

Evaluation Summary

*Technical assistance for capacity building provided to
Da Nang and Can Tho Development Investment Funds (DDIF and CADIF)*

Country: **Vietnam**

Sector: **Financial intermediaries
(formal sector)**

Evaluator: **Ernst & Young Vietnam**
Date of the evaluation: **August 2017**

Key data on AFD's support

Projet number: CVN 1125-02

Amount: €500k grant

Disbursement rate: 90%

Signature of financing agreement:
November 2011

Completion date: June 2017

Total duration: 5 years and 7 months



Context

In the context of the **newly established CADIF and DDIF**, the fund officers were newly recruited or transferred from other departments of the Provincial People's Committees (PPC).

They **lacked expertise** in the following areas related to Local Development Investment Fund (LDIF):

- management,
- project appraisal,
- social and environmental safeguard management,
- fund mobilization,
- financial analysis
- and soft skills.

Actors and operating method

The **project owners** were the DDIF and the CADIF.

The **intended beneficiaries** were the DDIF and the CADIF, the PPC and their investors.

Objectives

1. **To help the municipalities of Da Nang and Can Tho** respond effectively and innovatively to the growing needs in social and environmental infrastructures.
2. **To support the reorganization and enhancement of the human resources and management capacities** of the two funds, the local authorities, and its clients and partners.

Expected outputs

The **implementation of a program to strengthen the capacities** of the CADIF and the DDIF, as well as the local authorities and its clients and partners.

Performance assessment

Relevance

The project's purposes and objectives were **relevant** to the policies and directions of the government and the donor.

However, **the detailed training program was not suitable for both the DDIF and the CADIF.**

The secondary objective of training Provincial People's Committee (PPC) staff was furthermore **slightly ambitious.**

Effectiveness

The capacity building program did not meet the initial objective of structuring the procedures and strengthening institutional capacities for the three following types of beneficiaries: LDIFs, PPC and investors.

The actual outputs were:

- 41 training courses
- 589 participants (572 from the LDIFs and 17 from other parties)
- and one local/overseas field visit.

Efficiency

The delay in consultant selection and fee payment and the change in the consultant team's leader significantly impacted the project's progress and lead to the shortening of the implementation period and the reduction of the project's efficiency and effectiveness.

The project management unit should be more active in exposing its expectations and requirements to the consultant. It should also include representatives from the HR Department.

Impact

The project somehow helped the LDIFs update their knowledge and **positively impacted** some of the participants' working styles.

However, the project impact was **overall unimpressive** and the changes to the LDIFs' capacities and procedures are **not significant.**

In addition, no representatives from the PPC attended the training courses.

Sustainability

The training program's benefits **did not last long**, due to the fact that a number of participants may have no opportunity to practice as they are not in charge of related fields.

Besides, there were **no procedures/guidelines developed** to retain knowledge within the LDIFs.

Added value of AFD's contribution

The technical assistance grant is specific to the AFD, as opposed to other donors. It benefited the LDIFs and had a **positive impact on their long-term development.**

However, the ADF should guide the LDIFs in providing more detailed and clearer Terms of reference.

Conclusions and lessons learnt

- The secondary objectives toward capacity enhancement of the PPC were **slightly ambitious.**
- The bidding documents and Terms of reference should be **more detailed and accurate.**
- Details of the training contents and schedules should be properly **discussed** between the LDIFs and the consultant.
- The capacity building should have included the development of **manuals/guidelines** to improve its effectiveness and enhance the applicability of knowledge.
- LDIFs should be better at **allocating and monitoring the staff's training attendance.**