far in attaining its targets and creating the desired impact:*
- Is an extension in project implementation period desirable to improve project attainments, impact and sustainability?*

MISSION FINDINGS

Project Relevance

- Project's objectives and approach still remain valid despite delay in formulation of a planning decree by MPI.
- Community centric development remains common theme in all government strategies and policies e.g. SEDP formulation, CPRGS, Grassroots Democracy, PAR, strengthening of commune administration and New Rural Development

- ❑ Even now provinces have considerable authority for decentralization and PSD improvement

Stakeholder Perceptions

- ❑ There is a difference of perception due to inherent contradictions in TFF
- ❑ Project name, objectives and narrative suggests a much larger roll out agenda whereas projects inputs/outputs suggest only piloting and preparation of a replication strategy
- ❑ No attempt at the start to develop a shared vision
- ❑ MTE also did not specify any steps or budgets for a roll out.
- ❑ For BTC it is a Phase II whereas for the province it is a Phase I since the previous capacity and experience stayed in Can Tho.

Project Efficiency

- ❑ Project quite efficient from purely inputs/outputs angle
- ❑ Thin management structure and overly dependent on STA and PC
- ❑ An opportunity for roll out missed during 2010 due to MANAGEMENT ISSUES and delayed response.
- ❑ Communication gaps are pronounced between BTC and PPC.
- ❑ Management structure needs serious rethinking to ensure government leadership and ownership
- ❑ PAR Taskforce not geared to be an agent of serious reform
- ❑ High staff turn-over remained an issue at all levels
- ❑ Linkage to central policy level and exchange of information on pilot experience remained weak (over ambitious assumptions)

Sustainability

- ❑ Sustainability of project approach and interventions appear promising in view of provincial government commitment to deepen the PPB and PAR initiatives.
- ❑ Planning Manual
- ❑ Planning database across province
- ❑ ISO certification of district offices
- ❑ OSS
- ❑ Capacities in PPB and SEDP Formulation

Project Extension

- ❑ **Project extension is justified on grounds of:**
 - ❑ Need to build on some very good and solid work and models developed in pilot communes/districts
 - ❑ Provincial commitment and enthusiasm in rolling out/scaling up these models
 - ❑ To make up for 2010 management issues and utilize the available balance for further improving the impact
 - ❑ To invest in supportive regulatory and institutional development for transitioning the project into government management and systems.
 - ❑ Question about exact period – June 2012 or Dec 2012?

Agreed Priorities for Extended Period

- ❑ Finalize and issue SEDP Manual
- ❑ Finalize and operationalize planning database
- ❑ Continue PPB and CDF in Pilot communes
- ❑ Scale up PPB in three pilot districts and subsequently to entire province
- ❑ Provide targeted support to new rural development strategy
- ❑ Institutionalize decentralized fund management for government budgets for communes

- ❑ Scale up improved OSS standards in pilot communes to whole province
- ❑ Scale up ISO certification for all districts
- ❑ Computerize public administration services in three pilot districts
- ❑ Build capacity at all three levels
- ❑ Integrate all development resources and allocate funds to 6 pilot communes in CDF mode and subsequently to additional communes in 3 districts
- ❑ Strengthen provincial training institutions capacity for PPB and PAR
- ❑ Early recruitment of Project Coordinator and drop STA position
- ❑ Improved provincial control and ownership of project and a simplified co-management system
- ❑ Create fulltime planner position at commune level starting with 6 pilot communes
- ❑ Include additional people including village heads and mass organization staff in PPB training
- ❑ Nomenclature and TOR of BTC Coordinator be refined in the light of past experience
- ❑ STA position may not be filled given the stage of project implementation
- ❑ Government should assume greater management responsibility through appointment of a Vice Director for PMU from DPI or DOHA who can lead the PMU
- ❑ BTC may simplify co-management arrangement and delegate more financial authority to PMU.
- ❑ All future recruitments for project be joint exercise

MISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

- ❑ Project be extended – December 2012 is better options than June 2012 since it would give new communes experience of 2 planning cycles
- ❑ Priorities agreed in provincial workshop should be the basis for 2011-2012 Work Plan and Mission shall furnish a draft in this regard
- ❑ Replication approach should be incremental starting with three pilot districts and early finalization of manual, database and their notification
- ❑ Agreed priorities with province will ensure greater impact at three levels i.e. commune, district, province
- ❑ Pilot testing of provision of government budgets in CDF mode to initially six pilot communes and then all communes in 3 pilot districts.
- ❑ A transition strategy be developed in remaining period
- ❑ An action plan be prepared for capacity building of Provincial Political School as key training provider for PPB and PAR
- ❑ BTC Project in MPI should take lead in building linkages of PARROC with other projects and information dissemination
- ❑ An additional Euro 30,000 be injected in CDF to support pilot communes' soft initiatives
- ❑ STA position for remainder of project be dropped
- ❑ BTC Coordinator position be redefined as Project Manager with suitable adjustment in TOR
- ❑ Province should consider placement of a Vice Director to be head of PMU for enhanced provincial leadership and ownership
- ❑ 2011-12 AWP be quickly developed and approved based on agreements reached during the mission

Next Steps

- ❑ Endorsement of mission recommendations – Province has already endorsed them – Formal agreement on extension period
- ❑ BTC response on simplified co-management
- ❑ Draft report, including proposed Work Plan/ Budget for 2011-12 by Mission by 30th Nov.
- ❑ Feedback to Mission by PSC members by 10 Dec 2010
- ❑ Final report by 20 Dec 2010.

5.5 Draft Work Plan and Budget 2011-2012

(See also attached Excel File)

Budget Code	Budget estimation (Euro)			Ref. No.	Workplan 2011-2012	Responsibility	Work Schedule 2011-2012										
	2011+2012	2011	2012				2010	2011				2012					
							Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		
	118,182	59,000	59,182		Result Area 1: 1. Improvement of the planning and budgeting process and system at the provincial, district and commune level												
	22,000	17,000	5,000		Sub-result Area 1.2: Participatory planning materials and data available												
A/01/02/COG	15,000	10,000	5,000	1.2.1.a	National Study tours (in combination with Sub-result area 2)	PMU	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
A/01/03/COG				1.2.2.e	Finalization Commune SEDP Manual	DPI/ PMU											
	2,000	2,000		1.2.2.i	Support for legalization of the Commune SEDP Manual (PPC's Decision; Publication and dissemination of the manual)	PPC/ DPI											
A/01/04/COG				1.2.3.c	Building up software for SEDP database (including trainings)	Consultant/ DPI/ PMU											
	5,000	5,000		1.2.3.e	Supports for updating SEDP database at province/districts/communes	DPI	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
	30,000	20,000	10,000		Sub-result Area 1.3: Training delivered to key stakeholders												
A/01/05/COG	10,000	10,000		1.3.1.a	Training on participatory SEDP (based on the SEDP manual) for provincial/district staff	Consultant/ DPI/ PMU											
	20,000	10,000	10,000	1.3.1.b	Training on participatory SEDP (based on the SEDP manual) for communes staff and village leaders of 29 communes in 3 districts	DPI/ PMU											
	30,000	20,000	10,000		Sub-result Area 1.4: Planning is used as an effective Management Tool												
A/01/06/COG	10,000	10,000		1.4.3.a	Training on M&E of SEDP implementation for provincial/district planning staff	Consultant/ DPI/ PMU											
	20,000	10,000	10,000	1.4.3/b	Training on M&E of SEDP implementation for communes staff of all 29 communes in 03 districts	DPI/ PMU											
	36,182	2,000	34,182		Sub-result Area 1.5: Lessons drawn and incorporated into replication strategy for whole Province												

Mission Report: PARROC Strategic Reflection Mission

Budget Code	Budget estimation (Euro)			Ref. No.	Workplan 2011-2012	Responsibility	Work Schedule 2011-2012									
	2011+2012	2011	2012				2010	2011				2012				
							Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
A/01/07/COG	2,000	2,000		1.5.1.a	Evaluation of participatory SED planning in 6 pilot communes and plan for scaling up to all communes in 3 districts	PMU/ DPI										
	2,000		2,000	1.5.1.b	Evaluation of participatory SED planning in 3 district and plan for scaling up to all communes in the province	PMU./ DPI										
A/01/08/COG	32,182		32,182	1.5.2.a	Support for implementation of participatory planning for all communes in the province	PMU/ DPI										
	308,000	298,000	10,000		Result Area 2: 2. Improvement of the local administrative and socio-economic service delivery systems											
	176,000	176,000	0		Sub-result Area 2.1: Building on/completing phase 1 administrative service delivery											
A/02/03/COG	20,000	20,000		2.1.3.b	Support IT application (hardware and software) in 2 districts (Phung Hiep and Long My)	Cosultant/ PMU										
	150,000	150,000		2.1.3.c	Support for upgrading OSS office building and equipments for 23/29 remaining communes of 3 districts	PMU/Districts/Communes										
A/02/04/COG	3,000	3,000		2.1.4.h	Capacity building for computerization of OSS in 3 pilot districts	Provincial Political School/ PMU		II	II	II	II	II	II			
	3,000	3,000		2.1.4.g	Training skills for OSS staff of all 29 communes in 3 districts	Provincial Political School/ PMU		II	II	II	II	II	II			
	132,000	122,000	10,000		Sub-result Area 2.2: Piloting approaches to social and economic PSD at sub-provincial level											
A/02/07/COG	15,000	10,000	5,000	2.2.4.c	Supports for preparation of annual SEDP in all 29 communes of 3 districts	DPI										
A/02/08/COG	15,000	10,000	5,000	2.2.5	Training on decentralized investment management manual at commune level (all 29 communes in 3 districts)	Consultant/ PMU										

Mission Report: PARROC Strategic Reflection Mission

Budget Code	Budget estimation (Euro)			Ref. No.	Workplan 2011-2012	Responsibility	Work Schedule 2011-2012								
	2011+2012	2011	2012				2010	2011				2012			
							Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
A/02/10/COG	90,000	90,000		2.2.7	CDF support to 6 pilot commune SEDPs	PMU/Districts/Communes				II	II				
A/02/11/COG	10,000	10,000		2.2.8.a	Drafting Manual on decentralized investment management at commune level	Consultant/DPI									
	2,000	2,000		2.2.8.b	Issuance of Manual on decentralized investment management at commune level (PPC's decision; publication and dissemination of the Manual)	PPC/ DPI									
	60,000	50,000	10,000		Result Area 3: 3. Improvement of the capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project-related training										
	30,000	30,000	0		Sub-result Area 3.2: Training resources developed										
A/03/02/COG	10,000	10,000		3.2.1	Prepare training materials (including training manuals) (continued)	Provincial Training Institutions/ PMU									
	10,000	10,000		3.2.2	Training of Trainers (continued)	Provincial Training Institutions/ PMU									
A/03/03/COG	10,000	10,000		3.2.3	Support necessary IT (continued)	Provincial Training Institutions/ PMU		II	II	II	II				
	30,000	20,000	10,000		Sub-result Area 3.3: Training related to participatory planning and improved PSD delivered										
A/03/04/COG	30,000	20,000	10,000	3.3.1	Series of training courses conducted by local training institutions (continued)	Provincial Training Institutions		II	II	II	II	II	II		
	50,000	25,000	25,000		Result Area 4: 4. Dissemination of the lessons learned from the project										
	10,000	5,000	5,000		4.2: Establish network of pilots										

Mission Report: PARROC Strategic Reflection Mission

Budget Code	Budget estimation (Euro)			Ref. No.	Workplan 2011-2012	Responsibility	Work Schedule 2011-2012								
	2011+2012	2011	2012				2010	2011				2012			
							Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
A/04/02/COG	10,000	5,000	5,000	4.2.2	Receiving of study visits from other projects/provinces	PMU/ DPI/ DOHA	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
	15,000	7,500	7,500		4.3: Web design and other communication tools										
A/04/03/COG	5,000	2,500	2,500	4.3.2	Maintain and improve the project web-pages	PMU	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
	10,000	5,000	5,000	4.3.4	Cooperate with local & regional TVs and Newspapers to operationalize the Communication Strategy	PMU	II	II	II	II	II	II		II	II
	5,000	2,500	2,500		4.4: Prepare best practice cases studies for publication/distribution									II	II
A/04/04/COG	5,000	2,500	2,500	4.4.1	Soạn và phổ biến các điển hình tốt/ thực tiễn hay và minh họa bằng các video clip	PMU	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
	20,000	10,000	10,000		4.5: National workshops for experience sharing										
A/04/05/COG	20,000	10,000	10,000	4.5.1	National/ Provincial Workshops for sharing experience and best practices	PMU/ DPI/ DOHA									
Part Z	341,000	164,000	177,000		5.General Means										
	302,000	157,000	145,000		5.1 Staff and running cost	PMU	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
	7,000	3,500	3,500		5.2 PMU Office equipment	PMU	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
	32,000	3,500	28,500		5.3 M&E, formulation & contingencies	PMU	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
REG	116,000	51,500	64,500												
COG	761,182	544,500	216,682												
Total	877,182	596,000	281,182												

5.6 TOR for Vice Director/Head PMU

PPC, Hau Giang will select a suitable officer, from among the pool of Vice Directors working in DPI or DOHA, to provide leadership in the PMU. The selected Vice Director shall allocate 75% of his time for the project related functions and will be in-charge of the PMU for all practical purposes, including signing of all official internal and external communications related to work plans, budgets, procurements, progress reports etc. Main functions and responsibilities of the Vice Director/Head PMU will be:

- Be the leader of PMU on behalf of Project Steering Committee and PPC for all functions assigned in the annual work plan of the project and the execution of activities of the project as per approved annual work plan;
- Ensure use of project funding and human resources in an effective, timely and efficient manner;
- Develop and operate appropriate planning, reporting, coordination, disbursement, procurement and implementation systems for timely achievement of project objectives and targets;
- Ensure effective coordination and liaison between project partners at all levels;
- Ensure timely procurement of consultancy services and ensure their effective delivery and monitoring.
- Remain posted in the project till the completion of the project.

Qualifications:

- At least three year experience as Vice Director in DPI or DOHA
- Ability to communicate in English and keenness to improve English Language skills
- Demonstrated interest in PAR and participatory development approaches

•
5.7 **TOR for Project Manager (Ex-Project Coordinator)**

- Under the overall supervision and guidance of Project Steering Committee and Head PMU, the Project Manager shall be responsible for the following:
 - Assistance to head PMU in all aspects of project implementation including planning, coordination, monitoring, procurements and reporting.
 - Be a permanent presence on behalf of head PMU and project partners and overall responsible for effective operation of the PMU
 - Develop and implement required systems and procedures related to planning, coordination, procurement, reporting, M&E and capacity building
 - Assist Head PMU and PSC in developing a post-project road map for replication of project approach and its sustainability
 - Oversee/monitor the input of consultants and its quality and relevance
 - Assist Head PMU and BTC in development of TOR and specifications for various procurements of goods and services and oversee their timely delivery and quality assurance
 - Supervise and oversee the work of PMU staff under the overall guidance of Head PMU and Steering Committee.
 - Prepare periodic progress reports on financial and physical aspects for the consideration of Steering Committee and BTC.

 - **Qualifications:** Relevant degree in management or development fields with at least five year experience in a responsible position in projects/departments dealing with participatory rural development and/or public administration reform. Reasonable proficiency in English desirable. Good report writing skills essential.

5.8 Revised Log Frame

Hierarchy of Objectives	Key indicators of Performance	Monitoring and Evaluation	Critical Hypothesis
Development Objective	Sector Indicator	Sector Reports	
To promote pro-poor socio-economic development and promote poverty reduction through public administration reform at provincial, district and commune levels.	<p>Macro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per capita income increases Poverty rate reduction <p>Sectoral Level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment/business growth Agriculture output Employment Tax receipts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MDG/VDG/CSGRP UNDP HDR WDR Income Tables UNCTAD Global Investment 	
Purpose of the Project	Indicators of Outcomes	Project Reports	From purpose to Dev. objective
To improve the institutional and human capacities, the organizational set up and the performance of local governments in the fields of development planning and public service delivery, management and monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments' ability to integrate poverty reduction and growth into planning and budgeting and to deliver services efficiently and effectively To do this in a broad-based participatory manner and with a focus on outcomes and monitorable results involving the user and especially the poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodic evaluations Mid term Evaluation Final Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reversal of grassroots democracy legislation and PAR Promulgation of New National Planning Law
Results	Indicators of Results	Reports of the Project	From Results to Purpose
RESULT 1 Improvement of planning and budgeting process and system at the provincial, district and commune level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breadth of participation from stakeholders at different levels and result of their participation on planning decisions Provincial planning manual formalizing the roles and responsibilities in decentralized planning notified and implemented Decentralized investment management guidelines for communes notified and implemented Increase in number of communes applying notified annual PPB process Increase in number of districts applying notified PPB process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project plans and progress reports Ad-hoc, mid-term and final evaluations Consultants reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Planning Manual prepared and notified at provincial level Decentralized investment guidelines for communes/ districts adopted Capacity of training institutions at provincial level improved in delivering PPB and PAR training
RESULT 2 Improvement of the local administrative and socio-economic service delivery systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority services identified for plans, budgets allocated and services delivered CDF support for implementation mobilized and CDF approach adopted for government's own budgets Pro-poor services prioritized and delivered in an efficient manner One Stop Shop concept adopted across the pilot and subsequently on province wide basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project quarterly and annual reports Commune and district plans Adhoc and mid-term evaluations Final evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDF approach to decentralized plans and budgets adopted for provincial budgets as well

Mission Report: PARROC Strategic Reflection Mission

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of citizen's satisfaction with quality of government services at commune and district level 		
<p>RESULT 3 Improvement of capacity of training institutions in providing PAR and project related training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive training plan for required capacity development prepared Action plan for required capacity building of provincial political school finalized and identified human and material resources provided Number of training modules for PAR and PPB prepared for district and commune staff Number of sessions held and number of staff trained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual project plans Quarterly and annual project reports Adhoc evaluations 	
<p>RESULT 4 Dissemination of lessons learned from project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson sharing plan and systems developed/ forums identified as part of annual plans of the project Regional/national workshops held for sharing of experience on improved planning and service delivery between national and provincial and among provincial entities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project plans and budgets Project progress reports Workshop reports 	

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of VIE0403011

Project Title : **PAR extension linked to CPRGS**

Budget Version: **C02**

Currency : **EUR**

YtM :

Year to month : 31/12/2010

Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2009	Expenses 2010	Total	Balance	% Exec
A IMPROVE CAPACITIES & PERFORMANCES OF LOCAL			1.574.000,00	564.540,86	377.231,93	941.772,79	632.227,21	60%
01 Improve planning system at provincial, district and			257.500,00	78.185,59	26.954,95	105.140,54	152.359,46	41%
01 Study and assessment of the current planning situation		COGES	19.000,00	6.143,94	0,00	6.143,94	12.856,06	32%
02 Study tours on PPB		COGES	40.000,00	36.456,03	3.644,92	40.100,95	-100,95	100%
03 Planning manuals and organisation of trainings on the		COGES	15.500,00	14.567,44	6.290,51	20.857,95	-5.357,95	135%
04 Build up a database to support planning at commune level		COGES	135.000,00	6.960,05	16.906,61	23.866,66	111.133,34	18%
05 Organise training on PPB for 5 target groups		COGES	9.500,00	9.011,28	0,00	9.011,28	488,72	95%
06 Implementation of participatory planning method		COGES	10.000,00	5.046,85	0,00	5.046,85	4.953,15	50%
07 Assessment of implementation and development of the		COGES	9.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	9.500,00	0%
08 Replication of the model in line with replication strategy		COGES	19.000,00	0,00	112,91	112,91	18.887,09	1%
02 Improve the service of delivery system			1.145.500,00	435.048,33	343.247,44	778.295,77	367.204,23	68%
01 Undertake assessment of province wide experience with		COGES	34.000,00	2.985,12	0,00	2.985,12	31.014,88	9%
02 Support planning of further improvement of administrative		COGES	7.500,00	100,88	0,00	100,88	7.399,12	1%
03 Support implementation and evaluation		COGES	29.000,00	21.046,57	13.452,72	34.499,29	-5.499,29	119%
04 Provide capacity building		COGES	2.500,00	312,19	552,21	864,40	1.635,60	35%
05 Institutional appraisal of service delivery		COGES	23.000,00	9.109,97	0,00	9.109,97	13.890,03	40%
06 Develop a service delivery implementation plan		COGES	25.000,00	5.619,03	0,00	5.619,03	19.380,97	22%
07 Action planning & budgeting workshops		COGES	14.500,00	6.766,77	-2,74	6.764,03	7.735,97	47%
08 Train officials involved in pilot districts and communes		COGES	39.000,00	5.522,48	-1,34	5.521,14	33.478,86	14%
09 Establish CDF's rules, criteria's and procedures		COGES	20.000,00	203,74	0,00	203,74	19.796,26	1%
		REGIE	404.934,26	187.041,03	58.421,95	245.462,98	159.471,28	61%
		COGEST	2.065.565,00	761.933,25	436.668,24	1.198.601,49	866.963,51	58%
		TOTAL	2.470.499,26	948.974,28	495.090,19	1.444.064,47	1.026.434,79	58%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of VIE0403011

Project Title : **PAR extension linked to CPRGS**

Budget Version: **C02**

Currency : **EUR**

YtM :

Year to month : 31/12/2010

Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2009	Expenses 2010	Total	Balance	% Exec
10 CDF support for implementation of actions plans for		COGES	800.000,00	382.310,11	327.636,98	709.947,09	90.052,91	89%
11 Technical support for implementation of service delivery		COGES	100.000,00	780,48	1.609,61	2.390,09	97.609,91	2%
12 Evaluation implementation (annual commune performance		COGES	48.000,00	290,99	0,00	290,99	47.709,01	1%
13 Hold consultations with Districts and communes		COGES	3.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	3.000,00	0%
03 Improving capacity of training institutions in PAR related			74.000,00	34.026,50	1.889,40	35.915,90	38.084,10	49%
01 Conduct capacity assessment of local training providers		COGES	8.500,00	7.046,51	0,00	7.046,51	1.453,49	83%
02 Prepare materials		COGES	25.500,00	8.065,75	0,00	8.065,75	17.434,25	32%
03 Support necessary IT		COGES	25.000,00	18.914,24	1.889,40	20.803,64	4.196,36	83%
04 Assess the quality of training inputs		COGES	15.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	15.000,00	0%
04 Dissemination of lessons learned			97.000,00	17.280,44	5.140,14	22.420,58	74.579,42	23%
01 Communication strategy		COGES	15.000,00	13.393,27	0,00	13.393,27	1.606,73	89%
02 Establish network with other pilot districts and communes		COGES	17.000,00	2.478,70	1.007,19	3.485,89	13.514,11	21%
03 Web site design and networks		COGES	40.000,00	1.408,47	3.688,13	5.096,60	34.903,40	13%
04 Prepare best practices series and case studies		COGES	5.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	5.000,00	0%
05 Dissemination workshop (national)		COGES	20.000,00	0,00	444,82	444,82	19.555,18	2%
Z GENERAL MEANS			896.499,26	384.433,42	117.858,26	502.291,68	394.207,58	56%
01 Staff & running costs			717.860,00	326.911,36	92.905,98	419.817,34	298.042,66	58%
01 PPB & service delivery TA		REGIE	234.000,00	128.188,80	20.361,14	148.549,94	85.450,06	63%
02 BTC Coordinator		REGIE	93.600,00	48.018,54	13.108,53	61.127,07	32.472,93	65%
03 PPB & service delivery facilitators		COGES	113.760,00	31.556,08	19.453,68	51.009,76	62.750,24	45%
		REGIE	404.934,26	187.041,03	58.421,95	245.462,98	159.471,28	61%
		COGEST	2.065.565,00	761.933,25	436.668,24	1.198.601,49	866.963,51	58%
		TOTAL	2.470.499,26	948.974,28	495.090,19	1.444.064,47	1.026.434,79	58%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of VIE0403011

Project Title : **PAR extension linked to CPRGS**

Budget Version: **C02**

Currency : **EUR**

YtM :

Year to month : 31/12/2010

Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2009	Expenses 2010	Total	Balance	% Exec
04 Communication expert		COGES	37.920,00	7.666,59	0,00	7.666,59	30.253,41	20%
05 Translator		COGES	29.520,00	14.070,41	6.372,55	20.442,96	9.077,04	69%
06 Senior Admin / accountant		COGES	32.400,00	18.181,23	7.042,07	25.223,30	7.176,70	78%
07 Secretary		COGES	23.520,00	7.729,11	4.242,90	11.972,01	11.547,99	51%
08 Drivers		COGES	37.440,00	15.464,04	7.902,12	23.366,16	14.073,84	62%
09 PMU staff training		COGES	11.900,00	12.495,13	1.302,38	13.797,51	-1.897,51	116%
10 PMU communication costs		COGES	12.000,00	5.214,03	1.134,09	6.348,12	5.651,88	53%
11 Running costs vehicles		COGES	48.000,00	16.209,12	7.032,99	23.242,11	24.757,89	48%
12 PMU local travel costs		COGES	28.800,00	10.988,38	2.594,06	13.582,44	15.217,56	47%
13 Training equipment (beam,...)		COGES	3.000,00	2.959,16	0,00	2.959,16	40,84	99%
14 Consumables		COGES	12.000,00	8.170,74	2.359,47	10.530,21	1.469,79	88%
02 PMU Office equipment			100.500,00	46.688,37	0,00	46.688,37	53.811,63	46%
01 Office furnitures		COGES	10.000,00	249,96	0,00	249,96	9.750,04	2%
02 9 computers		COGES	18.000,00	4.115,66	0,00	4.115,66	13.884,34	23%
03 Printers		COGES	2.000,00	682,41	0,00	682,41	1.317,59	34%
04 Copy machines		COGES	10.000,00	7.249,40	0,00	7.249,40	2.750,60	72%
05 Project vehicles		COGES	50.000,00	33.709,57	0,00	33.709,57	16.290,43	67%
06 Motorcycle (for facilitators)		COGES	4.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	4.500,00	0%
07 Softwares		COGES	3.000,00	406,10	0,00	406,10	2.593,90	14%
08 PMU office network		COGES	3.000,00	275,27	0,00	275,27	2.724,73	9%
		REGIE	404.934,26	187.041,03	58.421,95	245.462,98	159.471,28	61%
		COGEST	2.065.565,00	761.933,25	436.668,24	1.198.601,49	866.963,51	58%
		TOTAL	2.470.499,26	948.974,28	495.090,19	1.444.064,47	1.026.434,79	58%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of VIE0403011

Project Title : **PAR extension linked to CPRGS**

Budget Version: **C02**

Currency : **EUR**

YtM :

Year to month : 31/12/2010

Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2009	Expenses 2010	Total	Balance	% Exec
03 M&E, formulation & contingencies			78.139,26	10.833,69	23.395,57	34.229,26	43.910,00	44%
01 Technical backstopping (BTC & external)		REGIE	16.000,00	2.075,65	1.831,12	3.906,77	12.093,23	24%
02 PSC meetings		REGIE	8.000,00	3.611,52	-2,48	3.609,04	4.390,96	45%
03 Mid-term and final evaluations		REGIE	40.000,00	4.980,49	21.472,64	26.453,13	13.546,87	66%
04 Financial audits		REGIE	10.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	10.000,00	0%
05 Formulation balance		REGIE	3.334,26	166,03	94,29	260,32	3.073,94	8%
06 Contingencies		COGES	805,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	805,00	0%
99 Conversion rate adjustment			0,00	0,00	1.556,71	1.556,71	-1.556,71	?%
98 Conversion rate adjustment		REGIE	0,00	0,00	1.556,71	1.556,71	-1.556,71	?%
99 Conversion rate adjustment		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%

REGIE	404.934,26	187.041,03	58.421,95	245.462,98	159.471,28	61%
COGEST	2.065.565,00	761.933,25	436.668,24	1.198.601,49	866.963,51	58%
TOTAL	2.470.499,26	948.974,28	495.090,19	1.444.064,47	1.026.434,79	58%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of VIE0403011

Project Title : **PAR extension linked to CPRGS**

Budget Version: **C02**
 Currency : **EUR**
 YtM : **Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing**

Year to month : 31/12/2010

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2009	Expenses 2010	Total	Balance	% Exec
A IMPROVE CAPACITIES & PERFORMANCES OF LOCAL			1.574.000,00	564.540,86	377.231,93	941.772,79	632.227,21	60%
01 Improve planning system at provincial, district and			257.500,00	78.185,59	26.954,95	105.140,54	152.359,46	41%
01 Study and assessment of the current planning situation		COGES	19.000,00	6.143,94	0,00	6.143,94	12.856,06	32%
02 Study tours on PPB		COGES	40.000,00	36.456,03	3.644,92	40.100,95	-100,95	100%
03 Planning manuals and organisation of trainings on the		COGES	15.500,00	14.567,44	6.290,51	20.857,95	-5.357,95	135%
04 Build up a database to support planning at commune level		COGES	135.000,00	6.960,05	16.906,61	23.866,66	111.133,34	18%
05 Organise training on PPB for 5 target groups		COGES	9.500,00	9.011,28	0,00	9.011,28	488,72	95%
06 Implementation of participatory planning method		COGES	10.000,00	5.046,85	0,00	5.046,85	4.953,15	50%
07 Assessment of implementation and development of the		COGES	9.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	9.500,00	0%
08 Replication of the model in line with replication strategy		COGES	19.000,00	0,00	112,91	112,91	18.887,09	1%
02 Improve the service of delivery system			1.145.500,00	435.048,33	343.247,44	778.295,77	367.204,23	68%
01 Undertake assessment of province wide experience with		COGES	34.000,00	2.985,12	0,00	2.985,12	31.014,88	9%
02 Support planning of further improvement of administrative		COGES	7.500,00	100,88	0,00	100,88	7.399,12	1%
03 Support implementation and evaluation		COGES	29.000,00	21.046,57	13.452,72	34.499,29	-5.499,29	119%
04 Provide capacity building		COGES	2.500,00	312,19	552,21	864,40	1.635,60	35%
05 Institutional appraisal of service delivery		COGES	23.000,00	9.109,97	0,00	9.109,97	13.890,03	40%
06 Develop a service delivery implementation plan		COGES	25.000,00	5.619,03	0,00	5.619,03	19.380,97	22%
07 Action planning & budgeting workshops		COGES	14.500,00	6.766,77	-2,74	6.764,03	7.735,97	47%
08 Train officials involved in pilot districts and communes		COGES	39.000,00	5.522,48	-1,34	5.521,14	33.478,86	14%
09 Establish CDF's rules, criteria's and procedures		COGES	20.000,00	203,74	0,00	203,74	19.796,26	1%
		REGIE	404.934,26	187.041,03	58.421,95	245.462,98	159.471,28	61%
		COGEST	2.065.565,00	761.933,25	436.668,24	1.198.601,49	866.963,51	58%
		TOTAL	2.470.499,26	948.974,28	495.090,19	1.444.064,47	1.026.434,79	58%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of VIE0403011

Project Title : **PAR extension linked to CPRGS**

Budget Version: **C02**

Currency : **EUR**

YTM :

Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

Year to month : 31/12/2010

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2009	Expenses 2010	Total	Balance	% Exec
10 CDF support for implementation of actions plans for		COGES	800.000,00	382.310,11	327.636,98	709.947,09	90.052,91	89%
11 Technical support for implementation of service delivery		COGES	100.000,00	780,48	1.609,61	2.390,09	97.609,91	2%
12 Evaluation implementation (annual commune performance		COGES	48.000,00	290,99	0,00	290,99	47.709,01	1%
13 Hold consultations with Districts and communes		COGES	3.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	3.000,00	0%
03 Improving capacity of training institutions in PAR related			74.000,00	34.026,50	1.889,40	35.915,90	38.084,10	49%
01 Conduct capacity assessment of local training providers		COGES	8.500,00	7.046,51	0,00	7.046,51	1.453,49	83%
02 Prepare materials		COGES	25.500,00	8.065,75	0,00	8.065,75	17.434,25	32%
03 Support necessary IT		COGES	25.000,00	18.914,24	1.889,40	20.803,64	4.196,36	83%
04 Assess the quality of training inputs		COGES	15.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	15.000,00	0%
04 Dissemination of lessons learned			97.000,00	17.280,44	5.140,14	22.420,58	74.579,42	23%
01 Communication strategy		COGES	15.000,00	13.393,27	0,00	13.393,27	1.606,73	89%
02 Establish network with other pilot districts and communes		COGES	17.000,00	2.478,70	1.007,19	3.485,89	13.514,11	21%
03 Web site design and networks		COGES	40.000,00	1.408,47	3.688,13	5.096,60	34.903,40	13%
04 Prepare best practices series and case studies		COGES	5.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	5.000,00	0%
05 Dissemination workshop (national)		COGES	20.000,00	0,00	444,82	444,82	19.555,18	2%
Z GENERAL MEANS			896.499,26	384.433,42	117.858,26	502.291,68	394.207,58	56%
01 Staff & running costs			717.860,00	326.911,36	92.905,98	419.817,34	298.042,66	58%
01 PPB & service delivery TA		REGIE	234.000,00	128.188,80	20.361,14	148.549,94	85.450,06	63%
02 BTC Coordinator		REGIE	93.600,00	48.018,54	13.108,53	61.127,07	32.472,93	65%
03 PPB & service delivery facilitators		COGES	113.760,00	31.556,08	19.453,68	51.009,76	62.750,24	45%
		REGIE	404.934,26	187.041,03	58.421,95	245.462,98	159.471,28	61%
		COGEST	2.065.565,00	761.933,25	436.668,24	1.198.601,49	866.963,51	58%
		TOTAL	2.470.499,26	948.974,28	495.090,19	1.444.064,47	1.026.434,79	58%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of VIE0403011

Project Title : **PAR extension linked to CPRGS**

Budget Version: **C02**

Currency : **EUR**

YtM :

Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

Year to month : 31/12/2010

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2009	Expenses 2010	Total	Balance	% Exec
04 Communication expert		COGES	37.920,00	7.666,59	0,00	7.666,59	30.253,41	20%
05 Translator		COGES	29.520,00	14.070,41	6.372,55	20.442,96	9.077,04	69%
06 Senior Admin / accountant		COGES	32.400,00	18.181,23	7.042,07	25.223,30	7.176,70	78%
07 Secretary		COGES	23.520,00	7.729,11	4.242,90	11.972,01	11.547,99	51%
08 Drivers		COGES	37.440,00	15.464,04	7.902,12	23.366,16	14.073,84	62%
09 PMU staff training		COGES	11.900,00	12.495,13	1.302,38	13.797,51	-1.897,51	116%
10 PMU communication costs		COGES	12.000,00	5.214,03	1.134,09	6.348,12	5.651,88	53%
11 Running costs vehicles		COGES	48.000,00	16.209,12	7.032,99	23.242,11	24.757,89	48%
12 PMU local travel costs		COGES	28.800,00	10.988,38	2.594,06	13.582,44	15.217,56	47%
13 Training equipment (beam,...)		COGES	3.000,00	2.959,16	0,00	2.959,16	40,84	99%
14 Consumables		COGES	12.000,00	8.170,74	2.359,47	10.530,21	1.469,79	88%
02 PMU Office equipment			100.500,00	46.688,37	0,00	46.688,37	53.811,63	46%
01 Office furnitures		COGES	10.000,00	249,96	0,00	249,96	9.750,04	2%
02 9 computers		COGES	18.000,00	4.115,66	0,00	4.115,66	13.884,34	23%
03 Printers		COGES	2.000,00	682,41	0,00	682,41	1.317,59	34%
04 Copy machines		COGES	10.000,00	7.249,40	0,00	7.249,40	2.750,60	72%
05 Project vehicles		COGES	50.000,00	33.709,57	0,00	33.709,57	16.290,43	67%
06 Motorcycle (for facilitators)		COGES	4.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	4.500,00	0%
07 Softwares		COGES	3.000,00	406,10	0,00	406,10	2.593,90	14%
08 PMU office network		COGES	3.000,00	275,27	0,00	275,27	2.724,73	9%
		REGIE	404.934,26	187.041,03	58.421,95	245.462,98	159.471,28	61%
		COGEST	2.065.565,00	761.933,25	436.668,24	1.198.601,49	866.963,51	58%
		TOTAL	2.470.499,26	948.974,28	495.090,19	1.444.064,47	1.026.434,79	58%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of VIE0403011

Project Title : **PAR extension linked to CPRGS**

Budget Version: **C02**

Currency : **EUR**

YtM :

Year to month : 31/12/2010

Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2009	Expenses 2010	Total	Balance	% Exec
03 M&E, formulation & contingencies			78.139,26	10.833,69	23.395,57	34.229,26	43.910,00	44%
01 Technical backstopping (BTC & external)		REGIE	16.000,00	2.075,65	1.831,12	3.906,77	12.093,23	24%
02 PSC meetings		REGIE	8.000,00	3.611,52	-2,48	3.609,04	4.390,96	45%
03 Mid-term and final evaluations		REGIE	40.000,00	4.980,49	21.472,64	26.453,13	13.546,87	66%
04 Financial audits		REGIE	10.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	10.000,00	0%
05 Formulation balance		REGIE	3.334,26	166,03	94,29	260,32	3.073,94	8%
06 Contingencies		COGES	805,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	805,00	0%
99 Conversion rate adjustment			0,00	0,00	1.556,71	1.556,71	-1.556,71	??%
98 Conversion rate adjustment		REGIE	0,00	0,00	1.556,71	1.556,71	-1.556,71	??%
99 Conversion rate adjustment		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
		REGIE	404.934,26	187.041,03	58.421,95	245.462,98	159.471,28	61%
		COGEST	2.065.565,00	761.933,25	436.668,24	1.198.601,49	866.963,51	58%
		TOTAL	2.470.499,26	948.974,28	495.090,19	1.444.064,47	1.026.434,79	58%

