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Preface

This workshop on Community Driven Development, held in Ha Noi in April 2004, aimed to achieve two things. Firstly, to bring together and share experience from Community Driven Development programs both from within Viet Nam and internationally, including relevant experience from other countries in Southeast Asia. And secondly, to help lay the foundation for future programs in Viet Nam that focus on community infrastructure and rural livelihoods by identifying some of the most important issues that should be addressed by these programs.

As described in the presentations given at the workshop, Community Driven Development can be defined as an approach to poverty alleviation that focuses on working together with poor people and poor communities as partners in development. This involves giving decision-making and resource management responsibilities to the grassroots administrations and to community groups. In this way, Community Driven Development can also be described as a ‘trust driven’ approach – whereby government and donors enable local people to decide on their own development priorities, and build the capacity of local leaders and officials and local people to manage and implement their development activities effectively.

The principles of Community Driven Development are enshrined in many of the social and economic policies of Viet Nam. In recent years, there has also been an increasing number of projects and programs that are working according to these principles. Much valuable experience has come from these projects and programs, and there have been positive impacts on socio-economic development of the rural areas. At the same time, people in the remote rural areas still face many difficulties. More work is required to assess and replicate successful models of poverty alleviation and local area development, to improve targeting of the most needy areas and socio-economic groups, to increase the efficiency and integration of projects and programs working in the same locality, and to enhance the Government’s administrative and decentralization reforms.

The presentations and discussions at this workshop covered many important practical topics including key principles in the design of Community Driven Development programs, the scope of community infrastructure and livelihoods components, monitoring and evaluation, scaling-up and institutionalization of these approaches, and local capacity building priorities. It is hoped that the proceedings of the workshop will provide a valuable resource for people working on community development, as well as contributing to the design of future programs.

Le Thi Thong
Vice Director General
Department of Agriculture Economy
Ministry of Planning and Investment
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INTRODUCTION
This proceedings is of a Workshop on Community Driven Development (CDD) in Viet Nam that was jointly organised by the Partnership to Assist the Poorest Communes (PAC), Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI), and the World Bank in Hanoi on April 13-14, 2004. The objectives of this workshop were as follows:

- To present the findings of a review and publication on Community Driven Development in Viet Nam that was jointly conducted by the World Bank and the Partnership to Assist the Poorest Communes in 2003.

- To share international experience on CDD, particularly from World Bank projects in countries of the SE Asian Region, on topics such as the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and scaling-up of CDD approaches.

- To identify and discuss key questions and issues relating to CDD in Viet Nam with a view to creating a platform for the institutionalization and wider application of these approaches in future projects and programs.

The workshop was attended by around 120 representatives from central government ministries and agencies, province authorities and departments from 18 provinces nationwide, donor-supported rural development projects, NGOs and donor agencies, and World Bank specialists on CDD. Senior representatives from MPI (Mr. Pham Hai and Mrs. Le Thi Thong) and from the World Bank (Mr. Robin Mearns and Mr. Nguyen The Dzung) co-chaired the workshop. A full list of participants is given in Annex 1.

The workshop was opened by the Vice Minister of Planning and Investment, Mr. Nguyen Xuan Thao. In his Opening Speech, the Vice Minister said that over the past 5 years the poverty rate in Viet Nam has been reduced to 25.9 percent compared with 50-60 percent before 1998, the living conditions of people in remote rural areas have improved, infrastructure has been improved, and the knowledge of local people is increased. The Vice Minister expressed his gratitude to bilateral and multilateral donors, international organizations and NGOs for their assistance and support in this regard. He also thanked local and central organizations in Viet Nam for their active participation in the successful implementation of community development programs.

The Vice Minister noted that all Community Driven Development projects and programs follow a bottom-up approach – as their action plan preparation is based on the needs of local communities and with participation of local people. Poverty alleviation has been supported by implementing diversified components of community infrastructure construction, strengthening management capacity amongst local beneficiaries, and promoting production, economic and social development. The Vice Minister stressed, however, that despite these significant improvements, the livelihoods of people in the remote rural areas still face many difficulties, the best practices and models of poverty alleviation projects have not been
adequately assessed and replicated, integration of different projects in the same locality is still weak with low efficiency, and decentralization reforms have not been taken strongly in some provinces. He suggested that participants at the workshop discuss mutual concerns and issues to identify new community driven development approaches, to replicate successes and to overcome weaknesses in order to accelerate poverty alleviation in Viet Nam.

In his Opening Address, Mr. Klaus Rohland, the World Bank Country Director for Viet Nam, said that CDD is becoming increasingly important for the development process not only in Viet Nam but also worldwide. CDD is the new way of doing business in development, whereby people are responsible for their own future as they have better understanding of what is right for their community than those living far away. This is a learning process for donors, governments and local people alike, and it is also increasingly important for donors to harmonize their approaches for supporting CDD.

Mr. Rohland suggested some issues for discussion at the workshop, including how to improve the linkages between local communities and government agencies, and issues of transparency and the flow of information between the central and local authorities and between the government and local people. He stressed that CDD is “trust driven” – whereby government and donors enable people to decide and believe in their decisions, and that local communities should be allowed to make mistakes in this learning process.

THE PRESENTATIONS

In the first presentation providing an Overview of CDD Practice (Presentation No.1), Mr. Daniel Owen from World Bank’s CDD Unit and Social Development Department began by defining the CDD approach as ‘working with poor people as partners in development’. This involves giving decision-making and resource management responsibilities to community groups, and it is a way of organizing for poverty reduction that increases the capacity of communities in partnership with a range of institutional actors. He provided an overview of the evolution of CDD approaches over recent decades, and informed the audience that CDD projects are becoming an increasingly important component of the World Bank’s portfolio across different sectors and regions of the world.

Mr. Owen then identified the following key principles for CDD design: (a) making investments responsible to informed demand; (b) building participatory mechanisms for community control and stakeholder involvement; (c) investing in the capacity of Community-Based Organizations; (d) facilitating community access to information; (e) developing simple rules and strong incentives backed by monitoring and evaluation; (f) establishing enabling institutional and policy frameworks; (g) maintaining flexibility in the design of arrangements and innovation; (h) ensuring social and gender inclusion; (i) designing for scaling up; and (k) investing in an exit strategy.

Mr. Owen reviewed the experience and impacts of a number of CDD projects from different countries. On the basis of this evidence, he concluded that CDD approaches can help to improve the effectiveness and targeting of public service delivery, it can have positive impacts on the living standards of poor people, and can help to build social capital and sustainability. However, he noted that cultural and social contexts strongly determine the effectiveness of CDD programs, and that CDD approaches may not be the best option in contexts where there is low pre-existing social capital or capacity for collective action.
In her presentation on Approaches to CDD in Viet Nam (Presentation No.2), Mrs. Le Thi Thong, Deputy Director of the Department of Agricultural Economy of MPI, said that in past years poverty alleviation has received great support and attention from the Communist Party, the State and the Government as well as from the donor community. Advantages of the community development approach are: continuous participation of local people in the process of program implementation; helping to ensure transparency and increase sustainability; encouraging the capacities of local people; promoting mutual assistance among local people and communities; improving unity in order to build a healthy community and increasing knowledge on poverty reduction. The weaknesses to be addressed include: the number of CDD approaches and models in Viet Nam depends on the donors and localities; participation of local people depends on the guidelines from higher levels; a longer time is required to build a project; local governments have low capacity in CDD; the administrative and budget decentralization process is slow; local people are often passive in this process; and the project integration process is still poor.

Based on the experience from preparation and early implementation of the Northern Mountainous Poverty Reduction Project (NMPRP), Mrs. Thong laid out some essential requirements for this approach to be effective, including: it is necessary to establish more common mechanisms for promoting community participation; people at all levels should be invited to participate in all steps in project preparation and implementation activities; there is a need to provide participatory methodology training to local people and authorities; concrete and comprehensive guidelines should be provided to local People’s Committees; Commune Development Boards structures should be strengthened; and there should be an integration of various projects and programs at the local level.

Mr. Robin Mearns, on behalf of the World Bank and the Partnership to Assist the Poorest Commune, gave a briefing on the recently completed report on Community Driven Development in Viet Nam: a review and discussion platform (Presentation No.3). This report aimed at understanding what CDD means in the Viet Nam context; identifying factors that influence outcomes in different socio-economic contexts and parts of the country; reviewing the experience and lessons from a selection of government, donor and NGO projects and programs; and assessing future potentials and options for CDD projects in the rural sector.

The report and presentation highlight some key issues relating to national policies and the context for CDD programs today. These include: (i) the linkages in province level planning and decision-making between the policies set out in the Comprehensive Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy (CPRGS), the on-going Program on Administrative Reform, and the content and financing of the targeted poverty reduction programs; (ii) the need for better coordination between government and donor financed programs to create an aggregated impact at community level and to increase the efficiency of investments; and (iii) the balance between sector specific and integrated CDD approaches.

The study concludes that there is a strong demand and justification for continuing with ‘integrated’ programs that focus on community infrastructure and livelihoods in the remote communes and villages. The impact of such programs will be enhanced, however, if they really do concentrate on small-scale infrastructure to fulfill basic community needs and household livelihoods. Regarding future potentials and options for CDD programs in the poor commune areas, the report makes a set of recommendations relating to: (i) commune and village infrastructure and appropriate technology development; (ii) community based natural
resources management; (iii) creating synergy in service to support household livelihood improvement; (iv) direct financing mechanism - working through commune budget to increase transparency; and (v) human resource and institutional capacity building priorities.

In his presentation on **CDD in Viet Nam (Presentation No.4)**, Mr. Pham Van Ngoc from ActionAid defined ‘local community’ in the current context as a ‘local administrative unit’ but which has its own traditional identity characterized by economic and cultural relations and lines of descent based on kinship. Mr. Ngoc suggested that communes, villages and groups (sets of persons with common interests) should be considered as CDD subjects. And he listed the following strategic issues in development that can be addressed by CDD: inefficient and unsustainable management and use of natural resources; weak grassroots governance; inequitable development; and weaknesses in translating policies and strategies into actions at grassroots level. Mr. Ngoc also noted that the participation of local people can be facilitated and legitimized through community-based organisations and local institutions, and this is a key element in the rights-based approach supported by ActionAid.

In a presentation on **Monitoring and Evaluating CDD Programs (Presentation No.5)**, Mr. Rob Chase from World Bank’s CDD and social capital team addressed the question of how to monitor and evaluate CDD programs. Based on experience from Thailand and the Philippines, he highlighted key principles in M&E which may be of use in Viet Nam. He proposed a set of “gold standard” evaluation principles including: (i) the evaluation design should be tailored to the specific project and context; (ii) there should be randomized treatment and control groups; (iii) there should be adequate baseline and follow up survey data; (iv) the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection; (v) a long time horizon is required in order to examine sustainability; and (vi) there should be statistical representation on a program or national scale.

However, Mr. Chase also drew the participant’s attention to real world constraints in conducting M&E, including financial and logistical constraints, and the diversity of activities, socio-economic groups and communities that are often included in CDD programs. Given this situation, “golden standard” evaluation is often hard to achieve. Mr. Chase therefore suggested that the most important principles are to use different data sources creatively, to combine baseline data collection with program planning, to use a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods, and to keep evaluations highly relevant for program operations.

Mr. Saurabh Sinha from UNDP gave a presentation on the methodology that is being used in the **Evaluation of the National Target Program on HEPR and Program 135 (Presentation No.6)**. The objectives of this evaluation, which is being conducted under MOLISA, are to assess the overall effectiveness of the NTP on HEPR and Program 135 in sustainably reducing poverty, and to draw lessons for designing the program for the period 2006 to 2010. An evaluation report is expected to be published in June that will cover targeting issues, institutional and process issues, and impact assessment.

Commenting on Program 135 in the period of 1998 to 2005, Mr. Pham Hai, Director of the Local and Regional Economy Department of MPI, said that thanks to this program, infrastructure and people’s livelihoods have been significantly improved, local capacity has been raised and many resources have been mobilized from various sectors and localities. According to Mr. Hai, reasons behind this success were appropriate targeting, adequate and synchronous resource mobilization, transparency to ensure good monitoring, good implementation and management. However, the program still faces some challenges including
unanticipated changes in the scope of the projects, inadequate people’s participation and empowerment, and an inadequate legal framework.

In a summary of the presentations and discussions from the first day of the workshop, Mr. Hai suggested that further discussion is required to address the questions raised by the participants. He also emphasized the importance of building capacity, of creating a favorable legal environment for community participation, using a comprehensive approach for investment planning, and setting up and maintaining an effective monitoring system for CDD programs.

Day two of the workshop began with a presentation on Scaling-up CDD in the context of decentralization: some international experience (Presentation No.7) by Mr. Keith Mclean from World Bank’s CDD and social capital team. Mr. Mclean explained the importance of decentralization and provided some international experience on integration of CDD and decentralization reforms, as well as challenges in scaling-up CDD. In this respect, he emphasized the importance of building partnerships and two-way accountability between local government and communities. Amongst the main conclusions from this presentation are that: (i) linking communities and local governments in effective partnerships is not easy, but is important for scaling-up, maintaining financial and institutional sustainability, and improving local governance; (ii) scaling-up CDD is best complemented with policy dialogue to strengthen the decentralization framework, inter-governmental fiscal systems and strengthening local governments; and (iii) strengthening communities to manage their development requires a systemic and integrated approach to local development.

In his presentation on CDD: perspectives and mainstreaming (Presentation No.8), Mr. Pham Hai listed the projects and programs in which CDD had been applied since 1998 and how these relate to the objectives of the Comprehensive Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy. He then provided details of CDD trends in Viet Nam, which require effective utilization of resources, clear definition of the scope and objectives of the program, formulation of effective institutions, and building community capacity. Mr. Hai also summarized Viet Nam’s viewpoints on CDD as follows: (i) using a comprehensive approach (multi-sector); (ii) putting people at the center (i.e. economic effects should link with social effects); (iii) the government supports budgets and technical inputs (consultants); (iv) maximizing decentralization and empowerment (institutionalization); and (v) promoting people’s participation in management (formulating support procedures).

Mr. Pham Van Tong, Vice Chairman of Binh Phuoc Province People’s Committee brought some local experience to the workshop. He stated that although investment capital for CDD programs remains small, it receives strong support from local people and has made a progressive contribution to the improvement of infrastructure. As a result of CDD, living standards in poor communes in the province have been improved, new sources of income have been generated, and capacity at local level has been increased. The province, however, is still facing a lack of investment allocation and difficulties in integrating different projects and programs.
THE DISCUSSIONS

In addition to the presentations, and questions and discussions during the plenary sessions, the participants also joined 6 breakout Discussion Groups on the following topics: empowerment; targeting; monitoring and evaluation; capacity building; scaling-up and mainstreaming; and infrastructure / livelihood support. During the report back session, representatives of the groups presented many valuable viewpoints, suggestions and comments. Some key points raised by each group included:

- **Group 1 – empowerment.** Institutionalization of CDD approaches and capacity building should go hand-in-hand with increasing the system of benefits. This group also suggested that community development funds should be fully managed by the community itself.

- **Groups 2 + 3 - targeting and M&E.** There is a lack of an adequate monitoring mechanism in Viet Nam and this needs to be resolved. This is important to promote transparency. Greater effort is also required to apply CDD approaches more widely, and to clarify objectives in order to lead to focused project targeting.

- **Group 4 - capacity building.** Capacity building in CDD is required at all levels, but especially at commune and village levels. This group also made suggestions to improve the effectiveness of capacity building at the local level such as the materials provided by the central level should be modified to fit local contexts, and introduction of flexible training methods.

- **Group 5 - mainstreaming and scaling up.** This group suggested some actions to improve the effectiveness of CDD, including: setting up a uniform mechanism of CDD, providing a framework for decentralization, establishing a CDD platform as well as a government platform, simplifying the current procedures and policies, drawing lessons and experiences, forming a CDD task force, and improving coordination among donors.

- **Group 6 – infrastructure / livelihoods.** This group discussed the pros and cons of infrastructure development and livelihoods support and concluded that the two components are equally important and complimenting each other in CDD programs. The group suggested that a master plan appropriate for each locality is required, combined with capacity building, and creating models in each region for replication.

Lively discussions between the participants were evident during the 2-day workshop. These focused on some important questions and issues that will need to be addressed in the future, including:

- What is CDD in the Viet Nam context and how do we define ‘community’? Although the issue requires further discussion on whether the commune and/or village is the most appropriate focus for CDD, many participants agreed that some basic principles and a framework for the CDD approach should be established. Some participants suggested that community definition could be flexible depending on the local context.

- What are the respective roles of the central and local government authorities and coordination between these agencies in CDD?

- What is the impact of the market economy on CDD projects, and the appropriate approaches to this? Participants raised many questions on how to facilitate the community’s participation in socio-economic development activities.
• How to integrate CDD projects with other programs and projects in the same areas such as Program 135?
• How to overcome local tax barriers, limited local revenue collection and re-distribution in remote districts and communes?
• How to set up an effective monitoring system as a management tool and ensuring information flow?

CLOSING COMMENTS
Summarizing the workshop, Mr. Robin Mearns from the World Bank listed five vital issues and topics which may help in moving the discussion forward:

• In the CDD approach people are the actors, not the beneficiaries. CDD is development by and for the people. Community based development requires an enabling framework and action.
• Institutionalizing CDD is a way to improve sustainability, predictability and accountability.
• Clarify the roles and responsibility of the actors. Stakeholder analysis is important as it will bring about behavior changes.
• Information flow will bring about a higher level of accountability.
• CDD is trust-driven development, where we promote learning-by-doing, and build capacity by allowing communities to make mistakes. The process of implementation of CDD should allow flexibility within a broad standard and agreed benchmarks, but not imposing from outside.

Mr. Mearns also proposed some follow-up actions to the workshop including further discussions with concerned government agencies, and further review to identify future applications of the CDD approach at provincial level.

In conclusion, Mr. Pham Hai from MPI summarized six key issues, around which discussions have evolved during the workshop:

• There is a close connection between empowerment and decentralization and a link between empowerment and benefits.
• Monitoring and evaluation needs our utmost attention. Appropriate and clear criteria, an appropriate framework and building trust at commune level are required.
• Capacity building is a must and should be carried out in the first stage. More discussions are required to find out appropriate training methods and materials. Trainers at local levels are often best for building capacity.
• Scaling-up and mainstreaming should focus on commune budget allocations.
• Institutionalization is required for scaling-up.
• Infrastructure and livelihood support are closely connected. And people at commune level should make investment decisions based on the local context.
Poverty alleviation is one of the key tasks of the Vietnamese government and it has reached the first significant achievement in different its activities.

Over the last 5 years, the Poverty rate in the especially difficult area has reduced to 25.9 percent, compared to 50-60 percent before 1998 (according to Vietnam's poverty criteria). Living conditions of people in remote areas have improved, infrastructure is built and knowledge of local people is increased. All these provide them better opportunity to access new technology and science to apply in production development, to increase responsibility and contribution in implementation projects as well as in carry out after-project maintenance. Community driven projects also create poverty alleviation movement in all country with participatory of ministries, institutions, organizations, social groups and individuals in the country and abroad.

These achievements in poverty alleviation have been supported actively and efficiency by governments of other countries, institutions of UN, international NGOs and other donors such as: the WB provides support to different poverty alleviation programs in Vietnam, including Northern Mountains Poverty Reduction Project (NMPRP) and Community Based Rural Infrastructure Project (CBRIP) in central region, assistance from UNDP, IFAD, EU, ADB, DFID, OXFAM, governments and organizations of Sweden, Australia, Belgium, Germany, Finland, Canada etc.

On behalf of Ministry of Planning and Investment, I would like to thank governments of other countries, international organizations, NGOs for their assistances provided to Vietnam in the last years, and I hope that this assistance shall be continued in coming time. I also express sincerely thank to central and local organizations in Vietnam for their actively participation in successfully implementation of community driven program.

The noted common feature of all these projects/programs is that all of them have been following bottom up approach, their action plan preparation has been based on the needs of community and with participation of local people; projects focus in the poorest regions and ethnic minority communities; Poverty alleviation has been supported by implementing diversified components of community driven infrastructure construction, strengthening management capacity to local beneficiaries, promoting production, economic and social development.

Despite of having significant improvement, however, the livelihoods of people in the remote areas still facing difficulties to improve. The best practices and models of poverty alleviation projects have not been assessed and replicated. Integration of different projects that implement in the same community is still poor and low efficiency. In some provinces decentralization has not been taken strongly.
Therefore, today, dear participants, we gather together here to discuss mutual concerned issues and find new community driven approach in order to replicate advantages, avoid weaknesses that happen in last time for accelerating poverty alleviation in Vietnam.

I wish the workshop be successful.

Thank you for your attention.

Nguyen Xuan Thao  
Vice Minister  
Ministry of Planning and Investment
Presentation No.1

Community-Driven Development: An Overview of Practice

Dan Owen
CDD & Social Capital Unit
Social Development Department
World Bank
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1. The Approach – what, why, how

POVERTY REDUCTION REQUIRES

National Programs: education, health, infrastructure...

A globally competitive economy

Immediate and lasting results at the grassroots:
COMMUNITY-DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT
Is often the missing link in strategies
CDD: WORKING WITH POOR PEOPLE AS PARTNERS

The Approach

• CDD gives decision-making & resource management responsibility to community groups
• It is a way of organizing for poverty reduction that leverages the capacity of communities, in partnership with a range of institutional actors

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT TO CDD USUALLY INCLUDES

Promoting an enabling environment through policy and institutional reform (decentralization, sector policies, etc.)

CDD

Strengthening capacity of community groups

Strengthened local governance relationships

WHAT’S NEW WITH CDD?

• Not reinventing the wheel

• Innovations in CDD:
  o Scale
  o Links to national poverty reduction strategies and to policy and institutional reform
  o Increased emphasis on community action
  o Partnerships, especially with local government
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE: GRADUAL EVOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>• Integrated rural development programs (multi-ministry coordination) • Sectoral programs (urban and rural)</td>
<td>• NGO Programs • Social Funds • Participatory Urban and Rural Development • Piloting of demand-driven sector investment programs • Research on Participation and Decentralization • “Voices of the Poor”</td>
<td>New generation of: • Social Funds • Rural development programs • Urban development and slum upgrading programs • Sector programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Top down planning and accountability Sustainability issues faced in many projects</td>
<td>Numerous “islands” of success, but limited in scale, parallelism Improved efficiency and sustainability</td>
<td>Larger scale programs Greater community control and links with local governments Links to broader reform in the enabling environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHEN IS CDD APPROPRIATE AND WHEN NOT?

**Broad relevance**
- Greater capacity than generally recognized - potential of community organizations exists across developing world
- Extensive global experience

**But not a panacea**
- Many services better provided by central public sector or by private sector
  - Public goods requiring large and complex systems (e.g., multi-kilometer bridge)
  - Private goods with local revenue-earning potential
- CDD may not be effective in all social contexts

**CDD is appropriate when community groups have the comparative advantage**
- Small scale goods/services that require local cooperation
  - Common pool goods (e.g., pasture management, surface irrigation)
  - Public goods (e.g., maintenance of community roads and other basic infrastructure)
- Subsidiarity principle: locate management at lowest appropriate level
### WORLD BANK PORTFOLIO CDD TYPOLOGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Enabling Environment</th>
<th>Local Governments</th>
<th>Community Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Policy and institutional reforms oriented toward increased control of decisions and resources by community groups.</td>
<td>Democratically elected local governments make decisions on planning, implementation, O&amp;M in partnership with different community groups</td>
<td>Community groups make decisions on planning, implementation, O&amp;M AND directly manage investment funds BUT do not directly manage investment funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROWING WORLD BANK CDD PORTFOLIO ACROSS REGIONS AND SECTORS

**Estimate of CDD components of Bank financed projects ($ Billions)**

![Graph showing the growth of CDD components from 1996 to 2002 across different regions.]

**By Region**

- MENA: 436
- ECA: 95
- SA: 59
- AFR: 268
- EAP: 294
- LAC: 349

**By Network**

- HD: 678
- 247
- 542
2. Design Principles and Institutional Arrangements

CDD DESIGN PRINCIPLES
1. Make investments responsible to informed demand
2. Build participatory mechanisms for community control and stakeholder involvement
3. Invest in capacity of Community-Based Organizations
4. Facilitate community access to information
5. Develop simple rules and strong incentives backed by M&E
6. Establish enabling institutional and policy frameworks
7. Maintain flexibility in design of arrangements and innovation
8. Ensure social and gender inclusion
9. Design for scaling up
10. Invest in an exit strategy

Make investments responsive to informed demand
• Decisions based on accurate information about costs and benefits of options
• Communities’ own resources invested

Build participatory mechanisms for community control and stakeholder involvement
• Providing inclusive community groups with knowledge, control, and authority throughout all phases from program inception
• Programs designed with relevant stakeholders (government, local leaders, NGOs, civil society, the community) and dynamically over time

Invest in capacity building of CBOs
• Impact directly related to strength of CBOs driving process.
• Emphasis on training and capacity building through ‘learning by doing’

Facilitate community access to information
• Flows of information as important as flows of funds (market opportunities, available resources, etc.)
• Growing use of information technology

Develop simple rules and strong incentives supported by monitoring and evaluation
• Simple rules easy to interpret and apply
• Clearly defined procedures, widely disseminated
• Rules monitored and transparently enforced
• Output-based rewards against pre-agreed indicators

Establish an enabling environment through institutional and policy reform
• Empowered elected local governments responsive to constituents
• Inter-governmental arrangements for fiscal decentralization including fiscal flows to local governments and CBOs
• Conducive legal and regulatory framework that supports community action
• Clear sector policies with well-defined financing rules and defined roles and responsibilities of key players in each sector

Maintain flexibility in design of arrangements
• Flexibility in design essential to allow systems to evolve
• Direct feedback from community on program performance (beneficiary assessments, etc..)

Ensure social and gender inclusion
• Communities not homogeneous thus design need to be socially inclusive – giving voice and decision making to women, elderly, youth, minorities, those with HIV/AIDS, disabled.
• Menu of techniques are available for this purpose

Design for scaling up
• Approval and disbursement processes as decentralized as possible

Invest in an exit strategy
• Recurrent services require permanent institutional and financing arrangements at locally affordable cost level
• Temporary services (e.g. initially intensive capacity-building) may not require sustainable financing or permanent institutional structures
INSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS

A: Partnerships between CBOs and local governments

- Community-based organizations
- Elected local or municipal government
- Central government or central fund

B: Partnerships between CBOs and private support organizations

- Community-based organizations
- NGOs and private firms
- Elected local or municipal government
- Central government or central fund

C: Direct partnerships between CBOs and central government or central fund

- Community-based organizations
- Central government or central fund
- Elected local or municipal government

A combination of multi-sector and single-sector program instruments are required

**Single Sector**
- Greater opportunities to innovate in specific sectors and demonstrate value of new sector policies for sustainable operations
- Greater opportunities to foster sector agency institutional reform
- Instruments can be more focused with simpler objectives

**Multi-Sector**
- Greater choices for communities, emphasis on demand-responsiveness, local ownership
- Efficiency gains – sharing cost of outreach, social mobilization and capacity-building across sectors
- Poverty impact of bundled services – combined services can be worth more than sum of independent parts
- Potential to save internal processing costs (i.e. Cost of 2 separate projects > 1 project covering 2 sectors)
3. CDD examples from the global portfolio

EXAMPLES OF CDD IN ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Sector CDD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador: EDUCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expands quality, coverage and efficiency of basic education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parents and community members a key factor in sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Sector CDD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zambia Social Investment Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- From SRP to ZAMSIF - traditional social fund with community participation to deconcentrated program for district investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community and district investment windows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaled Up CDD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Brazil Poverty Alleviation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funds go directly to communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Basic social and economic infrastructure and employment and income-generating opportunities for the rural poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decentralizes resource allocation and decision-making to local levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leverages resources mobilized at community and municipal levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Analytical Evidence: benefits, risks and implications

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE - IMPACT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Studied</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peru Social Fund</td>
<td>Paxson &amp; Schady, 2000</td>
<td>Increased school attendance particularly for young children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based water services in India,</td>
<td>Isham &amp; Kahkonen, 1999</td>
<td>Improved access to water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka and Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved health outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School decentralization in Nicaragua</td>
<td>King &amp; Ozler, 2000</td>
<td>Greater decision power given to PTAs and teachers increased test scores in primary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica Social Fund</td>
<td>Rao &amp; Ibanez, 2001</td>
<td>80% satisfaction with chosen project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CDD can improve service delivery and welfare

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE - IMPACT ON POVERTY TARGETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Studied</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh Food for Education Programs</td>
<td>Galasso &amp; Ravallion, 2001</td>
<td>Community identification of poor households was more effective than centrally-managed targeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Social Fund</td>
<td>Schady, 2000</td>
<td>Poorer districts reached, and poorer households within these districts; however, allocations often political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina Workfare Program</td>
<td>Jalan &amp; Ravallion, 2001 Ravallion, 2000</td>
<td>Greater voice of communities improved targeting and distribution of gains; more than 50% of gains in poorest decile; wide variation in ability of communities to target well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVIEW OF EVIDENCE – IMPACT ON SOCIAL CAPITAL AND SUSTAINABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive impact on social capital and sustainability</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive impact on capacity for collective action but impact greatest for better networked members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability increases when communities make informed choices on different service options during design phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key hypothesis that need further research:**
- Support to community-driven development may increase local capacity for collective action and may promote social harmony
- Community-driven approaches may lead to more sustainable outcomes than more centrally-driven approaches

### REVIEW OF EVIDENCE – RISKS AND FACTORS THAT AFFECT EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social factors can reduce effective-ness of CDD programs. These factors require careful analysis to guide context-specific design</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pre-existing social capital is a key factor determining program effectiveness. Communities with higher social capital achieve better results | • Isham and Kahkonen (1999) study of water projects in India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia
• Ibanez and Rao study (2001) of the Jamaica Social Fund |
| Local elites tend to dominate decision making. Sound project rules and facilitation support are key to minimize elite capture. | • Mansuri and Rao (2003) Evaluating Community-Based and Community-Driven Development: A Critical Review of the Evidence
• Abraham and Platteau (2001) survey of CDD projects in Sub-Saharan Africa
• Bardhan (2000) study of water projects in South India
• Ibanez and Rao study (2001) of the Jamaica Social Fund |
IMPLICATIONS OF ANALYTICAL EVIDENCE

EVIDENCE OF BENEFITS
CDD can:
- Improve effectiveness and targeting of public service delivery
- Have positive impact on living standards of poor people
- Build social capital

EVIDENCE OF RISKS
- Cultural and social contexts are key drivers of CDD program effectiveness
- CDD may not be the best choice in contexts where there is low pre-existing social capital or capacity for collective action

IMPLICATIONS
- Potential to intensify support to CDD for poverty reduction
- Risks call for careful combination of economic and social analysis to inform design
- Context is critical: design must be context-specific and CDD approaches may not be appropriate in all contexts. Careful and measured approach needs to be followed.
INTRODUCTION

Poverty alleviation is not easy task, it takes time to achieve and requests participatory of beneficiaries with the assistance and supports from social organizations, government and donors. The participatory shall be taken at all stages of project implementation, from preparation to realization, monitoring and evaluation. Encouraging participatory reflects policy ‘people know, people decide, people implement, people monitor and people benefit’ and “promoting grassroots democracy”. Local people shall be allowed to involve in each step of project/program implementation from PRA, action plan preparation, investment management, and other activities that are taken place in their location. This will enable to improve quality of construction and activities, reduce corruption and inefficiency, increase transparency, high light ownership.

Poverty alleviation has received the attention and supports from different sources:

- During the last years, party and government has paid attention and created policy environment to promote participatory of local people in poverty alleviation programs. Local people have been mobilized to participate with different scopes in poverty alleviation projects in Vietnam.

- Government has issues a number of decisions to increase efficiency and effectiveness of HEPR in generally, and target poverty alleviation projects in particularly.

- All donor communities have been interested in participatory approach in planning methodology

THE ADVANTAGES OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

- The participation of local people and authority following function division in the process of development planning is continually chain from starting point to completion and afterward maintenance.

- The participatory reflects voluntary, actively, responsibility, honor of local people in building and developing social progress
• Ensure transparency: local people can access all information, and understand their responsibility and benefit. This is the most important issue to promote democracy and openness.

• Increase sustainability: activities like infrastructure construction, food security, technology transfer, environment, health care, education, capacity building have supported each other and integrated to help local people and authority to improve their responsibility.

• Consolidate experience: through CDD, all initiatives are encouraged and all points of view are consulted in order to meet benefit of each people, groups and all community.

• Promote mutual assistance between local people as well as between communities (ethnic minority groups) in order to better master their own as well as community destiny.

• Improve information dissemination to help people to know party’s orientation and government policy, especially in remote areas, poor communes and ethnic minority groups.

• Increase community spirit: local people together solve appearing problems, reduce local conflict, improve unity in order to build healthy community at all its aspects.

• Increase understanding for all community

• Mobilize contribution of community in construction infrastructure and in government funded project implementation.

THE WEAKNESSES TO ADDRESS

• There are number of CDD approaches and models that have been implementing in Vietnam, depending on the donors and location. Some projects with different steps/procedures have been implemented in same commune. That makes local people have got misunderstood and difficult to follow.

• The mode of participatory depends on the guidelines from upper supervisors. Simple and clear guidelines bring more efficiency; Local people could not be able to follow complicated and not clear guidelines.

• Projects with bottom-up participatory approach take more time and resources to implement (usually from one to two years) than that with top-down approach. It is because it takes time to meet and discuss with people.

• District and commune authority have low capacity on CDD and participatory approach; the guidelines given by supervision is not detail enough. Decentralization is still limited that keeps local authority from making decision, especially in remote and poor communes.
• Local people usually are passive to participate in the first stage of project implementation. It is more popular in communes where social development is still low.

• Budget decentralization is not completed that prevents local authority, especially in communes from flexible adjusting it to fit local conditions.

• Integration of project implementation in local communes is poor; line institutions have not well coordinated to promote participatory of local people.

• Participatory of local people is promoted in communes that have government/donor funded projects. Participatory is very poor in communes without projects.

PARTICIPATORY IS AN ESSENTIAL REQUIRE

• All projects shall follow and promote participatory from the first stage: preparation, planning, M&E, maintenance and benefit sharing

• It is necessary to institutionize community participatory in order to create sound environment and opportunity to all to involve.

• Renovate planning: turn from top down to bottom up approach, mobilize and integrate all internal and external resources to improve efficiency and effectiveness of poverty alleviation program, strengthen capacity of local authority, well implement government policy on grassroots democracy promotion

THE PROCESS OF NMPRP PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

1. Program preparation

The participatory in social economic planning is taken as main tool of NMPRP to lead throughout all process of project implementation.

• It is requested that all people shall be invited to participate all steps in project implementation activities: action plan preparation, component realization, investment management that take place in their communes, villages. Transparency, openness, ownership have been ensured to people.

• WB and Project Management Board PMB at central level has conducted surveys and studies on social economic situation in project sites to identify target beneficiaries and infrastructure in need. The attention focusing on the most difficult communes such as H’Mong and Dao ethnic minority communities.
• PMB disseminates information on project objective, contests to province, district, communes and villages, especially to commune level, to make them have good understanding project approach. With the supports from district, communes have prepared action following the project regulation.

• Central PMB has prepared sample guideline comprising text and formats on preparing poverty alleviation project in commune

• Provincial and district PMB has paid attention to strengthen capacity of People’s Committees in commune of H’Mong and Dao ethnic minority. Staff from province and district shall come to communes to assist local staff in project implementation.

• Commune Peoples’ Committee (commune PMB) assists villages to organize meetings with villagers to discuss on:
  o Provide villages information on policy and contest of poverty alleviation project preparation
  o Villagers discuss and provide proposals on needed infrastructures, select and prioritize proposed infrastructure including new and update ones in consistent with local conditions. Infrastructure comprises road (including bridge, sewer), market place, small irrigation, drinking water supply, agricultural models (cropping, livestock, processing) for farming households, commune school and classrooms in villages, commune and inter-village health center. Villagers have voted selection and prioritization of infrastructure
  o The minutes of village meetings and its proposals have been submitted to Commune Peoples’ Committee

• Commune Peoples’ Committee has reviewed all the proposals submitted by villages to prepare draft of Commune Poverty Alleviation Project CPAP in consistent with the given formats. After having approval of commune Party and People’s Council, Commune Peoples’ Committee complete CPAP to submit to district PMB. District PMB consolidates CPAP to send to province PMB.

2. Annual Plan Preparation and Implementation

• Besides province and district PMB, Commune Development Board CDB has established in each commune. Its members comprise commune PC chair or vice chair person as the head of CDB, the representatives from commune Fatherland Front, Farmer Association, War Veteran Association, Women Union ext. Commune accountant, extensionist, cadastral staff, village heads have been assigned task to participate in project implementation.

• Central and provincial PMB has organized training courses to province staff on procurement and bidding procedures, accounting, disbursement, compensation, resettlement and environment. Training is also organized to village and commune staff on monitoring and checking infrastructure construction.

• Based on the progress of province feasibility project approved by PPC, province PMB guides district and commune to prepare annual action plan following participatory and bottom up approach.
• Commune Development Board guides villages to organize village meetings (all village meetings, as well as meetings with target groups of women, farmers, ext.). Based on the list of projects determined in the commune project documents, village meetings identify projects that are priority in the year and the order of priority. After that villages prepare report to send to Commune people’s Committee.

• Paid workers: the target beneficiaries who work for project will receive wage. Project shall mobilize local people to work to project construction in order to have job, receive additional income to improve livelihoods. Local workers can sign contract with bidders directly or through assistance of local authority, and negotiate on payment. The bidders are encouraged to recruit local workers. Local worker recruitment is one of issues to give priority score in bidding document.

NMPRP has been implemented by the tool of bottom up participatory in social economic development plan. The participatory of community and people in project activities is the right attitude, meets the need of people. To follow principle “people know, people decide, people implement, people monitor and people benefit”, it has brought efficiency in the number of aspects. To improve its implementation, it is necessary to have assistance and guide in detail from different levels. Especially district and commune level shall create sound environment to people to have their voice as well as pay attention to people’s voice.
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OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To understand what Community Driven Development (CDD) means in the Vietnam context.
- To identify factors that influence outcomes in different socio-economic contexts and parts of the country.
- To review the experience and lessons from a selection of government, donor and NGO projects and programs.
- To assess future potentials and options for CDD projects in the rural sector.

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

- These would include infrastructure and services to support rural livelihoods & poverty reduction.
- Study commissioned to provide an analytical foundation and discussion platform for this (not intended to make firm recommendations).
- Partnership to Support the Poorest Communes requested as a forum to discuss and explore future options for CDD programs in the rural sector.

CONTENT OF THE STUDY

CHAPTER 1: definitions of CDD; poverty reduction trends in the rural areas; the diversity of socio-economic conditions.

CHAPTER 2: underlying concepts and themes; relevant aspect of social organization in Vietnam – the co-production of services; participatory self-management of local communities; intermediation in state-society relations.
CHAPTER 3: changes in rural livelihoods over the last decade; local institutional change in response to agriculture intensification, emerging market and employment opportunities, changes in service supply systems, increasing private sector activity, new land management policies.

CHAPTER 4: Experience from Program 135; application of the legislation on local democracy in Program implementation on the ground; program strengths and weaknesses.

CHAPTER 5: Experience from selected donor projects on scaling-up participatory approaches; direct financing of commune development budgets; community participation in the infrastructure cycle; appropriate financing and procurement methods for CDD.

CHAPTER 6: Future potentials and options for supporting CDD initiatives in the poor commune areas…

FUTURE POTENTIALS AND OPTIONS FOR CDD PROGRAMS IN THE POOR COMMUNE AREAS

The report (summary) explores 6 aspects:

1. National policies and program context.
2. Commune and village infrastructure and appropriate technology development.
3. Community-based natural resource management.
4. Creating synergy in services to support household livelihood improvement.
5. Direct financing mechanisms and targeting.
6. Human resource and institutional capacity building priorities.

Some main points of discussion are as follows:

1. National policies and program context – some key issues
   - Linkages in province level planning and decision-making between: (i) the policies set out in the Comprehensive Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy (CPRGS), (ii) the on-going administrative reforms, and (iii) content and financing of the targeted poverty reduction programs.
   - Future balance between targeted program approaches to poverty reduction vis-à-vis strengthening social relief, insurance and regulatory mechanisms.
   - Coordination between Government and donor financed programs to create an aggregated impact at community level and to increase the efficiency of investments.
   - The balance between sector specific and ‘integrated’ CDD approaches (e.g. financing and procurement mechanisms).

2a. Commune and village infrastructure: considerations
   - Larger commune infrastructure (e.g. commune access roads, administrative centers, secondary schools) is increasingly covered by other programs.
• The capacity of sector services and projects to provide this type of infrastructure in the remote areas is also increased.

• It is suggested that larger and more complex commune infrastructure would now be better provided through sector specific projects rather than through CDD.

• There is an urgent need for more clearly differentiated strategies for community participation and management in different categories of commune and village infrastructure. In particular between:

  (i) Types of infrastructure to be managed by local communities and “user groups”, and infrastructure that requires greater service agency involvement in operations and maintenance.

  (ii) Types of construction for which voluntary community contributions are valid, and types for which paid labour opportunities should be maximized.

• In recent years substantial investment has been made in infrastructure in the poor communes. Many schemes are being handed over to the communes and local communities to manage.

• In most programs insufficient attention is given to planning for future operations and maintenance requirements, responsibilities and financing.

• There is a risk that increasing levels of voluntary contributions expected from local people for operations and maintenance will place a heavy burden on these communities and poorer households.

### 2b. Commune and village infrastructure: future priorities for CDD

• There is a strong demand and justification for continuing with ‘integrated’ programs that focus on community infrastructure in remote communes and villages.

• The impact of such programs will be enhanced if they really do concentrate on small-scale infrastructure to fulfill basic community needs and household livelihoods.

• Basic needs including water supply and sanitation, light and power, housing, food security…

• This would imply an increasing focus on infrastructure for improved water management combined with village level power supply and transport infrastructure.

• Much good experience is available on Participatory Irrigation Management (PIM) from some provinces and projects. However, the legal basis for PIM is still unclear.

• In water supply, there is a critical lack of technical service supervision capacity in a majority of upland districts and communes. This is a major priority for public sector capacity building.
• Infrastructure should be combined with development of technology options for domestic applications, production and processing technologies etc.

3. Community-based natural resource management

• Placing greater emphasis on water issues in CDD would require improved approaches to ‘watershed area management’. This is critical in both in upland and delta areas.

• Closer linkages also need to be established between household livelihood improvement (poverty reduction) and forest management and protection.

• Some major production & marketing sectors in which the uplands have a comparative advantage (e.g. large livestock raising) are often dependent on multiple-use systems for forest land.

• The legal status for community management of natural resources has been unclear in the past. This situation has improved with the revision to the Land Law (2003).

4. Creating synergy in services to support household livelihoods

• Building stronger synergies in service provision implies a number of things:

• Identifying the most important areas of linkage that are likely to have the greatest benefit and impact on livelihoods in any particular area or socio-economic context;

• Looking at how the content of these services – including the delivery mechanisms and the sequence of delivery – can be made to complement each other more effectively;

• Developing stronger collaborative relationships between different agencies, including public and private sector service providers and various intermediary organisations;

• And at community level, building the capacity of local organisations and individuals to integrate these services in an effective way.

5. Direct financing mechanisms and targeting

• Much experience is now available from donor projects on direct financing of commune and/or village development budgets.

• There are still a number of institutional and legal uncertainties about these direct financing mechanisms.

• Successful introduction is highly dependent on local government backing and support. There is considerable variation in the extent to which provinces see this as possible.

• Under Program 135 only some provinces have transferred investment ownership, decision making powers and financial control to the commune.

• Written decisions are needed to the effect that communes can be investment owners for projects in their territory.
• Procedures are often too complicated. It is easy to make such direct financing mechanisms almost impossible to work in the remote upland areas by placing excessive financial reporting demands on the communes.

• There are important multiplier effects in the local economy that can be generated by enabling communes to purchase small goods and services in the local area. These need to be promoted in the regulations.

• Building up horizontal and downward mechanisms of accountability (transparent systems of budget and expenditure disclosure at community level) is at least as important as external auditing.

• There is a need for more refined ‘multi-level’ targeting and financing mechanisms that address the need of poor communes, remote villages / hamlets in these communes, and the needs of vulnerable groups and households.

6. Human resource and institutional capacity building priorities
• Building stronger professional skills at commune level is key element of the Government’s Program on Public Administration Reform.

• A huge amount of experience has been built up by NGO and donor supported projects on the methods and content of training and capacity building for commune and village cadres.

• Yet most of this has taken place outside the regular (province) government training systems. Only a few donor projects have systematically addressed the issue of scaling-up in the government system.

• Projects tend to draw on ad-hoc contracted training services which – while filling short-term needs – does not address the fundamental long-term challenge of how to build sustained managerial and technical capacities in these remote communes and villages.

• Key elements of capacity building in future CDD programs would need to include:
  (i) Methods for implementing the legislation on local democracy at commune and village levels.
  (ii) Integrated with technical skills training and as applied to specific work contexts, tasks and responsibilities as well as to functional literacy training where required.
  (iii) Introducing innovative approaches to non-formal community-based education and vocational skills training for upland people that are not dependent on qualification requirements and that are geared to small-scale income generation activities.
  (iv) Finding ways to increase the capacity and involvement of local private businesses, household enterprises, cooperatives, and local artisans in CDD programs through community sub-contracting methods.
Community Driven Development in Vietnam
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LOCAL COMMUNITY IN THE CURRENT CONTEXT

- Legal feature: a local administrative unit;
- Traditional identity: local community people live in close kinship's typically characterized by economic and culture relations, and line of descent.

COMMUNITY

+ International level
  + National level
  + Regional/provincial level
    + District level

+ Commune/locality level
  (A set of communities having socio-economic relations)
    + Village level
  (A socio-economic residential unit)
    + Group level
  (A self-identified set of persons with common interest)

+ Household level
  + Individual level

STRATEGIC ISSUES IN DEVELOPMENT

- In-efficient and unsustainable management and uses of natural resources.
- In-effective grassroots governance:
  - Lack of participation in decision making process.
  - Poor accountability, transparency etc.

- Inequitable development
- Weakness in translating policies/strategies into actions at grassroots level.

ROLES OF COMMUNITY

- Local community would potentially ensure sustainable development:
  - More appropriate local knowledge and technologies.
  - Where supportive policies, strategies, program activities are introduced/implemented.
  - Appropriate codes of conduct, different ethics and social norms that help changes individual behavior for a better.
• Local communities through their institutions potentially facilitate and legitimate participation of members.
  o Mobilizing resources and regulating their use with a view to maintaining a long term base for productive activity.
  o Most efficient and sustainable use of available resources with location specific knowledge best generated and interpreted locally.
  o Monitoring progress of any interventions would be quicker and less costly, allowing adaptive changes where local decision-making become institutionalized.
  o Preserving or instituting good practices, and sustainable programs, cooperation that would bring in outcomes/impacts beyond individual interests.
  o Enhancing democracy and empowering the powerless and voiceless that would lead to changes in position and eventually secure rights.
  o Well organized communities who know how to prioritize issues using their own resources would be in a stronger position to get outside assistance.
  o Ensuring more appropriate outcomes in resolving conflicts in managing and implementing programs/policies.

COMMUNITY & ACTIONAID’S INTERVENTION
• Local communities as partners more than ‘beneficiaries’ or (worse) ‘target group’.

• CDD becomes key in ActionAid’s rights-based approach with the followings:
  o Developing/supporting CBOs, local development associations, local NGOs.
  o Working in partnership with local government organisations and others.
  o Influencing/advocating government/donors
  o Building capacity for local communities, grassroots government cadres.
AN EXAMPLE FROM THE PHILIPPINES

In February 2004, the Secretary of the Department of Social Welfare wanted to review progress on a large CDD operation just starting, including a baseline survey designed to measure project impact. The World Bank had often asked her about how the Government intended to measure “results on the ground” and she was pleased that the baseline survey had been completed.

She planned to spend 10 minutes discussing the survey design, the data collected, and initial findings.

But she and her staff got so interested in what the numbers showed, they spent an hour discussing how to use them to help field staff do their jobs.

She also asked her staff to figure out ways to keep track of these issues, not just through special surveys, but continuously.

Burden → Opportunity
AN EXAMPLE FROM THAILAND

In February 2003, a large CDD operation was closing. The Director felt the project had a large impact on villages where it had operated. He wanted to share the knowledge Thailand had gained with other countries by documenting the project’s impact. He asked for World Bank technical assistance.

But the baseline survey
• had not been done before the project started,
• visited no comparison villages and
• asked no questions about social capital

“How can we tell project impacts are real?”

“GOLD STANDARD” EVALUATION

• Tailored to project & context
• Randomize treatment & control groups
• Baseline & follow-up surveys for panel data
• Follow treatment, comparison & alternative
• Quantitative & qualitative data collection
• Long time horizon to examine sustainability
• Statistical representation on program or national scale

REAL-WORLD CONSTRAINTS

• Financial constraints
  o “Money no object” never the case
  o Bearing the burden of knowledge: public good

• Logistical constraints
  o Randomization?
  o Identifying indicators ex-ante?
  o Delay design/implementation for baseline survey?

• CDD-specific constraints
  o Which communities participate?
  o What type of activities resources will finance?
IMPACT EVALUATION: KEY PRINCIPLES

- Comparison groups
  - Randomization: phasing?
  - Propensity score matching: existing data?
  - Pipeline matching

- Baseline data
  - Phasing: baselines for future phases
  - Existing data: other data sources

- Mixed methods
  - Quantitative: statistically representative
  - Qualitative: getting “inside the black box”

TOPIC COVERAGE: WHAT CDD PURPORTS TO DO?

- Primary welfare
  - Okay: income, health, education
  - More: sustainability

- Infrastructure
  - Covered: access, quality, maintenance, utilization, recurrent inputs
  - More: cost effectiveness

- Targeting
  - Covered: poverty
  - More: preferences

- Social dynamics
  - More: social capital, inclusion, representation, empowerment, conflict, crime, leadership

- Governance
  - More: local governance, corruption, public sector reform

- Comparative impact
  - More: CDD vs. other approaches, different CDD approaches

PHILIPPINES KALAHI PROJECT: BASELINE SURVEY APPROACH

- Phasing
  - 3rd Phase treatment municipalities
  - Before project starts in those municipalities

- Sampling
  - 4 survey provinces
  - Using existing data, match 2 treatment municipalities and 2 control municipalities in each province
  - Visited 2,400 households
  - Household survey and barangay official survey
PHILIPPINES KALAHI PROJECT: LINKS TO OPERATIONS

- **Output Indicators**
  - Health
  - Education
  - Water and Sanitation
  - Roads, Communication and Access to Services

- **Empowerment and Governance**
  - Collective Action
  - Social Cohesion and Inclusion
  - Trust and Solidarity
  - Groups and Networks
  - Governance

- **Poverty Indicators**
  - Employment
  - Agricultural Profile
  - Housing and Amenities
  - Diet Recall
  - Consumption and Expenditure
  - Self-rated Poverty

THAI SOCIAL CAPITAL EVALUATION: GOALS

- Understand how social capital operates in Thailand
- Isolate effects of SIF on communities, particularly with regard to sustained changes in social capital
- Identify promising practical approaches to enhance Thai social capital

THAI SOCIAL CAPITAL EVALUATION: METHODOLOGY

- Lack of adequate baseline: ex-post evaluation
- Combine Quantitative & Qualitative
  - Quantitative:
    - Existing high-quality household data from before SIF started: synthetic baseline
    - Match treatment and control communities
    - Create community profiles of valuable indicators
  - Qualitative:
    - Conduct structured interviews
    - Understand social capital
    - Explore how SIF may have changed community

CDD EVALUATION: POINTS TO TAKE AWAY

- “Gold Standard” very hard to achieve
- Manage real world constraints
  - Use existing data creatively
• Key Principles
  o Comparison groups: know project participants
  o Baseline data: prior planning
  o Combining quantitative and qualitative

• Keep evaluations relevant for operations
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HEPR Evaluation part of a process

Evaluation —— Re-design —— Implementation

CENTRAL OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION
To assess the overall effectiveness of the NTP on HEPR and Programme 135 in sustainably reducing poverty

To draw lessons for designing the programme for the period 2006-2010

EVALUATION COMPONENTS

- Targeting
- Institutional / Process Issues
- Impact Assessment

Component 1: Targeting
- Have we correctly identified the poor?
- Is the process of identification transparent and fair?
- What is the extent of leakage in targeting?
- Does the programme address the needs of the poor?

Component 2: Institutional & Process Issues
- How are financial resources allocated and used, and expenditure tracked?
- What systems exist for programme monitoring and how effective are these?
- What factors enhance community participation and can these be replicated?
- Has the programme led to empowerment of local communities?

Component 3: Impact Assessment
- What are the effects of project outputs on household well-being?
- What are the effects of project outputs on household well-being relative to what would have happened in the absence of the project?
**METHODOLOGY**

Combination of

(i) Secondary data analysis through
   - synthesis of existing studies,
   - literature reviews,
   - analysis of PPAs,
   - commissioned studies

(ii) Qualitative Household Survey, and

(iii) Propensity Score Matching

**KEY OUTPUTS**

- Synthesis of Targeting Effectiveness
- Budget Allocation Study
- Expenditure Tracking Study
- Monitoring Systems Review
- Qualitative Household Survey
- Study on Participation & Empowerment

**SOME SPECIFICS OF THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Impact Assessment: How to Make Causal Link between Project Outputs and Well-being Impact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three relevant approaches</th>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Difference between three approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transmission mechanisms/Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process tracing</td>
<td>Assess nature of transmission mechanisms between output and impact (how and why)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self or group assessments</td>
<td>Assess magnitude of impact (qualitatively) without using counter-factual scenario</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity Score Matching</td>
<td>Asses magnitude of impact (quantitatively) using counter-factual scenario</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Assessment: Summary of Key Questions Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why and how have project components succeeded or failed to have an impact?</td>
<td>1 PRA/PPA literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are people's perceptions of the well-being impact of project components over time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the well-being impact of select project components relative to what would have happened in the absence of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LINK WITH THE IMPACT CHAIN

Component 1: Targeting

Focus: Distribution of project outputs

Q1: What proxy indicators best identify the 'poor'?
Q2: Is the actual process of identification of the poor transparent and fair?
Q3: Do project inputs and outputs miss the 'true' poor or 'leak' to the non-poor?
Q4: Does the programme effectively target the poor’s needs?
Component 2: Institutional/Process Issues

Q1: How are project financial inputs planned, allocated, released, received, used and monitored?

Focus:
Flow of financial inputs

Inputs ➔ Activities ➔ Outputs ➔ Outcomes ➔ Impact

Component 2: Institutional/Process Issues

Q1: What are the optimal institutional arrangements for planning, implementation and monitoring of project activities?
Q2: What have been the factors in enhancing community participation and self-reliance in project activities and what is the scope to scale these up?
Q3. To what extent has the programme empowered local communities?

Focus:
Institutions & Participation

Inputs ➔ Activities ➔ Outputs ➔ Outcomes ➔ Impact

Inputs ➔ Impacts

Inputs ➔ Activities ➔ Outputs ➔ Outcomes ➔ Impact

Inputs ➔ Impacts
Component 3: Impact Assessment

Q1: What are the effects of project outputs on well-being impacts over time?
Q2: How and why does the project generate this effect?
Q3: What are the effects of project outputs on well-being impacts relative to what would have happened in the absence of the project?

THE OVERALL EVALUATION: TARGETING, SYSTEM/PROCESSES, IMPACT

Q1: What are the effects of project outputs on well-being impacts over time?
Q2: How and why does the project generate this effect?
Q3: What are the effects of project outputs on well-being impacts relative to what would have happened in the absence of the project?

Institutional/Process Issues - Financial Management
Q1: How are project financial inputs planned, allocated, released, received, used and monitored (accountability)?

Institutional/Process Issues - Institutions & Participation
Q1: What are the optimal institutional arrangements for planning, implementation and monitoring of project activities?
Q2: What have been the factors in enhancing community participation and self-reliance in project activities and what is the scope to scale these up?
Q3: To what extent has the programme empowered local communities?

Targeting
Q1: What proxy indicators best identify the 'poor'?
Q2: Is the actual process of identification of the poor transparent and fair?
Q3: Do project inputs and outputs miss the 'true' poor or 'leak' to the non-poor?
Q4: Does the programme effectively target the poor's needs?
WHY DECENTRALIZATION MATTERS

- Integrating local governments (LG) is an important pillar of CDD
  - To scale-up (mainstream)
  - For Sustainability
    - Anchor in the local public finance system
    - Helps to build durable local institutions
  - Improve Local Governance
  - Engage rather than by-passes LGs
  - Support Deepen Decentralization

FEW GOOD EXAMPLES OF INTEGRATION

- Few pure decentralization operations build effective systems of accountability to communities within LG jurisdiction
  - Little attention to participatory frameworks (beyond some local planning process)
- Few CDD operations link to LG in ways that can influence structural reforms of LG and decentralization systems

CHALLENGES FOR SCALING UP

- Parallelism—through project structures
- Competition and Duplication locally
  - Overlapping roles and responsibilities
  - LG competing and/or undermining CDD
  - Central govt/agency pervasive
    - Momentum for real structural reforms and subnational devolution reduced
- Can’t scale up CDD approach, sustain financially, or make dynamic
- Logistical complexities hard to overcome

KEY PRINCIPLES FOR SCALING UP

- Subsidiarity
- Public Provision vs. Production
- Co-production
- Downward/upward Accountability
- Local Autonomy
- Improved Local Governance
- Dynamism and Flexibility
• Training and Capacity building
• Managing Logistics (often complex)

MAIN ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Partnerships between CBOs and local governments

Partnerships between CBOs and private support organizations

Direct partnerships between CBOs and central government or central fund

CLARIFY EXPENDITURE ASSIGNMENTS & FUNCTIONS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

• Partnerships not viable if center dominates and LG domain is unclear
• Stabilize functional assignments
• Local autonomy related to downward accountability
  o Citizens can demand results when LG is actually responsible
  o Responsibility ← -- → Responsiveness
• Romania Rural Development Project—LGs clearly responsible for rural roads and rural water supply
• Project objective to strengthen local provision of through LG-CBO partnerships (CDD)
• Decentralization dialogue through (PAL Program) strengthen LG framework

LOCAL REVENUE MOBILIZATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

• No local government raises all of its resource requirements
• Transfers are very important in budget but not 100%
• Type of transfers (grants) matters:
  o Block
  o Conditional/specific
  o Ad hoc
• Own revenue mobilization important
  o LGs have more fiscal flexibility
  o Citizens/CBOs empowered to voice demands
  o Service levels negotiated locally
• Discretion on use of own revenues is very important

ON FISCAL FLEXIBILITY
• Allocate own revenues (taxes and fees) across recurrent and capital costs
  o Enable new investments
  o Link revenue raising to local planning process
  o Taxation flexibility
    - Set base and rate
    - Adjust rates
• Expand coverage of project/program funds
  o Introduce third element of financing
    - Donor/Central Government
    - Community
    - LG
  o Increase the number of beneficiaries
  o 2/3 local sources (sustainability)

IMPROVING LOCAL GOVERNANCE
• Common accountability Challenges for both local government and communities
• Elite Capture
  o By ethnic/racial/social groups
• Corruption
• Opaque Decision-making
• Patronage Politics
• Common citizens’ opinions marginalized

TWO-WAY ACCOUNTABILITY
• LGs are best placed to receive and act on complaints about CBO leaders from community
• CBO leaders, village representatives are best placed to transmit community complaints on LGs up the project chain, and to mobilize for changed leadership during the electoral cycle.
• Cleaning-up and strengthening LG processes yields governance and service delivery benefits.
• Well designed participatory planning frameworks help
• CDD programs can incorporate MOU between various local stakeholders (Maharashtra RWSS, AP Rural Poverty Reduction Project)
PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

- Financial
  - LGs can contribute resources and implementation capacity
    - leverage community funds, with project funds, and possibly private funds
- Local economic development framework
- Strategic Planning
- Programmatic
  - With strong financial support from LGs, more difficult to disband than central programs
    - Local political process empower communities
- National and Donor programs change
  - Paradigm shifts

ZONES OF CBO-LG PARTNERSHIP

Diagram 1: Partnership Between LGs and CBOs
DEEPENING AND STRETCHING FUNCTIONS

Deepening: deepen citizens’ involvement
- Higher Value Added from Collective Action
- Movement along Vertical Axis
- Mobilization Capacity is More Important
  - Greater Flexibility in Design and Execution
  - Generally Older and Better Established CBOs (legitimacy, voluntary consent, collective action)

Stretching: stretching LGs’ authority territorially and functionally
- Supra-local or dysfunctional or non-mandated LGs
- Movement along Horizontal Axis
- Sub-Contractor Role for CBOs
- Technical Capacity is More Important
  - Tasks can be considerably specified in advance
  - New CBOs might also work well (multiplication, technical capacity, sub-contracting)

INSTRUMENTS
- Structural Reforms
  - Best through a policy reform loan or decentralization project, e.g. India (AP, MP, Kerala, Karnataka); Romania, Thailand.
  - Or dual approach
    - Indonesia Decentralization Program, KDP 1&2 & UPP 1&2
  - Sequencing issue
- CDD to demonstrate local good practices
  - Pilot models of participation, good governance, and co-production.
  - Social accountability tools, e.g. citizen report cards, tracking surveys etc
  - Participatory budgeting, planning
- Increase central faith in local capacity

CONCLUSION
- Linking Communities and Local Governments in effective partnerships is not easy, but is important:
  - Scaling up
  - Financial and institutional sustainability
  - Improving local governance
- Best complemented w/ policy dialogue to strengthen decentralization framework, inter-governmental fiscal system and empower LGs
- Empowering communities to manage their development requires a systemic and integrated approach to local development.
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Community Driven Development: Perspectives and mainstream in Vietnam

Mr. Pham Hai – Director of Local and Regional Economy Department – MPI

PROGRAMS, PROJECTS APPLYING CDD APPROACH

Period 1998-2001
1. RIDEF Project in Quang Nam (funded by UNCDF)
2. IFAD Project in Quang Binh, Ha Tinh
3. IFAD Project in Tuyen Quang, Ha Giang
4. Program 135 of the Government

Period 2001 – 2010
5. Community based Rural Infrastructure Project (funded by World Bank)
6. Northern Mountain Poverty Reduction Project (funded by World Bank)
7. Central Region Livelihood Improvement Project (funded by Asia Development Bank)
8. Phase II of Program 135 (2006-2010)

COMPREHENSIVE POVERTY REDUCTION AND GROWTH STRATEGY (CPRGS)
(Decision No 2685/VPCP-QHQT approved by Prime Minister on May 21, 2002)

- Poverty is a pressing problem of countries all over the world;
- The Government of Vietnam takes poverty reduction as a cutting-through objective in the process of country socio-economic development;
- The Government of Vietnam has declared its commitment to implement the Millenium Development Goals and poverty reduction objectives that had been agreed upon in the National Summit in 2000;
- Poverty Reduction aims at:
  - Ensuring social equality;
  - Sustainable Growth;
  - Creating physical strength _ supporting the poor

OBJECTIVES OF CPRGS (12 OBJECTIVES)

1. Poverty Reduction (2 basic targets)
   - Viet Nam Poverty Line: 17,2% (2000) a5% (2010)
2. Education Objectives
3. Gender Objectives
4+5+6. Health Care Objectives
7. Environmental Sustainability Protection
8. Provision of basic infrastructure services to the poor and poor communes
9. Job creation
10. Cultural Objectives
11. Development of social safety nets
12. Institutional Reform, capacity building for the poor, poor communes

**COMMUNITY DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT TREND IN VIETNAM**

**I. Goals**

- Economic Growth
- Poverty Reduction

**II. Requirements**

1. Using effectively resources
2. Scope
3. Subjects
4. Objectives

**III. Priorities Activities**

1. Central Budgets
2. ODA
3. Community Contributions
4. Supporting of enterprises

5. Information Dissemination will make opportunities for people to speak out their opinions clearly and specifically

6. Management Organization System
7. Policies Making
8. Simple, close and standard Procedures

9. Decentralization and Empowerment
10. Training and Capacity building

**IV. Planning**

1. Resources Analysis (Yes-No)
2. Difficultes and Advantages Analysis

3. Priority Sectors:
   - Infrastructures
   - Credits
   - Trainings


5. Measures and Policies:
   - Mobilizing Resources (comm. capacity)
   - Project management and implementation Arrangements
   - Supporting Policies
   -Establishing Democracy Grassroots Decree
   -Establishing M&E process for community

**V. Views**

1. Comprehensive Approach (multi sectors)
2. People are central – Economic Effects link with Social Effects
3. The Government supports Budgets and Technical (consultants)
4. Decentralization and empowerment (Institutionalization)
5. Participating in management (Formulate supporting procedures)
## Annex 1: Workshop participants

### I. Government organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning &amp; Investment</td>
<td>Nguyễn Xuân Thảo</td>
<td>Deputy Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dep. Agricultural Economy</em></td>
<td>Lê Thị Thống</td>
<td>Vice Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Đào Quang Thư</td>
<td>Vice Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyễn Văn Đoàn</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chu Văn Tý</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyễn Tiến Trọng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyễn Thị Lộc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bùi Nghị</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phạm Văn Thăng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lê Văn Minh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Dep. Local and regional economy</em></td>
<td>Nguyễn Thị Thanh Nga</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phạm Hải</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Dep. of Foreign economic relation</em></td>
<td>Nguyễn Thanh Phương</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Dep. Of Infrastructure and urban development</em></td>
<td>Phan Tiến</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Central Institute of economic management</td>
<td>Trần Thu Hương</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lê Thanh Hãng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Institute of development strategy</td>
<td>Lê Kim Dung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Dep. Of Science, education, natural resources and environment</em></td>
<td>Nguyễn Lê Thùy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Dep. Of Labour, Cultural and social affairs</em></td>
<td>Nguyễn Thế Ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ministry of Agricultural and Rural development</td>
<td>Nguyễn Thị Tuyết Hà</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chu Văn Chính</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Invalid Social affairs</td>
<td>Bùi Ngọc Quỳnh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign affairs</td>
<td>Đỗ Hoàng Minh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>Dinh Thị NhưƯơng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Committee for Nationality</td>
<td>Triệu Hồng Sơn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vietnam Farmers Union</td>
<td>Hà Phúc Mịch</td>
<td>Standing member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lê Văn Dên</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>National Youth Committee of Vietnam</td>
<td>Hoàng Văn Ty</td>
<td>Head of rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization/Project</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Hoàng Hà</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ministry of Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Vũ Thị Thanh Phương</td>
<td>Vice director of dev. centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ministry of Training &amp; Education</td>
<td>Vũ Văn Long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ministry of Fishery</td>
<td>Nguyễn Duy Vĩnh</td>
<td>Dep. Planning &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vietnam Garden Union</td>
<td>Phi Văn Hà</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vietnam Investment Review</td>
<td>Nguyễn Đức Minh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport</td>
<td>Tồ Hồng Anh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Central Economic Committee</td>
<td>Hoàng Lê Tú</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vietnam Bank of Agricultural and Rural Development (VBARD)</td>
<td>Nguyễn Xuân Bặc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CPMU of NRPRP</td>
<td>Nguyễn Văn Anh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dương Quốc Hưng Ian</td>
<td>Atified Erling Ramussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>CPMU of Central Region Poverty Reduction Project</td>
<td>Vũ Văn Lộc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Institute of Agricultural Planning (MARD)</td>
<td>Vũ Công Lân</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>CPMU of VIE/01/023</td>
<td>Phan Duy Toan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Vietnam Television Centre</td>
<td>Đắc Lương Công Khu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mạnh Quân Duy Trung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Institute of Science, Labour and Social Affairs (MOLISA)</td>
<td>Lê Minh Tâm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phùng Thị Hương</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sharing Project</td>
<td>Vũ Hoài Minh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kolshus Halvor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Disaster mitigation project of Quang Binh (under MARD)</td>
<td>Marie Võ-Thị Thu Nguyễn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Locano Grignon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoàng Hồng Hạnh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Minister Adviser of MPI</td>
<td>Lê Đăng Doanh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>CPMU of PAC (MPI)</td>
<td>Thái Thu Phượng Nguyễn Phượng Ngọc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annexe1: Workshop participants

#### II. Donors and NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Job title / notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Klaurs Rauhland</td>
<td>Country Director of WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen The Dung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robin Mearn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Swinkes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel owen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith McLean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Mink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lament Mscellaty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Saurabh Shinha</td>
<td>Poverty Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AusAid</td>
<td>Robert Megkegor</td>
<td>First Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen Quoc Viet</td>
<td>Senior Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Alwyl Chilver</td>
<td>Rural livehood Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vo Thanh Son</td>
<td>Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Nguyen Thienn Huong</td>
<td>Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Vo Truc Dien</td>
<td>PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>Vo Thi Khanh Nha</td>
<td>PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Hoang Thi Phuong</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ActionAid</td>
<td>Pham Van Ngoc</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Helvetas</td>
<td>Neil Waltor</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CCPR</td>
<td>David Payn</td>
<td>(Centre Coordination of Poverty reduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen Van Kien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NGO Resource Centre</td>
<td>Nguyen Van Kien</td>
<td>Co-director RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>HIQ CANADA</td>
<td>Nguyen Tat Thang</td>
<td>(MARD + WB NDMP Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PAC Adviser</td>
<td>Nguyen Kim Long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michel Latendress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>VICA Consultant,Co</td>
<td>Nguyen Hong Tho</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mekong Economist</td>
<td>Bui Minh Tam</td>
<td>Economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Son La-Lai Chau Rural development Project (EU)</td>
<td>Graham Sawer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lao Cai</td>
<td>Hoang Van Kich</td>
<td>Director of NMPRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tong Thi Sen</td>
<td>PO of NMPRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Son La</td>
<td>Nguyen Duy Phuong</td>
<td>NMPRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen Thanh Hai</td>
<td>NMPRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hoa Binh</td>
<td>Nguyen Van Diep</td>
<td>NMPRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tang Van Nghia</td>
<td>Vice Director of DPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Phu Tho</td>
<td>Thieu Vinh</td>
<td>DPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uong Van Tuoc</td>
<td>NMPRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yen Bai</td>
<td>Tuong Van Tho</td>
<td>Vice Director of DPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen Thu Huong</td>
<td>NMPRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bac Giang</td>
<td>Nguyen Van Thao</td>
<td>Vice Director of DPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duong Ngoc Chien</td>
<td>NMPRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ha giang</td>
<td>Nguyen Chi Huong</td>
<td>IFAD Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tuyen Quang</td>
<td>Nguyen Thi Nam Ha Van Hoa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Thanh Hoa</td>
<td>Nguyen Anh Xuan Nguyen Thi Giang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nghe An</td>
<td>Vi Van Phuc</td>
<td>DPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ha Tinh</td>
<td>Tran Nhat Thanh Tran Viet Ha Thai Van Hoa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Quang Binh</td>
<td>Le Man</td>
<td>Deputy Director of DPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quang Nam</td>
<td>Tran Van Tri Nguyen Thanh Hai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Quang Ngai</td>
<td>Le Tan Hung</td>
<td>Deputy Director of DPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Binh Phuoc</td>
<td>Pham Van Tong</td>
<td>Vice Chairman of PPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>KonTum</td>
<td>Nguyen Van Nguyen</td>
<td>Central Poverty reduction project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Soc Trang</td>
<td>Dinh Van Nghia Dang Tran Trang Nha Quach Thi Ngoc Thuan Nguyen Thanh Trang Tran Van Khon Ha Thanh Cuong Duong Hoang San</td>
<td>Deputy Director of DPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>DacLak</td>
<td>Nguyen Dinh That</td>
<td>DPI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>