

# **RESULTS REPORT 2017**

# SUPPORT FOR RESPONSIVE ACCOUNTABLE LOCAL GOVERNANCE IN NGHE AN - VIE1505011

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| ACRON        | YMS                           | 3  |
|--------------|-------------------------------|----|
| 1 INTE       | ERVENTION AT A GLANCE         | 4  |
| 1.1 I        | NTERVENTION FORM              | 4  |
| 1.2 E        | BUDGET EXECUTION              | 5  |
| 1.3 (        | Conclusions                   | 5  |
| 2 RES        | ULTS MONITORING               | 7  |
| 2.1 F        | PERFORMANCE RESULT 1          | 7  |
| 2.1.1        | 1 Progress of main activities | 7  |
| 2.1.2        | 2 Analysis of progress made   | 7  |
| 2.2 F        | PERFORMANCE RESULT 2          | 8  |
| 2.2.1        | 1 Progress of main activities | 8  |
| 2.2.2        | 2 Analysis of progress made   | 9  |
| 2.3 F        | PERFORMANCE OUTPUT 3          | 9  |
| 2.3.1        | 1 Progress of main activities | 9  |
| 2.3.2        | 2 Analysis of progress made   | 9  |
| 2.4 F        | PERFORMANCE RESULT 4          | 10 |
| 2.4.1        | 1 Progress of main activities | 10 |
| 2.4.2        | 2 Analysis of progress made   | 10 |
| 2.5 F        | PERFORMANCE RESULT 5          | 11 |
| 2.5.1        | 1 Progress of main activities | 11 |
| 2.5.2        | 2 Analysis of progress made   | 11 |
| 2.6 F        | RISK MANAGEMENT               | 13 |
| 3 LES        | SONS LEARNED                  | 18 |
| <b>4</b> ΔΝΝ | IFYES                         | 10 |

## Acronyms

| втс  | Belgian Technical Co-operation          |
|------|---|
| M&E  | Monitoring and Evaluation               |
| NEX  | National Execution                      |
| NOL  | No Objection Letter                     |
| NTA  | National Technical Advisor              |
| RALG | Responsive Accountable Local Governance |
| PMU  | Project Management Unit                 |
| PSC  | Project Steering Committee              |
| ToR  | Terms of Reference                      |

## 1 Intervention at a glance

#### 1.1 Intervention form

| Intervention title                                  | Support for Responsive Accountable Local Governance in NgheAn province, Vietnam  |
|---|--|
| Intervention code                                   | NN 3017553   |
| NAVISION CODE                                       | VIE 1505011  |
| Location  | NgheAn   |
| Total budget  | 1,150,000 EURO   |
| Partner Institution                                 | NgheAn province People's Committee   |
| Start date Specific<br>Agreement                    | 10 <sup>th</sup> November 2016   |
| Date intervention start /Opening steering committee | 20 <sup>th</sup> October 2017 (1st PSC meeting)  |
| Planned end date of execution period                | June 30, 2019  |
| End date Specific<br>Agreement                      | June 30, 2019  |
| Target groups                                       | <ul> <li>People's Committees and People Councils at the provincial, district and commune levels</li> <li>Participating line agencies: Departments of Home Affairs, Planning and Investment, Justice, Finance, Information and Communications, etc.</li> <li>The Vietnamese Fatherland Front members and members of mass organizations at the provincial, district and commune levels</li> <li>The citizens of selected communes of 3 targeted districts Quy Chau (12 communes, Quy Hop (10 communes), and Cua Lo (8 communes)</li> </ul>                           |
| Specific objective                                  | Improved citizen-government interaction leading to improved service delivery and increased citizen satisfaction.   |
| Results   | <ol> <li>Improved capacity of local government at all levels to disseminate information in a citizen-friendly manner.</li> <li>Improved capacity of People's Councils and Mass Organizations, and specifically PIBs and CISBs to facilitate and promote improved two-way communication between citizens and government at all levels</li> <li>Improved capacity of local government at all levels to collect, analyse and utilize citizens' feedback in a transparent and deliberative fashion for more responsive and accountable local governance and</li> </ol> |

|                            | <ul> <li>improved service delivery</li> <li>Improved capacity for local government at all levels to identify, plan, coordinate and oversee public administrative reforms in response to engagement with citizens and socio-political organizations</li> <li>The exchange and effective utilization of innovations, lessons learned and good practices with regard to citizen-government interactions; is promoted at provincial and national level</li> </ul> |
|----------------------------|---|
| Year covered by the report | 2017  |

#### 1.2 Budget execution

All amounts in Euro

| Budget | Budget -  | Disbu | rsement (N<br>REGIE) | IEX +  | Balance<br>at end | Cumulative disbursement |
|--------|-----------|-------|----------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| code   | Budget    | 2016  | 2017                 | Total  | 2017              | fraction at<br>end 2017 |
| Total  | 1,000,000 | 1,153 | 78,410               | 79,563 | 920,437           | 8.0%                    |
| A01    | 80,000    | 0     | 0                    | 0      | 80,000            | 0.0%                    |
| A02    | 150,000   | 0     | 0                    | 0      | 150,000           | 0.0%                    |
| A03    | 120,000   | 0     | 0                    | 0      | 120,000           | 0.0%                    |
| A04    | 200,000   | 0     | 1,542                | 1,542  | 198,458           | 0.8%                    |
| A05    | 60,000    | 0     | 2,064                | 2,064  | 57,936            | 3.4%                    |
| Х      | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0      | 0                 | 0.0%                    |
| Z      | 390,000   | 1,153 | 74,804               | 75,957 | 314,043           | 19.5%                   |

#### 1.3 Conclusions

#### Overview

In overview, 2017 was a preparatory year of RALG project in Nghe An. Preparations are made for project operational and managerialstructures including budget planning. At strategic layer, a Project Steering Committee (PSC) has been established at provincial level that will be responsible for providing the necessary strategic guidance and direction to project management and to approve project plans, budgets and reports. The Project Management Unit (PMU) has also been set up to coordinate, manage and monitor project processes in coordination with the relevant stakeholders. Other organizational arrangements were also prepared to ensure optimal participation of main project stakeholders which are an informal Provincial Project Working Group and Informal District Task Forces. A baseline survey has been conducted that was foundation for setting out the project M&E framework, risk management table and an updated operational plan.

Project launch workshop & the first PSC meeting in the second half of October 2017 marked the completion of the project inception phase that was followed by the implementation process. Surveys were conducted to develop a communication strategy aiming at bringing people into two-way dialogue, and to facilitate public administrative reforms.



Project launch workshop & the first PSC meeting Photo: NgheanTelevision

#### **Project Framework**

Project's updated Logframe, that was developed as a result of the baseline survey report, is available now for project monitoring and evaluation (M&E). The project will ensure quarterly updates of the Indicator Tracking Table for not only reporting purpose, but also necessaryadjustment for its better planning and implementation.

#### Disbursement

From the Project start till the end of Q4 2017, the Project executed €79,563 or 8% of its €1,000,000 total budget. Per modality the subtotals for 'NEX' and for 'REGIE' for the same period count with a total execution rate of 1.2% and 25% respectively.

RALG project in NgheAn province

BTC execution official

Mguyen Xuan Duc

Director of PMU of RALG Nghe An

#### 2 Results Monitoring

#### 2.1 Performance Result 1

#### 2.1.1 Progress of main activities

| Progress of main activities  |  | Progress Rating <sup>1</sup> |   |   |  |  |
|--|--|------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
|  |  | В                            | С | D |  |  |
| ResultA01: Improved capacity of local government at all levels to disseminate information in a citizen-friendly manner.  |  |                              |   |   |  |  |
| Activity A01.01:Support for development of communication strategy for making information more understandable and accessible to citizens  |  |                              |   |   |  |  |
| Including (i), assessing the effectiveness of existing communication methods - DoIC, and (ii), Conducting a capacity building/training need assessment for related departments on communications of local government's programs and policies |  | □X                           |   |   |  |  |
| - Coordination skills and preparation of communication materials - Editing and publishing through all kinds of media (social TV radio, print,);  |  | П                            | х |   |  |  |
| (Participating partners including: TTTT, DoJ, DoHA, DoF)   |  |                              |   |   |  |  |

Note 1. Progress is rated according to the following scale:

A: The activities are ahead of schedule

B The activities are on schedule

C The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.

D The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required

#### 2.1.2 Analysis of progress made

Project supported to develop a communication strategy for making information more understandable and accessible citizens. Specifically, the project collected citizens' feedback on the relative effectiveness of various methods communication, identified prioritization of issues to be



Annual Report 2017 - RALG project in NgheAn

Assessment of current communication methods and capacity building needs of government agencies and mass organizations in Nghe An. Photo:LeQuanaLuona/RALG project Nahe An

communicated that are most relevant to citizens and government, and proposed innovative collaboration for the preparation of communication material.

The project also prepared for an instruction training for officers from the Provincial Web Portal and other government agencies that will help them understand the corelations between subject matter and mode of communication, and enable themto select/adapt effective communication methods which are citizen-friendly.

# Activity A01.01: Support for development of communication strategy for making information more understandable and accessible to citizens

- · Assessing the effectiveness of existing communication methods
- Conducting a capacity building/training need assessment for related departments on communications of local government's programs and policies

#### Remarks:

Activity is on-track

#### Activity A01.02: Provide 02 technical trainings on:

- · Coordination skills and preparation of communication materials
- Editing and publishing through all kinds of media (social TV radio, print)

#### Remarks:

While the first technical training focusing on preparation of communication materials wasorganized as planned, the second one was suggested to be implemented in Q1 2018

#### 2.2 Performance Result 2

#### 2.2.1 Progress of main activities

| Durantee of main activities   | Progress Rating <sup>1</sup> |   |   |   |  |
|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Progress of <u>main</u> activities  |                              | В | С | D |  |
| Result A02: Improved capacity of People's Councils and Mass Organizations, and specifically PIBs and CISBs to facilitate and promote improved two-way communication between citizens and government at all levels       |                              |   |   |   |  |
| Activity A02.01:Provide PCcs and mass organizations with trainings and tools that focus on citizens' engagement, community facilitation, consensus building, advocacy, strategic communications, and dispute resolution |                              |   | х |   |  |
| Activity A02.02: Support for development of the Community oversight column on the PCCc's website  |                              |   | х |   |  |
| Activity A02.03:Develop guidelines, manuals and other tools to enable PIBs and CISBs to better perform their  |                              |   | Х |   |  |

|                                     | <br> |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| supervisory and eversight functions |      |
| supervisory and oversight functions |      |

Note 1. Progress is rated according to the following scale:

- A: The activities are ahead of schedule
- B The activities are on schedule
- C The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
- D The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required

#### 2.2.2 Analysis of progress made

Activities under this Result focus on capacity of PPC and mass organizations to facilitate 2-way communication. After getting approval for developing a contextualized handbook for PCc delegates, the project had selected consultants for the activity. The handbook will be completed in March 2018. TOR for development of the Community oversight column on the PCCc's website has been also prepared.

#### 2.3 Performance Output 3

#### 2.3.1 Progress of main activities

| Progress of main activities   | Progress Rating <sup>1</sup> |   |   |   |  |
|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Frogress of main activities   | Α                            | В | С | D |  |
| Result A03: Improved capacity of local government at all levels to collect, analyse and utilize citizens' feedback in a transparent and deliberative fashion for more responsive and accountable local governance and improved service delivery |                              |   |   |   |  |
| Activity A03.01:Develop guidelines on collection of citizens' feedbacks by using citizen score card survey  |                              |   | х |   |  |
| Activity A03.02:Conduct a study tour to a good practice of using M-score for collecting and responding to citizen comments  |                              |   | х |   |  |

Note 1. Progress is rated according to the following scale:

- A: The activities are ahead of schedule
- B The activities are on schedule
- C The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
- D The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required

#### 2.3.2 Analysis of progress made

The result's intervention contributes to improvements of local government on collection and analysis of citizens' feedback. TOR for development of guidelines on collection of citizens' feedbacks by using citizen score card survey have been developed. List of consultants and their technical proposals are now available for selection. The project is working on the selection of a consultant for the activity.

Activity of conducting a study tour on M-score application has been decided to implement in 2018 as suggested by the provincial PCc.

#### 2.4 Performance Result 4

#### 2.4.1 Progress of main activities

| Progress of main activities  | Progress Rating <sup>1</sup> |    |   |   |  |
|--|------------------------------|----|---|---|--|
| Frogress of main activities  | Α                            | В  | С | D |  |
| Result A04: Improved capacity for local government at all levels to identify, plan, coordinate and oversee public administrative reforms in response to engagement with citizens and socio-political organizations |                              |    |   |   |  |
| Activity A04.01:Support the province to carry out citizen score card surveys   |                              | □X |   |   |  |
| Activity A04.02:Develop guidelines to integrate PAR plan into participatory socio-economic development planning at commune level   |                              |    | х |   |  |

Note 1. Progress is rated according to the following scale:

- A: The activities are ahead of schedule
- B The activities are on schedule
- C The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
- D The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required

#### 2.4.2 Analysis of progress made

# Activity A04.01: Support the province to carry out citizen score card surveys

With support from the project, a survey on citizens' satisfaction with public administrative services at OSS has been conducted by DoHA in targeted districts. The survey result can contribute to the localities' PAR plans and result in changes in public administration services delivery at OSSs.



A sociological survey of citizens' satisfaction with public administrative services at OSSs. Photo:LeQuangLuong/RALG

# Activity A04.02.02: Develop guidelines to integrate PAR plan into participatory socio-economic development planning at commune level

This activity was proposed to be implemented in 2018

#### 2.5 Performance Result 5

#### 2.5.1 Progress of main activities

| Progress of main activities  |         | Progress Rating <sup>1</sup> |   |  |  |  |
|--|---------|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Progress of main activities  | A B C I |                              | D |  |  |  |
| Result A05: The exchange and effective utilization of innovations, lessons learned and good practices with regard to citizen-government interactions; is promoted at provincial and national level |         |                              |   |  |  |  |
| Activity A05.01:Conduct semi-annual meetings of PSC  |         | □X                           |   |  |  |  |

Note 1. Progress is rated according to the following scale:

- A: The activities are ahead of schedule
- B The activities are on schedule
- C The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
- D The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required

#### 2.5.2 Analysis of progress made

A joint meeting has been conducted on 20 October for PSCs of RALG projects in Nghe An and Ha Tinh.

| More responsive, transparent local government does not lead to accelerated social and economic development   | Risk<br>description                     | Identification of risk or issue |
|--|---|---------------------------------|
| TFF prep arati on (201   | Peri<br>od of<br>ident<br>ificat<br>ion | of risk o                       |
| OPS  | Categ                                   | rissue                          |
| Low  | Likelih<br>ood                          | Analy                           |
| Low  | Potential impact                        | Analysis of risk or issue       |
| Risk   | Total                                   | r issue                         |
| More responsive and transparent governance requires political commitment and a willingness to be creative and innovative. All indications suggest there are high levels of political commitment at the provincial and district levels to planned results and a willingness to exercise political authority to that end | Action(s)                               | Deal wit                        |
| PSC,   | Resp.                                   | th risk or issue                |
| December<br>2017   | Deadline                                | rissue                          |
| unaddressed  | Progress                                | Follow-up of risk or issue      |
| In progress  | Status                                  | risk or issue                   |

| Possible resistance (local government stakeholders) to change or place self- imposed limits to the scope for innovation and cretivity for PAR and accountable, transparent local             |   |
|--|---|
| TFF prep aration on (201 6)  |   |
| OPS  |   |
| Low  |   |
| High   |   |
| Medium<br>Risk   |   |
| Use of comparative and evidenced-based methods that would help project holders to take management decisions conductive to a more enabling environment for the achievement of planned results | exchanges of lessons learned and good practices can create opportunities for the sharing and mainstreaming of innovations in a manner which expands stakeholders' sense of what is possible |
| PMU  | PSC,  |
| December<br>2017   | December<br>2017  |
| unaddressed<br>yet   | unaddressed<br>yet  |
| In progress  |   |

| Much focus on performance indicators (PAPI, PAR & PCI) rather on adoption of new innovative business practices and new forms of social partnership  | governance  |
|---|---|
| TFF prep arati on (201  |   |
| OPS   |   |
| Low   |   |
| High  |   |
| Medium<br>Risk  |   |
| The political leadership within the province have a sophiticated and enlightened appreciation of the objectives of the project and the challenges to be addressed during project implementation | Good practives and lessons learned will be transerred, where possible and applicable across provinces Enhance communication capacity to PMU to help implementing agencies understand better the project |
| PSC,  | PMU   |
| December<br>2017  | December<br>2017<br>December<br>2017  |
| unaddressed<br>yet  | unaddressed<br>yet<br>unaddressed   |
| In progress   |   |

| Public servants and other implementing partners demonstrate resistance to the adoption of attitudinal changes which may be required for the achievement of planned results  |  |
|---|--|
| TFF prep arati o  (201 6)   |  |
| OPS   |  |
| Low   |  |
| Low   |  |
| Risk Risk   |  |
| Project holders are well aware of the attitudinal change that this project is designed to bring about and are in favour of changes which will enable project objectives to be achieved. Project holders can be expected to create incentives for stakeholders to embrace innovation and attitudinal and | Clear, consistent and appropreate vision and leadership will be provided by the Steering Committee to ensure implementing partners confront the fundamental challenges |
| PSC,  | PSC,   |
| December<br>2017  | December<br>2017   |
| unaddressed   | unaddressed<br>yet   |
| In progress   |  |

| -   |   |   |            |            |  |
|-----|---|---|------------|------------|--|
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
| -   | - |   | -          | -          | -                                      |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   | - |            |            | 4                                      |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
| 100 |   |   | SA-STUTAL: |            | W-172                                  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
| 200 |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   | serv       | the public | beha                                   |
|     |   |   | œ.         | otatio     | noive                                  |
|     |   |   |            | ) M        | <u>a</u>                               |
|     |   |   |            | 3          | ************************************** |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
| -   |   |   |            | -          |  |
| i   |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            | T                                      |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |
|     |   |   |            |            |  |

#### 3 Lessons Learned

| Lessons learned   | Target audience    |
|---|--------------------|
| It often takes too much timeto deal with procurement processes at the provincial level both administratively and financially. Working mechanisms with the province treasury and DIP need to be emphasized and established systematically. | PMU, PSC           |
| Adoption of bottom-up approach to ensure the effectiveness of project interventions as well as the ability to reach the specific objectives.  | PMU, PPWG,<br>DTFs |
| Capacity development focuses on organisational strengthening and humanresource management.  | PMU, PPWG,<br>DTFs |

4 Annexes

Budget and expenditure to 31/12/2017

|       |   |              |      |      |     |       |     | Disbur | Disbursement (EUI Total to | Disbursement (EUR)  Total to end 2017 | d 2017    | Disbursement (EUR)  Total to end 2017 Fract. of | d 2017 |
|-------|---|--------------|------|------|-----|-------|-----|--------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|---|--------|
|       |   | Budget (EUR) | EUR) | 2016 | 6   | 2017  | 7   | lotal  | õ                          | to end 2017                           | 55        | 55  | 55     |
| Code  | Description   | BEL          | ¥    | BEL  | ≨   | BEL   | ¥   | BEL    |                            | ¥                                     |           | VN BEL VN                                       | BEL VN |
| A01   | Improved capacity of LG to disseminate information                        | 80.000       | Sars | 99   | 10  | 315   |     | 7      |                            | 310                                   | - 0%      | - 0% -  | ,<br>, |
| 3     | Improved capacity of PPC mass   |              |      |      |     |       |     |        |                            |                                       |           |   |        |
| A02   | organisations to facilitate 2 way communication                           | 150.000      | r    | ř.   | ũ   | E     |     | ř      |                            | ı.                                    | - 0%      |   | 0%     |
| A03   | Improved capacity of LG to collect, analyse and utilize citizen feed back | 120.000      | .0E  | (0)  | (4) | 342   | (1) |        | 3) <b>!</b> ()             |                                       | - 0%      | - 0% -  | 7      |
| A04   | Improved capacity for LG to plan coordinated PAR reforms                  | 200.000      | t    | Ē    | r.  | 1.542 | ķ   |        | 1.542                      | 542 -                                 | 542 - 1%  |   | - 1%   |
| A0501 | Workshops, capitalization exercises                                       | 40.000       | В    | į.   | 1)  | 2.064 | 0   | 2      | 2.064                      | .064 -                                | .064 - 5% |   | - 5%   |
| A0502 | Studies and consultancies through framework contracts                     | 20.000       | :107 |      | 5•0 | 31    |     |        | j•/                        | 10)                                   | - 0%      | - 0% -  |        |
| X0101 | Contingencies<br>COGEST   |              | 21   |      | ě   | 1     | ï   |        | *                          |                                       | 3         | ,   |        |

|           |          |                                    | Ν.           | N                               | N   | N                | <b>N</b> 1   | ~                 | N      | N.                                      | Ν.                              | 2  | ~                   |
|-----------|----------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------|---|---------------------------------|--|---------------------|
|           | Z0403    | Z0402                              | Z0401        | Z0302                           | Z0301   | Z0202            | Z0201        | Z0105             | Z0104  | Z0103                                   | Z0102                           | Z0101  | X0102               |
| TOTAL     | Auditing | Evaluation (baseline, evaluation,) | Backstopping | Other Operating<br>Expenditures | operational costs<br>technical assistance<br>modalities | Vehicle          | IT equipment | Financial Officer | Driver | Translator cum Administrative Assistant | National Technical<br>Assistant | International Technical<br>Assistance - Technical<br>advisor | Contingencies REGIE |
| 1.000.000 | 9.000    | 15.000                             | 9.000        | 18.500                          | 17.948  | 38.350           | 8.000        | 19.200            | 7.350  | 16.800                                  | 50.852                          | 180.000  | •                   |
| 0         | 848      |                                    | 946          | a.                              | 3.10  | 15               |              | No.               | 1      | 20.1                                    | ř                               | ÿ  | 0.00                |
| 1.153     | (0)      |                                    | · ·          | 2                               | •   |                  | 3            |                   |        |   | 7                               | 1.147  | 0                   |
| 0         |          | 7                                  | i e          | 3                               |   | 16               | 3            | •                 | 3      | •                                       | Ē                               | 3  | •                   |
| 78.410    | /(#1)    |                                    | 1.522        | 816                             | 2.318   | I.e.             | 281          | 2.180             | ,      | 2.043                                   | 10.948                          | 54.696   | 89.5                |
| 0         |          | 1                                  | ·M           |                                 | .0  | E-15             | Į.           | 9                 | 9      |   |                                 | i  | 9                   |
| 79.563    | :00      | ,                                  | 1.522        | 816                             | 2.318   | Ē                | 281          | 2.180             | ì      | 2.043                                   | 10.955                          | 55.842   |                     |
| 0         | ugg      | 2                                  | 9            | ч                               | æ   | t <sup>2</sup> . |              | •                 |        | 4                                       |                                 |  | 712                 |
| 8%        | 0%       | 0%                                 | 17%          | 4%                              | 13%   | 0%               | 4%           | 11%               | 0%     | 12%                                     | 22%                             | 31%  | (1)                 |
| 0         |          |                                    | f)           | 2                               | 10  | 1                | 1            |                   | 1      | 781.7                                   | r                               | 1  | 2.07                |
| 920.437   | 9.000    | 15.000                             | 7.478        | 17.684                          | 15.630  | 38.350           | 7.719        | 17.020            | 7.350  | 14.757                                  | 39.897                          | 124.158  | 101                 |
| 0         | ì        | î                                  | r            | •                               |   | •                | i            | ĭ                 | 3)     | 1                                       | ,                               | 10   | ľ                   |

## Annex

# Quality criteria – VIE1505011 RALG project in Nghe An

1. RELEVANCE: The degree to which the intervention is in line with local and national policies and

| In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least of a A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D  Assessment RELEVANCE: total score  A B C | ne 'A', no 'C' or 'D'  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Assessment RELEVANCE: total score  A B C  | D  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessment RELEVANCE: total score   | U  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Y I   | MICHI RELEVANCE. Iotal 30016   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 What is the present level of relevance of the intervention?   | L  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearly still embedded in national policies and Belgian strategy, responds to aid commitments, highly relevant to needs of target group.  | l effectiveness  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B Still fits well in national policies and Belgian strategy (without always being exp compatible with aid effectiveness commitments, relevant to target group's need  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C Some issues regarding consistency with national policies and Belgian strategy, or relevance.  | aid effectiveness  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contradictions with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid efficiency commit to needs is questionable. Major adaptations needed.   | tments; relevance  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 As presently designed, is the intervention logic still holding true?  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Clear and well-structured intervention logic; feasible and consistent vertical logic of objectives; adequate indicators; Risks and Assumptions clearly identified and managed; exit strategy in place (if applicable). |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adequate intervention logic although it might need some improvements regard objectives, indicators, Risk and Assumptions.   | ng hierarchy of  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problems with intervention logic may affect performance of intervention and ca and evaluate progress; improvements necessary.   | pacity to monitor  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intervention logic is faulty and requires major revision for the intervention to ha success.  | ve a chance of   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTATION TO DATE: Degree to which the resources o (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted into results in an economical way   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least two 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B', no 'C' or 'D' = B; at least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessment EFFICIENCY : total score  A B C  | D  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| /   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 How well are inputs (financial, HR, goods & equipment) managed?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All inputs are available on time and within budget.   | All inputs are available on time and within budget.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Most inputs are available in reasonable time and do not require substantial bud However there is room for improvement.  | lget adjustments.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C Availability and usage of inputs face problems, which need to be addressed; of may be at risk.  | herwise results  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Availability and management of inputs have serious deficiencies, which threate of results. Substantial change is needed.  | n the achievement  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 How well is the implementation of activities managed?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A Activities implemented on schedule  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| ✓        | В   | Most activities are on schedule. Delays exist, but do not harm the delivery of outputs  |
|----------|-----|---|
|          | С   | Activities are delayed. Corrections are necessary to deliver without too much delay.  |
|          | D   | Serious delay. Outputs will not be delivered unless major changes in planning.  |
| 2.3      | How | well are outputs achieved?  |
|          | Α   | All outputs have been and most likely will be delivered as scheduled with good quality contributing to outcomes as planned.   |
| <b>✓</b> | В   | Output delivery is and will most likely be according to plan, but there is room for improvement in terms of quality, coverage and timing.                                       |
|          | С   | Some output are/will be not delivered on time or with good quality. Adjustments are necessary.  |
|          | D   | Quality and delivery of outputs has and most likely will have serious deficiencies. Major adjustments are needed to ensure that at least the key outputs are delivered on time. |

|     |       | CTIVENESS TO DATE: Degree at the end of year N  | to which the o    | outcome (Specif | fic Objective) is | s achieved as      |  |
|-----|-------|---|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|
|     |       | o calculate the total score for this o<br>times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no '   |                   |                 | vs: 'At least one | 'A', no 'C' or 'D' |  |
| Ass |       | nent EFFECTIVENESS : total  | Α                 | В               | С                 | D                  |  |
|     |       |   |                   | <b>√</b>        |                   |                    |  |
| 3.1 | As pr | esently implemented what is the   | e likelihood of t | he outcome to I | be achieved?      |                    |  |
|     | Α     | Full achievement of the outcome is likely in terms of quality and coverage. Negative effects (if any) have been mitigated.  |                   |                 |                   |                    |  |
| ✓   | В     | Outcome will be achieved with minor limitations; negative effects (if any) have not caused much harm.   |                   |                 |                   |                    |  |
|     | С     | Outcome will be achieved only partially among others because of negative effects to which management was not able to fully adapt. Corrective measures have to be taken to improve ability to achieve outcome. |                   |                 |                   |                    |  |
|     | D     | The intervention will not achieve its outcome unless major, fundamental measures are taken.   |                   |                 |                   |                    |  |
| 3.2 | Are a | activities and outputs adapted (when needed), in order to achieve the outcome?  |                   |                 |                   |                    |  |
|     | Α     | The intervention is successful in adapting its strategies / activities and outputs to changing external conditions in order to achieve the outcome. Risks and assumptions are managed in a proactive manner.  |                   |                 |                   |                    |  |
| ✓   | В     | The intervention is relatively successful in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in order to achieve its outcome. Risks management is rather passive.                                     |                   |                 |                   |                    |  |
|     | С     | The intervention has not entirely conditions in a timely or adequat important change in strategies is outcome.  | e manner. Risk n  | nanagement has  | been rather stat  | tic. An            |  |
|     | D     | The intervention has failed to res<br>managed. Major changes are ne   |                   | •               | ions, risks were  | insufficiently     |  |

| 4. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY: The de an intervention in the long run (beyond t                   | _ |   | • |                   |
|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| In order to calculate the total score for this of A; Maximum two 'C's, no 'D' = B; At least the |   |   |   | , no 'C' or 'D' = |
| Assessment POTENTIAL  | Α | В | С | D                 |
| SUSTAINABILITY : total score  |   | ✓ |   |                   |
| 4.1 Financial/economic viability?   |   |   |   |                   |

|          | Α   | Financial/economic sustainability is potentially very good: costs for services and maintenance are covered or affordable; external factors will not change that.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| ✓        | В   | Financial/economic sustainability is likely to be good, but problems might arise namely from changing external economic factors.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | С   | Problems need to be addressed regarding financial sustainability either in terms of institutional or target groups costs or changing economic context.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | D   | Financial/economic sustainability is very questionable unless major changes are made.   |  |  |  |  |  |
|          |     | is the level of ownership of the intervention by target groups and will it continue after the ternal support?   |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | Α   | The steering committee and other relevant local structures are strongly involved in all stages of implementation and are committed to continue producing and using results.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>✓</b> | В   | Implementation is based in a good part on the steering committee and other relevant local structures, which are also somewhat involved in decision-making. Likeliness of sustainability is good, but there is room for improvement. |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | С   | The intervention uses mainly ad-hoc arrangements and the steering committee and other relevant local structures to ensure sustainability. Continued results are not guaranteed. Corrective measures are needed.                     |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | D   | The intervention depends completely on ad-hoc structures with no prospect of sustainability. Fundamental changes are needed to enable sustainability.   |  |  |  |  |  |
|          |     | is the level of policy support provided and the degree of interaction between intervention by level?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and      | A   | Policy and institutions have been highly supportive of intervention and will continue to be so.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ✓        | В   | Policy and policy enforcing institutions have been generally supportive, or at least have not hindered the intervention, and are likely to continue to be so.   |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | С   | Intervention sustainability is limited due to lack of policy support. Corrective measures are needed.   |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | D   | Policies have been and likely will be in contradiction with the intervention. Fundamental changes needed to make intervention sustainable.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.4      | How | ow well is the intervention contributing to institutional and management capacity?  |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | Α   | Intervention is embedded in institutional structures and has contributed to improve the institutional and management capacity (even if this is not an explicit goal).   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ✓        | В   | Intervention management is well embedded in institutional structures and has somewhat contributed to capacity building. Additional expertise might be required. Improvements in order to guarantee sustainability are possible.     |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | O   | Intervention relies too much on ad-hoc structures instead of institutions; capacity building has not been sufficient to fully ensure sustainability. Corrective measures are needed.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | D   | Intervention is relying on ad hoc and capacity transfer to existing institutions, which could guarantee sustainability, is unlikely unless fundamental changes are undertaken.  |  |  |  |  |  |