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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

A succession of intense storms, typhoons, triggering floods and landslides impacted Central Viet Nam from 5th October 2020. The floods focused on Ha Tinh, Quang Binh, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Tri, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai. More than 235 people were reported dead or missing. At least 380,000 houses were flooded, wind-damaged, or destroyed and damages estimated at VND 17 trillion (US$ 734.67 million). According to three inter-sector Joint Assessment Teams who visited the affected areas from the 21st to 23rd October, the flood levels and storms were unprecedented, causing widespread damage to people’s homes and crops, the death or loss of livestock, and affecting the lives and livelihoods of over 1.5 million people.

In the aftermath of the storms and floods, tens of thousands of vulnerable households were among the hardest hit. Many poor and near-poor people did not have the means to invest in house repairs, reconstruction, or purchase necessities. UNDP in Viet Nam mobilised finance for emergency humanitarian assistance, including USD 1 million from the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), targeting Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai, with house repairs and providing gender-responsive household kits.

REVIEW

The CERF Results Framework describes the project objective ‘to immediately improve life-threatening living conditions of the most vulnerable flood-affected households. The two outputs are:

1. House repairs support provided to 3,323 households through cash assistance to ensure safe and dignified lives post-disaster; and
2. Basic needs of 3,323 households addressed through gender-responsive household kits; both outputs require a minimum of 20 per cent female-headed households.

This report summarises the main findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the review of the CERF component of UNDP’s support in the affected areas. The report aims to supply relevant decision-makers in the Government, UNDP, project partners and development partners with an overall, independent assessment to make an informed judgment about the performance of the interventions.
Main Findings

Project implementation

Monitoring & evaluation

The project objective is relevant and met Results-based Management standards. The Project met the indicator targets for both outputs – providing cash support for house repairs for 3,323 households and gender-responsive household kits to 3,571 households (248 kits more than the target).

The Project Implementing Agency, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Vietnam, worked closely with two project partners, the provincial Red Cross chapters in the five provinces and the provincial Women’s Union in Quang Tri. The Red Cross had responsibility for day-to-day monitoring, supervision, and support of the house repairs, conducted mainly by local artisans and beneficiary households, their relatives, friends, and neighbours. Besides, in four out of five provinces (excepting Quang Tri where the Women’s Union had responsibility), the Red Cross chapters oversaw the selection of beneficiary households and procurement and distribution of household kits.

Further, UNDP appointed six Provincial Engineers, one based in each province, and a Chief Engineer in Quang Tri, to oversee the technical monitoring of the house repairs in the five provinces. Apart from supervising the Provincial Engineers, the Chief Engineer had overall responsibility for using the KoBo monitoring tool.

The monitoring tool, KoBo, was used effectively by UNDP staff, the UNDP Provincial Engineers, younger members of the project partners, and the Youth Union.

The Commune/Ward People’s Committees (CPC) played a crucial role in selecting the households for house repairs and household kits, along with the Head of Hamlets, working closely with the provincial and commune Red Cross staff. In some provinces with the provincial Departments of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (DoLISA) played a crucial role in selecting poor and near-poor households. The Youth Union, too, supplied young volunteers to assess household needs (for house repairs or household kits), monitor house repairs, and distribute gender-responsive household kits.

The external review by an international consultant, commissioned by UNDP in Vietnam, was carried out quickly within a month of project completion.

Execution by Implementing Agency (UNDP)

UNDP collaborated with the Provincial People’s Committees in each province, receiving support in all aspects of implementation (needs assessment, information sharing, project appraisal and approval, focal point arrangement, implementation, and supervision). This project confirms UNDP capabilities and responsibilities for implementing a complex humanitarian US$1M housing repair and non-food item operation within a short timeframe. This professional competence helps ensure increased donor trust and confidence to implement other similar projects in the future.

Implementation by Executing Agencies

The Red Cross and the Women’s Union implemented the project at the provincial, district and commune levels. The partners worked effectively and efficiently, involving beneficiary households, engaging well with the local government authorities (LGA) and other mass organisations. While the process – conducted in a four-month timeframe – included many steps and activities, these indicated good cooperation and coordination with clear roles and responsibilities among the different stakeholders.

Project outcomes

Relevance

❖ Government’s priorities

The Project is in keeping with the request for assistance from the Central Committee for Natural Disaster Prevention and Control. UNDP and project partners worked closely with the Provincial People’s Committees.

❖ UNDP mandate

The response is relevant to the role and works UNDP has been playing in Vietnam during disasters in providing humanitarian assistance and making sure that ‘no one is left behind’. Besides, UNDP’s functions in the Partnership for Disaster Risk Reduction in Vietnam signed between UNDP and Central Committee for Natural Disaster Management.1 UNDP helped strengthen the capacity of local government authorities (LGA) to lead and manage response efforts in five of the worst affected provinces of Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai. Also, of project partners – the sub-national Red Cross and Women’s Union.

The response met some of the affected people’s most pressing concerns after the succession of tropical storms, typhoon and floods for resilient house repairs and the provision of a comprehensive set of non-food items (NFI) in a gender-responsive household kit.

❖ Needs of affected households

The project partners, working particularly closely with the Commune People’s Committees and in some provinces with DoLISA, carefully identified and selected poor and near-poor households whose homes had been damaged by between 30 and 70 per cent. Among these, partners focused on vulnerable households comprising older people, people with disabilities, single women- or women-headed households, families with a shortage of labour, or exceptional circumstances. UNDP and project partner staff carried out a demanding beneficiary selection process in an open, fair, and transparent manner.

1 Signed in 2019.
Of the 3,323 houses repaired, the project selected to repair those with between 30 and 70 per cent damage. Without exception, local people met were happy with the support provided. Many had replaced their roofs, reinforced their roofing, replaced doors and windows, built a mezzanine with a ladder, and made other reinforcements to wall structures, improved foundations, repaired or replaced the electrical system. These were the most urgent needs from their individual ‘safe house repair plan’.

The project mainstreaming cross-cutting issues into the plans and actions highlights ‘women’s and men’s needs differentiated, and tailored assistance provided to particularly vulnerable households’. 3,571 households received a comprehensive set of gender-responsive household kits, including items specifically targeting women, including labour-saving rice cookers (Quang Tri and Thua Thien Hue).

**Effectiveness**

❖ Achieving expected outputs

The project successfully repaired the 3,323 houses and distributed 3,571 household kits proposed to poor and near-poor households well before the project end date. Supervision of house repairs by UNDP Provincial Engineers helped ensure build quality. It took about four months from the disaster (October 2020) to complete the house repairs, with most homes repaired before starting the Lunar New Year in early February.

The LGA agreed with the beneficiary selection process – which they considered transparent and fair – ensuring the correct people were selected. People’s Committees involved the Heads of Hamlets during the selection process. In Quang Ngai, the People’s Committee engaged DoLISA, with the Red Cross, to support beneficiary selection, which was prudent.

In four of the five provinces, the provincial Red Cross branches took responsibility for the house repairs and the household kits; in Quang Tri, the provincial Women’s Union had responsibility for the household kits. Engaging the Red Cross achieved all intended project outputs effectively. Given the scale and a tight deadline for the project, the Women’s Union may have been better placed by the Provincial People’s Committees to handle responsibility for gender-sensitive household kits in all five provinces. Thus, enabling the Red Cross to focus exclusively on the house repairs and lessening their burden.

Primarily because of the protracted online government procurement processes, households did not receive the non-food items in the household kits until March. The centralised government procurement procedures had recently changed to an online system. None of the Red Cross chapters nor the Quang Tri Women’s Union had any prior experience or the necessary certification. The local partners made the pragmatic decision to hire a specialised government-certified consultant in each province, to support the project partners through the process. ‘Alternatives, such as setting up provincial level ‘marketplaces’ (with pre-approved suppliers), was not possible as such a suppliers list did not exist. More preferably, directly providing cash to households would have saved time and money and, importantly, ensured that households could purchase the items promptly.

❖ Delivery of training

UNDP made a prudent and pragmatic choice selecting Development Workshop France (DWF) to be the technical consultant for the house repairs. DWF guided house assessment and repairs, facilitated training sessions in each province, developed technical guidance materials and conducted a survey of ten per cent of the houses repaired to evaluate quality. The

---

2 Several of whom had prior experience with the UNDP GCF project.

3 The project was approved in December 2020. By March 2021, the project partners oversaw the selection of households, assessment of house repair and NFI needs, facilitated training events on resilient house repairs, monitored, and completed all the houses repairs and distributed all household kits.

4 Possibly hiring such consultants to work on a ‘national’ procurement from the Red Cross (or Women’s Union) headquarters may have been an option (and possibly reduced costs through purchasing large quantities of each item). However, it could have been more time-consuming.
UNDP Provincial Engineers also participated. DWF trained over 151 people in technical knowledge of resilient house repair techniques. Of the attendees, 92 were men and 59 women. DWF produced suitable guidance materials, which were distributed widely.

Following the training, the Red Cross staff and UNDP Provincial Engineers facilitated dozens of half-day training events in the provinces targeting beneficiary households and local artisans. Of the households interviewed by the consultant, some showed knowledge and skills on resilient house repairs. The training enabled households to monitor the construction of their homes based on their new knowledge and understanding.

More direct, ‘hands-on training’ by DWF for local artisans, based on learning and experience from this response operation and best practices in other housing repair and construction, bringing artisans together with construction supervision engineers and the provincial Department of Construction to allow for more practical knowledge to be retained and used in the future.

❖ Use of innovative approaches

The application of the KoBo tool to monitor the house repair process was a unique feature of the project. It was used efficiently by the experienced engineers, some Red Cross, and other volunteers to scrutinise the house repair process in each province. It is easy-to-use to collect information and flexible for differing demands and contents. Those involved with the project at the province level and in Hanoi could check information, so it is transparent and easy to save records. Users reported some challenges during inclement weather and when in remote locations. The use of the tool needs some further improvement to overcome such difficulties.

❖ Feedback mechanism

Set-up specifically for this operation enabled calls via a dedicated ‘hotline’, Zalo or by email directed to UNDP staff in Hanoi ensured confidentiality and reporting any grievances and technical concerns. Posters regarding the feedback mechanism were printed and posted at distribution points. Also, the Red Cross staff provided verbal guidance to each household. UNDP received calls/feedback from local people, inquiring about when they would receive the goods, which showed that the system was working, and helped UNDP follow up on this feedback. UNDP reported that they had not received any negative feedback.

Efficiency

❖ Cost-effective

The project supplied US$ 200 cash assistance for house repairs for 3,323 households (total US$ 664,600) and US$ 50 for 3,571 gender-responsive household kits – totalling 6,894, equivalent to 27,576 people. At least 83 per cent of CERF resources – a total of US$830,750 – directly reached poor and near-poor households.

The project support of US$ 200 for houses repairs was considered by some local government authorities too low an amount towards total house repairs. Although,

5 The assessment questionnaire was translated into Vietnamese.
this amount was meant to contribute to a part of the total cost of repairs, enabling households to repair or fix urgently needed elements. When the household can arrange finance, they can fix other items in their ‘safe house repair plan’. Many householders interviewed said this acted as a catalyst for them to do further repairs. However, about 95 per cent had to borrow a small amount of between US$70 to 140 from relatives. While it is common practice for families to borrow money to repair (and construct) houses anywhere in Viet Nam, some households accrued debt.

The COVID-19 pandemic had also impacted many vulnerable people in the central provinces – most likely increasing poverty and inequalities. The assistance helped such households to use their existing resources for other needs, reducing the impact of COVID-19 and enabling them to recover from this ‘double crisis’ and help better ensure that ‘no one is left behind’.

❖ **Financial process**

Neither the project partners nor beneficiary households reported any issues with the financial processes, which were clear, and money arrived promptly.

❖ **Use of project resources**

A dedicated accountant with the project partner in each province was responsible for project funds and maintaining detailed accounts and financial reporting to their respective headquarters and UNDP. Funding was used for the proper purposes and provided through UNDP to the project partners; the reviewer was not requested to examine finances. Local Red Cross and Women’s Union project staff would have benefitted from more resources for monitoring activities. In future arrangements with UNDP, a review of cost-norms would be helpful.

The five Provincial Engineers managed by a Chief Engineer stationed in Quang Tri performed the overall coordination role well in challenging circumstances.

**Impact**

❖ **Intended or unintended**

The project addressed the needs of 6,894 poor and near-poor households of the 380,000 homes damaged in the five worst-affected provinces. An estimated 27,576 people directly benefitted from the project, with a further 1.5 million potentially reached through widespread media coverage.

Households expressed their genuine gratitude to the government, UNDP, and the project partners. Many explained how their circumstances had improved significantly since the disasters with the repair of their homes. Further, the project’s support, and its influence in the localities in promoting resilient repairs/house construction, is encouraging.

Most households benefited from the training courses for resilient house repairs, although not all attended, and an insufficient number of local masons took part. Greater emphasis on this group in each province to provide a clearer understanding of safer, resilient house design and repairs would pay dividends for the project and increase the number of safer and resilient houses in the future.

❖ **Verifiable changes in affected areas**

All beneficiary households met, described the improvements in their living conditions from late last year to Tet 2021, stating their homes felt secure. The repaired houses visited included new doors and windows, sealed vents, reinforced roofs, and improved connectivity between the roof and walls.

❖ **Social stability**

All beneficiary households met said that they could sleep better and had fewer worries. Many people stated they were now able to focus on their economic development and stabilise their lives.

---

6 It is unclear how many of the total number of damaged houses belonged to poor and near-poor households.
The project successfully fulfilled the objective and outcomes, meeting targets for the repairs of 3,323 houses of near-poor and poor houses damaged between 30 to 70 per cent by the succession of storms and flood-damaged houses in five central provinces well before the project end date. Besides, distributing gender-responsive household kits to another 3,571 households.

Project partners, the Red Cross Society and the Women’s Union, worked closely with LGA to focus on poor and near-poor households whose homes had been damaged by the succession of tropical storms and floods. Besides, targeting among those in particularly challenging circumstances. UNDP, through its project partners, conducted the project on time and within budget.

Project implementation benefited from the excellent partnership between the UNDP, the Central Committee for Natural Disaster Prevention and Control and the five Provincial People Committees. It formed a firm foundation for future cooperation. The project partners’ significant engagement and support from the DoLISA, the Youth Union, and the Fatherland Front were crucial to this success.

DWF provided excellent training on resilience house repairs, besides supporting the provincial Red Cross in the initial house assessment and repair plans. The UNDP Provincial Engineers and the Chief Engineer in Quang Tri with the project partners and LG were crucial to the project’s success.

The KoBo monitoring tool proved invaluable for real-time monitoring of the progress of implementation of the house repairs. Also, the feedback mechanism should be replicated in future humanitarian response operations to ensure the principles of transparency and accountability.

There is significant potential to scale up and replicate safer, more resilient house repairs in similar areas in the future based on the success of this project.
OVERALL PROJECT RATINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these main findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are provided, besides an overall rating for each evaluation criteria using the obligatory rating scale provided in Annex 1 of the ToR.

### Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Monitoring and Feedback Mechanism</th>
<th>2. IA &amp; EA Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design at entry</td>
<td>Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan implementation</td>
<td>Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality</td>
<td>Overall quality of Implementation/Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Impact on beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Changes in communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Overall impact rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Project Outcome Rating</td>
<td>4: Satisfactory (S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

**RELEVANCE**

| R1 | Investigate prospects for similar interventions for safe housing repairs and construction, aligning with government housing programmes in central Viet Nam. |
| R2 | Explore opportunities for building capacities at sub-national levels in safer, resilient housing to help ensure ‘no one is left behind’. |
| R3 | Consider increasing the level of financial support for house repairs, given inflation of construction materials and wages in the aftermath of disasters triggered by natural hazards or climate change impacts. |
| R4 | Continue to address women and men’s needs through differentiated and tailored assistance, allowing flexibility in determining a shortlist of NFI. |

**EFFECTIVENESS**

| R5 | Continue to engage DoLISA in beneficiary selection processes of poor and near-poor households in future humanitarian response operations. Also, encourage engagement from other socio-political organisations. |
| R6 | Continue to build the capacity of the Women’s Union in the central provinces, including training and awareness-raising on ‘Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse’ (PSEA). |
| R7 | Continue to build on the partnership with DWF to develop the capacity of local artisans in these disaster-prone provinces. |
| R8 | Seek opportunities to provide training and capacity building for Red Cross chapters in safe, resilient house repair and construction. |

**EFFICIENCY**

| R9 | Advocate the government to apply urgent procurement procedures for emergency projects to expedite the process for life-saving purposes. |
| R10 | Seek alternatives to NFI procurement, preferably providing cash to households directly, which would have saved time, money, and ensured households could purchase necessary items in a timely way. |
| R11 | Investigate ways to increase efficiencies to reduce the paperwork required by the project partners in future operations. |
| R12 | Improve support costs for project partner staff and volunteers in future operations. |
| R13 | Consider impacts of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic in the disaster-affected areas in the CERF application. |

**IMPACT**

| R14 | Continue working with the government, UN agencies, mass organisations, INGOs, the private sector and others to support resilient housing programmes outside times of disasters, to increase the number of households living in safe, resilient homes. |

**KOBO-BASED MONITORING SYSTEM**

| R15 | Promote the application of information technology tools, such as KoBo, for efficient monitoring of humanitarian response operations in the country. |

**FEEDBACK MECHANISM**

| R16 | Explore opportunities to promote a feedback mechanism in future humanitarian response operations by development partners, INGOs, UN agencies and the government to ensure the principles of transparency and accountability. |
UNDP Resident Representative in Viet Nam, Caitlin Wiesen meets project beneficiaries at a house repair ceremony in November 2020. (Photo: UNDP Viet Nam)
1. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND
A succession of intense storms, typhoons, triggering floods and landslides impacted Central Viet Nam from 5th October 2020, affecting Cambodia and Lao PDR. The floods focused on Ha Tinh, Quang Binh, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Tri, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai. The floods were mainly caused by the seasonal monsoon, though augmented by nine tropical storms – Linfa, Nangka, Ofel, Saudel, and Molave, struck the northern and central regions, bringing high winds and excessive rainfall. The subsequent flooding was the first time Viet Nam issued a Category IV disaster alert for heavy rainfall. On 5th November, weakening Typhoon Goni entered the South China Sea and made landfall in Central Viet Nam two days later as a tropical depression. Tropical Storm Etau made landfall in a similar area three days later. On 12th November, Typhoon Vamco approached Viet Nam and gradually strengthened to Category IV status.

More than 235 people were reported dead or missing. At least 380,000 houses flooded, wind-damaged, or destroyed and damages estimated at VND 17 trillion (US$ 734.67 million).

According to the findings of three inter-sector Joint Assessment Teams, the flood levels and storms were unprecedented, causing widespread damage to people’s homes and crops, and the death or loss of livestock, affecting the lives and livelihoods of over 1.5 million people.

In the aftermath of the storms and floods, tens of thousands of vulnerable households were among the hardest hit. Many lost almost all their household possessions, and others became homeless. Most poor and near-poor people did not have the means to invest in house repairs, reconstruction, or purchase necessities. UNDP mobilised finance for emergency humanitarian assistance, including USD 1 million from the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). Under the CERF funded project, the targeted provinces include five of the most severely affected provinces of Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai. The assistance primarily aimed at house repairs and providing gender-responsive household kits.

PURPOSE
The review examines the extent to which the project met its objectives and outputs of providing:

- House repair support to 3,323 households through cash assistance (VND 4.6 million, about US$ 200) to ensure safe and dignified lives.
- The basic needs of 3,323 households addressed through the delivery of gender-responsive household kits (each valued at VND1.2 million, about US$ 50).

As part of this review, UNDP Viet Nam aims to learn from experiences and explore options for enhancing UNDP’s emergency programming approaches for potential replication in future disaster response interventions.

Considering the independent nature of this exercise, findings from the review aim to provide a transparent basis for similar interventions by UNDP, the Government of Viet Nam, provincial government authorities, and potential donors in future disasters, which may necessitate similar interventions.

The report is intended for the following stakeholders:
- Management members of UNDP and UN system agencies in Viet Nam.
- Officials from the Vietnam Disaster Management Authority, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, and other ministries.
- Sub-national government officials, Red Cross and Women’s Union officials from Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, Quang Ngai (and potentially other disaster-prone provinces).

OBJECTIVES & SCOPE
The overall objective of the review is to:

1. Assess the effectiveness of the project in achieving the objectives and targets.
2. Examine the impacts (positive or negative, intended, or unintended) because of and/or contributed by the project.
3. Document lessons learned and potential opportunities to inform future emergency response programming and house resilience-building programmes by the Government and development partners in central Viet Nam.

The review covers the two Project outputs, implemented from December 2020 to April 2021 in the five provinces.

---


8 Who visited the affected areas from 21-23 October.
2. APPROACH & METHOD

**Approach**
The general approach adopted was gender-sensitive, socially inclusive, and participatory. The consultants followed a quantitative approach, using a mix of data collection tools, including interviews, focus group discussions (FGD), and observations from project site visits.

The consultants applied a reflective, strengths-based, and appreciative inquiry approach to the work, leveraging a diversity of opinions and inputs to conduct a comprehensive review of the project, owned by essential stakeholders:

- **Participatory and inclusive**: the consultant worked closely with the primary stakeholders, including UNDP staff and the Provincial, District and Commune People’s Committees of Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam and Quang Ngai provinces, the Viet Nam Disaster Management Authority (VNDMA). This collaborative approach to the exchange of knowledge and experiences led to more relevant and grounded documentation.

- **Gender-sensitive and socially inclusive**: the review documentation integrates gender-sensitive and socially inclusive approaches as much as possible and as relevant for the primary stakeholders.

- **Strengths-based**: rather than focusing on shortfalls or weaknesses, the consultant concentrated on capitalising on existing assets, capacities, skills, and strengths available.

**Method**
As stipulated in Terms of Reference, the consultant used the Development Assistance Committee of the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria for review/evaluation of humanitarian action (EHA). These are the most referenced evaluation criteria and have been a strong foundation for international development evaluation since 1991. The review looked at four of the five DAC evaluation areas – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and impact (excepting sustainability) to set the standard for what was considered and measured.

The review also considered the innovative tool, KoBo, to monitor Project progress and the feedback mechanism.

The consultant agreed with the UNDP focal point on the method and approach to supply credible answers to the review questions. The method aims to ensure information collected is valid, reliable, and sufficient to meet the review objectives and that the analysis was logical, coherent, and complete. Also, the consultant applied triangulation principles (using multiple sources of data and methods) to validate the findings and subsequently draw conclusions and make recommendations based on these.

After the review, ratings provided were based on performance criteria as stipulated in the review ToR.

1. **Desk review**
The consultant reviewed the information, including disaster assessment reports, project documentation, reports, and files, and studied the Government of Viet Nam (GoV) strategies, legislation, and programmes that aim to improve the resilience of poor and vulnerable households to natural hazards through resilient housing.

2. **Stakeholders**
The consultant met stakeholders at the sub-national level, including:

- Representatives from UNDP’s project partners - the Viet Nam Red Cross chapters in Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, Quang Ngai, and the Women’s Union Quang Tri.

- Representatives of the Provincial, District and Commune People’s Committees. Heads of Hamlets, and representatives of the Youth Union, and DoLISA.

- The five UNDP Provincial Engineers.

Also, in FGD and household visits:

---

9 See Annex 1 Terms of Reference.
11 The consultant used the ALNAP guide for applying the DAC in EHA, which provides 1) lessons-learned, accountability and evaluation, clear definitions for the OECD DAC criteria with an explanation, issues to consider, and examples of good practice; 3) brief guidelines for good practice in methods for an EHA. See https://www.alnap.org/help-library/evaluating-humanitarian-action-using-the-oecd-dac-criteria
12 https://www.kobotoolbox.org/
13 Annex V List of documents reviewed.
3. **Finalise review plan**

The consultant met the focal point within UNDP, who agreed with the five Red Cross chapters and the Quang Tri Women’s Union on the work schedule. Visits took place to five provinces, and in each, two communes, focusing on house repairs in one commune and household kits in the other. The visits were carried out from the 12th to 16th April, allowing a full day in each province.14

4. **Data collection through semi-structured interviews and Focus Group Discussions**

The consultant worked closely with UNDP, the provincial and commune/ward Red Cross in Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai provinces, and the Women’s Union in Quang Tri.

The consultant conducted semi-structured interviews using a set of guiding questions with almost 50 people in total.15 The consultant facilitated FGD with about 20 household representatives in each province, who had their houses repaired, and a further 20 supplied with household kits. The consultant met roughly equal numbers of men and women of differing ages who benefited from the house repairs or received the household kits. The consultant emphasised meeting 30 beneficiary households in their homes to ascertain their viewpoints.

The consultant examined the contributions in kind and cash of the beneficiary households and the various merits or otherwise of the design options available.16

5. **Deliverables**

The consultant produced the following deliverables according to the ToR:

1. **Draft review report** – according to the proposed elements provided in the ToR.
2. **PowerPoint presentation** – delivered during the final project workshop.17
3. **Final review report** – also supplying an audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report.

---

14 Annex II Final itinerary for provincial visits.
15 Annex III List of People Met.
16 Annex VI Questionnaire used.
17 See
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PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Monitoring & evaluation

The project objective was relevant and met Results-based Management standards. The project met the indicator targets for both outputs – successfully providing cash support for house repairs for 3,323 households and gender-responsive household kits to another 3,571 households (248 kits more than the target).

The Project Implementing Agency (UNDP) worked closely with two project partners, the Red Cross in the five provinces and the provincial Women’s Union in Quang Tri. The Red Cross, through its network of Red Cross Volunteers (RCV), had responsibility for day-to-day monitoring, supervision, and support of the house repairs, conducted mainly by local artisans and beneficiary households, their relatives, friends, and neighbours.

The INGO Development Workshop France (DWF) played an essential role in defining technical standards for safe house repair and the questionnaire for the house repair assessment. Also, DWF provided support to the provincial Red Cross during the initial phase of the assessment and later surveyed 10 per cent of house repairs carried out in the five provinces to assess quality.18

Further, UNDP deployed six Provincial Engineers, including several from its ongoing project that builds resilient houses in central Vietnam (funded by the Green Climate Fund).19 A Provincial Engineer based in each province reported to a Chief Engineer in Quang Tri, who supervised the technical monitoring of the house repairs in the five provinces using the KoBo monitoring tool. The Provincial Engineers took on considerable responsibility given the technical expertise needed to assess and guide house repair work (beyond the capacity of some less experienced RCV).

The UNDP staff, the Provincial Engineers, and some younger RCV or Youth Union members effectively used the KoBo monitoring tool, overcoming some technical challenges.

In four out of five provinces (excepting Quang Tri, where the Women’s Union had responsibility), the Red Cross oversaw the selection of beneficiary households, procurement, and distribution of the household kits.

The Commune/Ward People’s Committees (CPC) played a crucial role in selecting the households for house repairs or household kits, along with the Head of Hamlets, working closely with the provincial and commune Red Cross staff. In some provinces with the provincial Departments of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (DoLISA) played a role in selecting poor and near-poor households. The Youth Union, too, supplied young volunteers to assess household needs (for house repairs or household kits), monitor house repairs, and distribute gender-responsive household kits.

The external review by an international consultant, commissioned by UNDP in Vietnam, was carried out quickly within the final weeks of project completion.

Implementing agency (UNDP)

UNDP collaborated effectively with the Provincial People’s Committees in each province, receiving support in all aspects of implementation (needs assessment, information sharing, project appraisal and approval, focal point arrangement, implementation, and supervision).

Executing agencies (Vietnam Red Cross Society and Vietnam Women’s Union)

The implementation of the project’s method and approach were carried out well by the trained staff of the provincial, district and commune level Red Cross and Women’s Union.

The five Red Cross chapters and the Quang Tri Women’s Union worked effectively and efficiently, involving beneficiary households throughout the implementation process. At each level, they received support and cooperation from the LGAs. While the process included many steps and specific activities, these indicated clear roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders.


19 See https://www.greenclimate.fund/project/fp013
**PROJECT OUTCOMES**

1. **Relevance**

*Achievements*

❖ **Government priorities in the aftermath of the storms, typhoons, and floods in the Central Provinces**

The project is in keeping with existing Government of Viet Nam (GoV) legislation related to housing reconstruction (see Annex V: List of documents reviewed).

The project closely aligns with the request for assistance from the Central Committee for Natural Disaster Prevention and Control. Also, government programmes implemented throughout the country where communes received support for the construction – using resilient designs.20 Provincial People’s Committee officials met in three of the five provinces, appreciated the house repairs. The People’s Committee in Quang Nam commented on the importance of the reinforcement of roofs. The local people had also been encouraged that the budget met priority needs for repairs, especially for those living in high-risk areas affected by the sequence of storms and floods.

Without exception, local people met were happy with the support provided. Many had replaced their roofs, reinforced their roofing, replaced doors and windows, built a mezzanine with a ladder, and made other reinforcements to wall structures, improved foundations, repaired or replaced the electrical system.

All Commune People’s Committees (CPC) reported that the non-food items (NFI) in the household kit provided necessary and valuable items, particularly those in the mountainous areas. Some households met had not received any other support from donors – only from relatives – and were particularly grateful for the NFI provided. Also, in some localities, the Red Cross (and Women’s Union) had further ‘tailored’ the standard NFI to better suit the needs of the local affected households.

For example, in Quang Nam, besides the 18 items on the list proposed by UNDP, nine items were suitable for local people who also proposed other essential items, including kitchen knives, scissors, and a 60l plastic bucket. In Quang Tri, the kits included a rice cooker to help lessen women’s burden for cooking.

The Red Cross was an appropriate partner to implement house repairs in all five provinces because of their experience over many years in disaster response and recovery, with resilient house repairs and construction works.

❖ **UNDP mandate**

The UNDP Viet Nam Country Office supported the GoV to design and implement a complex US$1M housing repair and NFI operation.

20 The government housing project No. 48 undertakes house construction using resilient designs of 20 m² with housing costing VND 52 million per house. For example, in Quang Binh under this project, over the past three years, 30 houses have been constructed. Although the amounts provided by the project are considerably less as these are for essential house repairs, not construction.

The response is relevant to the role and work UNDP has been playing in Viet Nam during disasters in providing humanitarian assistance and making sure that ‘no one is left behind’. Besides, UNDP’s functions in the Partnership for Disaster Risk Reduction in Viet Nam signed between UNDP and Central Committee for Natural Disaster Prevention and Control.

UNDP helped strengthen the capacity of local government authorities (LGA) to lead and manage response efforts in five of the worst affected provinces of Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai. Also, the sub-national Red Cross and Women’s Union supplying humanitarian response in the five worst-affected provinces.

❖ **Needs of affected households**

The project focused on the most vulnerable poor and near-poor households, according to the global Multidimensional Poverty Index21 (2019), whose houses, because of successive typhoons, tropical storms, and floods were damaged between 30 to 70 per cent. Project partners gave priority to households in challenging circumstances, focusing on single-headed households (women or men), older people, people with disabilities (PwD), those suffering chronic sicknesses, pregnant or breastfeeding women, families with a shortage of labour, and ethnic minorities.

The criteria to focus support for poor and near-poor households was valuable and straightforward.

Many households met had received different supplies due to emergency response operations from the government, other organisations, and individuals – mainly food (instant noodles) and clothing. So, support...
for house repairs was helpful and significant, particularly for vulnerable groups who, without such support, would not have been able to repair their homes.

Couples usually decided together on what they considered the priorities for their house repairs; their immediate family or grown-up children often guided those living alone. Many household members reported discussing which repairs they should undertake among all family members.

**Challenges**

- **Government priorities**
  
  Government levels of financial support provided for resilient houses under housing programmes cover construction (instead of repairs); the project aligned with government priorities.

- **UNDP mandate**
  
  UNDP fulfilled the humanitarian mandate of the Resident Coordinator’s Office in Viet Nam and the theme of the Sustainable Development Goals to ‘leave no one behind’, its functions under the Partnership for DRR, besides building the capacity of LGAs and project partners.

- **Needs of affected households**
  
  The poor and near poor household list provided set criteria, also those affected by flood and storm to determine households to receive house repairs. However, in several provinces, some challenges existed with a limited number of people on the list of poor and near-poor.22

  The project used a consistent level of financial support (US$ 200/house) for urgent house repairs/fixing for lifesaving and not intended to repair a damaged house fully. Some households could not complete their ‘safe house repair plan’ as designed during the initial assessment for such an amount. In some cases, according to DWF assessments, some works which were done could have been improved.

  Several senior Red Cross representatives and CPC Presidents expressed that it would have been better to reduce the number of beneficiaries receiving support for house repairs and increase the level of support for each. It would likely have ensured that more households completed their ‘safe house repair plans’ and prevented some from borrowing money.

  The needs assessment process for NFI recipients was challenging as households had many different needs as they recovered from the disasters. Still, overall, households were content with the comprehensive set of NFI provided – comprising (in some cases) 16 different items – and with the quality. Where tailored further, e.g., by the Women’s Union in Quang Tri and the Red Cross in Thua Thien Hue, these were more suitable for local needs and context.

  In some areas in the aftermath of the floods and storms, access to clean water was a problem, and water filtration units required. However, the LGA considered house repairs of greater relevance to meet immediate and longer-term needs.

**2. Effectiveness**

**Achievements**

- **Achieving expected outputs**
  
  The project repaired the 3,323 houses and distributed 3,571 gender-responsive household kits to poor and near-poor households in 113 communes/wards of 25 districts in five provinces. Table 1 above shows the overall number of house repairs.23

  Planning and implementation by the Red Cross chapters in the five provinces were good and well-coordinated from the provincial to commune/ward level. Households met had all been able to complete their house repairs before Tet.

  The CPC agreed with the beneficiary selection process – which they considered transparent and fair – to ensure the correct people were selected. Project partners in all locations worked closely with the Commune or Ward People’s Committee and the Head of Hamlets, critical during beneficiary selection. In Quang Ngai, the Red Cross worked effectively with the DoLISA for beneficiary selection. It ensured coordination of support from different organisations, individuals, and the private sector besides providing explanations to local people ensuring the transparency of the beneficiary selection process. The CPC also worked with the Fatherland Front and Youth Union to draw on their membership to support beneficiary households.

  In all five provinces, local people recounted a similar process for the house repairs, which followed the Project regulations. After beneficiary household selection criteria, Red Cross staff visited each household

**Table 1 Overall Number of House Repairs Completed in Each Province**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Number of house repairs</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quang Binh</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>21.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quang Ngai</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thua Thien Hue</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>19.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quang Nam</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>19.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Quang Tri</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>19.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,323</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 For example, in Thua Thien Hue, which, when coupled with the ‘appropriate’ level of damage, resulted in the Red Cross working in 36 communes. This took a long time, was inevitably costly, and stretched human resources.

23 See [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HD-...](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HD-...)

---
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– often accompanied by Provincial Engineer – to discuss which household repairs were necessary through consultation with affected household members. Households (or their relatives) contacted the local artisans for the repair work and purchased the necessary materials. The RCV or CPC also helped with this for particularly vulnerable people. Households did not report having faced any difficulties when buying materials from the local shops. Shopkeepers knew about the programme and were willing to provide the materials on loan, knowing the beneficiary households would receive the money and pay the shopkeeper later.

DWF and the Provincial Engineers provided guidance and support to the RCV – the engineers often guiding the works directly – effectively assessing the house situation, consulting with households about the repairs needed, and then following up. Volunteers and Provincial Engineers often visited houses to encourage and guide households with their repairs.

Households appreciated the active support from the RCV from consultation on what house repairs they should consider, the costs involved and throughout the implementation process. Representatives in all localities spoke highly of the commitment from the RCV, the Provincial Engineers and the CPC staff. Significant were the timely discussions with the RCV and affected households about the house conditions following the storms and floods, what house repairs were required, and the costs involved. Households received support with their ‘safe house repair plan’ and made written commitments to repair their homes. All were aware of the process – the cash instalments and the verification by the RCV/Provincial Engineers.

In Quang Tri, the CPC mobilised support from other socio-political organisation members to provide labour to help households with house repairs. It included support from the Fatherland Front and was particularly important for households with limited labour – especially single-headed households or older people. The mobilisation of local labour was crucial for undertaking house repairs – households were encouraged to mobilise support from friends and relatives to provide labour to carry out necessary house repair training.

The UNDP Project closely followed up with all households to ensure that the finance provided was used only for household repairs and that households mobilise a little more to improve their living conditions. This close monitoring and follow-up were different from the other projects and crucial for its success.24

The Red Cross oversaw implementing Output 2 household kits in four provinces, except in Quang Tri, where UNDP gave this responsibility to the Women’s Union. For example, the Women’s Union considered women-headed households with disabled family members and older people and determined those most in need. Working with the CPC, they determined 100 households eligible for NFI support. It was challenging, meeting the selection criteria for poor and near-poor households for those who had suffered similar damage and loss. Besides, much other emergency support had come into the area from other organisations/individuals and the private sector.25

The Women’s Union also conducted a thorough assessment of the needs of the selected households for items to include in the household kit. The final kit procured included blankets and mosquito nets, cooking pots and items that families had not received from other items that households deemed essential to help them recover and stabilise their lives. Although challenging because different people had differing requirements, a consensus was reached. Sanitary supplies were not included in households with older women as these were not appropriate. Also, they took the innovative step of including a good quality rice cooker (VND 400,000) which would help reduce the burden of women who usually used would for cooking rice, washing powder, and in some cases, a pedestal fan.

The Women’s Union undertook the procurement despite their lack of prior experience in the government’s new tendering and online procurement procedures. This online system takes at least one month, with some steps taking five to seven days and contended with the Tet holidays (10th to 16th February).

In all provinces, the household kit items had been selected, and the procurement procedure process completed before Tet; however, households did not receive the household kits until early March.

Posters were helpful, and some residents had photographs of these on their phones. People were happy with the distribution from the CPC premises and knew what they were going to receive.

Training of partner staff, households, and artisans on resilient house repairs and construction

UNDP tasked Development Workshop France (DWF), an INGO based in Hue City for more than twenty years,26 to be the technical consultant team for house repairs; a prudent and pragmatic choice. The DWF remit included elaborating on the house assessment and repair (using the KoBo tool) and facilitating training sessions in each province on the assessment method and technical standards for flood and storm house repairs. Over 151 people were trained in technical knowledge of resilient house repair techniques. Of the attendees, 92 were men and 59 women. DWF produced useful technical guidance material, which was distributed widely. Besides, DWF conducted a survey of ten per cent of the houses repaired to evaluate the quality of works.27

24 Although not confirmed by the consultant, other stakeholder had reportedly supplied up to VND 10 million in cash for house repairs; some households had not used this money appropriately and not all houses were repaired.

25 Many received donations from individuals – such as clothes, food, and cash. The most significant help had come from the CPC, which provided rice and cash up to VND 1.5 million before Tet.

26 https://dof.org/en/english/vietnam

27 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1erDDaWJE4IegqtQAJAYK8Q8df50EjphZ/view?usp=sharing
The provincial-level technical training focused on the local Red Cross staff, volunteers, and the Provincial Engineers. Having received this training, the trained personnel replicated the training during half-day training events targeting beneficiary households, local artisans, CPC staff, other RCVs, and Youth Union members at the district and commune level in their respective provinces. Because of the number of communes involved in some provinces. For example, in Thua Thien Hue, it was not practical to run the course in each commune, so participants travelled to nearby communes for their training. Households provided positive feedback on consultations held with the RCV on technical issues and local masons regarding their house repairs to ensure the works were conducted correctly.

The inclusion of a Provincial Engineer in each province and the Chief Engineer in Quang Tri - who provided overall coordination for the project in a challenging situation - was an excellent decision. This committed team provided necessary hands-on support to the Red Cross, RCV, and masons besides the households throughout the process.

Many of the representatives who took part in the five FGDs (about 100 people) facilitated by the consultant had attended the half-day training events, most considering this sufficient. The training provided essential technical knowledge on construction issues to better prepare for storms and floods and what was required to address different levels of storm and flood impact. In all provinces, when asked, several people in each of the five groups could recall crucial features of the training and later put these into practice in house repairs undertaken. These included the importance of reinforcing the roofs with metal or concrete bars, reinforcing and correctly fitting doors (with several locks), ensuring the roof was correctly braced to the walls, and sealing air vents.

Participants at the training events received several flyers (developed by DWF) on repairing different house models. Many reported sharing this information with their relatives and neighbours, especially with others whose houses had also been affected and encouraged the household members to do the same.

For household kits, the regulations and instructions were clear for the implementation process from selecting beneficiary households, instalments of cash for house repairs and the cash distribution system. Red Cross officials and CPC staff agreed with the procedures and understood the required steps necessary for government procurement and implementation.

**Challenges**

- **Achieving expected outputs**
  Few RCV had much technical knowledge about house repairs. For example, roofing materials (not using fibro cement), fixing reinforcement bars, reinforcing doors to cope with strong winds, roofing materials. They benefited considerably from the one-day training of trainers conducted by DWF. They relied on the dedicated support of the Provincial Engineers to guide local masons, some of whom had not attended the training.

  The only recurrent negative feedback from the 200 plus households (recipients of the household kits), LGA, and...
partner staff met concerned the delay in receiving the household kits.

Because of the lengthy new online government procurement procedures, none of the gender-responsive household kits could be delivered before Tet in any of the five provinces.

Households in Quang Tri received their household kits in March – before other provinces – delays caused by the lengthy government procedures. In Quang Ngai, the protracted procurement meant households did not receive their household kits until after Tet (in March), by which time the weather had changed completely.

Most households visited in all the provinces who had received NFI had not used many of them – except for the large bucket and washing powder – as they were saving them to open and use during Tet 2021 as they wanted to have new things for that time of year.

In four of the five provinces, the provincial Red Cross branch took responsibility for the house repairs and the household kits; in Quang Tri, the provincial Women’s Union had responsibility for the household kits. Given the scale and tight deadline for the project, the Women’s Union would have been better placed to handle responsibility for the household kits in all five provinces, enabling the Red Cross to focus exclusively on the house repairs, lessening their workload. Besides, the Women’s Union actively promoted ‘Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, PSEA) throughout the project, aligning with an essential part of their mandate to protect women’s legitimate rights and strive for gender equality.28

❖ Training of partner staff, households, and artisans on resilient house repairs and construction

There was consensus that half-day training for households was likely sufficient; however, more intense training for local masons – engaging more local artisans from the locality – would have been better. Many masons learned from their local experiences and have limited formal training; this group also repairs and constructs houses in the locality.

Many Red Cross staff and volunteers lacked the technical experience and expertise on house repairs and construction. In some provinces, e.g., Quang Nam, the Provincial Engineer accompanied the RCV to houses for assessments, monitoring and verification and visited all 360 homes.

In Thua Thien Hue, where the Red Cross worked in 38 communes, representatives from several communes received training together as about a fifth of the province was affected. For example, in Phu Loc commune, only four out of 20 household representatives met had participated in the training. Many beneficiaries’ households were farmers and could not afford to attend the training events as these involved gathering households from a group of communes. Some local people felt that it would be better to have training for each commune. However, they acknowledged this was challenging.

28 See http://vwu.vn/vwu-in-brief

BOX 1

NGUYEN THIET KY
(88, Thua Thien Hue)

House repairs undertaken included replacing a broken fibro cement roof with a new corrugated metal roof and covering up the ventilation holes above the windows.

Her family and neighbours supported her after her home was damaged by the storm, including calling the Masons and helping her to discuss her ‘safe house repair plan’ with the Red Cross volunteers and UNDP provincial engineers.

After completing the works (VND 12 million), she now felt safe and secure, and her neighbours continue to help her.

(Photo: UNDP Viet Nam)
especially in Thua Thien Hue, where so many communes were involved (38 training events would be impractical).

3. Efficiency

Achievements

❖ Cost-effective

The project supplied US$ 200 as unconditional or conditional cash assistance29 for house repairs for 3,323 households (total US$ 664,600) and US$ 50 for gender-responsive household kits (non-food items, NFIs) (total US$166,150) to 3,571 households – totalling 6,894, equivalent to 27,576 people.

At least 83 per cent of CERF resources – a total of US$830,750 – directly reached poor and near-poor households.

The Red Cross staff and volunteers visited households to discuss their needs with family members, often encouraged households to mobilise further funding. Most households – except for those met in Quang Ngai – mobilised additional money to support the house repairs. Households used savings, some sold livestock or other assets, besides borrowing a little money from relatives – often their grown-up children, other family members, or friends. Households viewed this as a gift. There was no pressure to return this if paying back was required at all. Those who did, borrowed between VND 1 to 4 million and, if needed, could pay back small amounts. Only a couple of households (publicly) reported being concerned about this. Very few households reported getting loans from the bank, apart from those having prior experience, enough collateral and income to repay.

The UNDP support acted as a catalyst for families to carry out necessary house repair work, borrowing extra money to take advantage of the grant from the project. Apart from in Quang Ngai, where no one met mobilised extra money, in the four other provinces, possibly one or two households only used the financial support of VND 4.6 million for the repair work. In Quang Ngai, people seemed more risk-averse and continued repairing and renovating homes using their incomes or savings.

❖ Financial process

Project partners ensured a dedicated accountant in each province responsible for project funds, maintaining detailed accounts, and financial reporting to their respective headquarters and UNDP.

The consultant was not requested to examine finances, and as far as could be ascertained, the finance was used effectively and for the purposes intended in communes visited.30

There was some delay in receiving the money at the household level for the artisans. However, all households reported that the works were completed before Tet.

❖ Use of project resources

Households felt the support was timely – the floods and storms affected October. By December, they had begun to receive support, including being selected, having their house repair assessed, and later in the year, the first tranche of cash to carry out their house repairs – some of which were carried out quickly within a few days. In contrast, other repair work could take a week to ten days, such as repairing roofs. The repair of houses faced challenges because of the adverse weather, paucity of trained masons and their busyness (before Tet) in some localities, and some households’ traditional customs, which affected progress. The households did not use old materials as they consider most of these were of low quality or damaged.

The Red Cross, often a committed and extremely hard-working commune-level President supported by some local RCV, implemented the project efficiently. In several cases, they continued to follow up with families after completing the project to ensure there were no outstanding issues.

Increased household borrowing was a common feature among households met in FGD to discuss house repairs. Apart from the households met in Quang Ngai, nearly all 20 households met in each of the four other provinces (with one or two exceptions only) had borrowed money for their house repairs. In several provinces, the RCV encouraged households to mobilise more money for their house repairs. Generally, these amounts varied from US$ 40 to 170 (VND 1 to 4 million). However, a few families exceeded this amount considerably. Some households decided to borrow money from different sources apart from relatives and friends. A few families took loans of US$215 to 260 (VND 5 to 6 million) (at a 1.6 per cent interest rate) from the government programme for the poor and some from the Women’s Union. On average, in the five provinces of the 200 plus household representative met only one household in 20 met only used project money as they did not wish to borrow from others.

Most households selected are elderly, sick, and in some cases did not have relatives, which posed challenges for project partners when approaching, informing, and advising people about the implementation and took up much time for those involved in assessments and monitoring.

In Thua Thien Hue, the Red Cross spoke of the lengthy government procedures and the necessity to hire a specialist national consultant for procurement (this was necessary for each province) to help with the procedures. Each consultant received US$650 (VND15 million) according to Vietnamese government cost norms and supplied through a specialist agency in each province. Hiring the five consultants is estimated to have cost the project about US$3,250. However, these consultants helped to check all the documentation

29 Red Cross made a conditional cash grant of US $100 to the households, who, following assessment and decisions on house repairs, procurement of materials, and hiring local masons for repairs, received the final payment of US $100 on verification of completion of the works by project partners. Alternatively, some households – the majority – on signing a voluntary commitment to carry out the house repairs according to an agreed plan, received US $200 and, following repair, verification by the project partners of the completed works.

30 While no detailed financial auditing was carried out (this is not required by UNDP) given the size of the grant and its use across five provinces by several project partners, and suppliers, an external financial audit by a recognised international auditing firm is advised. It is understood by the consultant that UNDP will conduct an independent financial/capacity assessment.
prepared by the Red Cross (in Quang Tri by the Women’s Union) and prepare the bidding documents posted on the central government website. The consultants also involved in selecting suppliers (such consultants must have a certificate to do government procurement – which neither the Red Cross nor the Women’s Union in the affected provinces has).

Generally, there were no difficulties finding masons to help do the work. However, pre-Tet many were busy as other households renovated/repairs their homes, and households had to wait their turn. Also, not all masons had received the half-day technical training provided by the Red Cross.

In most provinces, within less than a month of the house repair assessments, work started on most homes. In Quang Ngai, people generally chose not to borrow money; only three of the 23 households met borrowed a little money (about VND 1 million). The remainder instead chose to focus on the priority repairs first and gradually undertaking other reinforcement/retrofitting.

A criticism in Quang Ngai from the CPC President was that the support for non-food items arrived too late, during March, and blankets, which would have been particularly useful if provided before Tet, were no longer of use (at least not at this time of year). The Quang Nam CPC President met, also complained of the significant delays in providing the household kits to households and said these should have been supplied to recipient households before Tet.

### Challenges

#### Cost-effective

While the households welcomed house repairs, many of their houses were in terrible condition with damaged house walls, foundations, and rooms. Still, they could not afford to address all the repairs ‘in their’ safe house repair plan’, only the most urgent parts, because of the limited funds available for house repairs from the project and their reticence to get too much debt.

The LGA and people understood the level of support available, recognising that there will always be unmet needs. The consensus was that the UNDP Project support was limited and did not provide high enough financial support for house repair. Nevertheless, households benefited through this finance, which acted as a catalyst for households to mobilise further funds for house repairs and momentum for people to improve their economic conditions. Such support – mostly from their children, relatives, and friends – enabled further house repairs and improved their living conditions (in Phu Loc, this work continued after Tet).

US$ 200 for house repair was considered low compared with the actual costs for critical house repairs. A recurrent comment was that the UNDP should increase the level of support per household – providing more money for poor households as these were really in need. Also, this would reduce the necessity for such households to borrow money from relatives. About 95 per cent of households met mobilised funds – the majority from close family or relatives – to cover the costs of their house repairs.

While some households received conditional payments and others received unconditional payments, this did not seem problematic (although one questions the necessity of these two options with such small quantities of money involved, potentially adding an extra layer of complexity).

Some project partner and CPC representatives stated the project was very demanding. The RCV and engineers had to visit the households on many occasions, as each was at different stages in their house repairs.

#### Financial process

The financial processes were transparent. Households understood the procedures. Households felt that the support they received was quick and in time and appreciated, although they all still had unmet needs. People accepted the delays in distributing NFI and knew that they would receive them, albeit later than they had hoped. They also understood the level of support provided.

#### Use of project resources

The Red Cross reported that in some localities, the attention and interest of some LGA officials lack to create favourable conditions, so the project faced challenges in timely implementation. Despite the usefulness of the KoBo system for monitoring, much paperwork was still required at the local levels to implement the project. The Red Cross staff complained that this was extremely time-
**BOX 2**

**NGUYEN THI THUC**

(84, Thua Thien Hue)

Nguyen Thi Thuc lives alone and has the support of VND 270,000 per month support for the poor but also raises vegetables which she sells at the market and can earn a further VND 10 to 20,000/day.

The support from the project towards her ‘safer house repair plan’ included reinforcement bars on the roof, new windows, sealing of the vents, and a front door. She also received in-kind help from her neighbours toward the house repairs (total ~VND 10 million).

She does not yet have electricity but has a small water well. She says she is now happy and secure before she could not sleep well, and the new roof and windows help keep the house dry and stop the wind from coming in.

(Photos: UNDP Viet Nam / Ian Wilderspin)

---

**4. Impact**

**Achievements**

❖ **Positive or negative, intended, or unintended**

In all provinces, the visibility of the Red Cross, Women’s Union and UNDP increased among local people, who appreciated their work and that of the Commune and Ward PC.

The repaired houses visited included new doors and windows, sealed vents, reinforced roofs, and improved connectivity between the roof and walls. Households reported feeling more safe and secure than they did a year ago. The support was beneficial as they are affected annually by storms and floods. Apart from the physical security the repaired houses provided, many households felt more encouraged, reported being mentally and spiritually happier, sleeping better at night, and reducing worries and uncertainties. All continued to feel their lives were stable because of the project’s intervention – particularly the house repairs. Without the Project support, they would not have been able to undertake the household repairs. Households met considered the learning they had of resilient house repairs and construction most helpful. People reported an increase in their capacity for disaster preparedness and their coping capacity for future disaster events. In all provinces, households requested that more similar works were carried out before the disaster season.
The Central Provinces are disaster-prone areas. Knowledge and skills of house repairs are helpful for all people – including wealthier families – some of whose homes were made more resilient to storms in the future by adopting resilient techniques. A positive and unintended impact through the UNDP technical training events – conducted by DWF – increased the knowledge, skills and awareness of resilient repairs and house construction and benefited those engaged in the roll-out of the government housing programmes. DWF produced promotional materials, including videos and pamphlets covering safe house repairs and reconstruction processes, and aired/delivered to a broader audience in all affected provinces. In the five provinces, neighbouring households affected by the succession of disasters reported having benefitted indirectly from their neighbours who had received the project’s support for house repairs.

The Women’s Union Quang Tri obtained competitive prices from suppliers – below-market rates – and saved money that had the unexpected and positive impact of enabling them to support a further hundred households with similar household kits. Similarly, in Quang Nam, where after purchasing 600 household kits as initially planned, surplus finance existed, enabling the procurement of an additional 35 kits to support other households according to the selection criteria.

❖ **Verifiable changes in affected areas**

UNDP estimated that the total number of people who indirectly benefited from project activities could reach as many as 1.5 million people because of the country’s sophisticated information distribution networks.

**Challenges**

❖ **Positive or negative, intended, or unintended**

According to the DWF survey of 300 houses, the quality of work is highly satisfactory for 54 per cent, ‘satisfactory for 42 per cent, and ‘needs improvement for only 4 per cent. The latter figure reflects houses with fibro-cement roofs, not replaced because of a shortage of funds. Only about 20 per cent of the houses surveyed in the five provinces remain vulnerable to tropical storms, common in Central Vietnam.\(^{21}\)

Resilience to floods is better, as most households in the flood-prone areas already have a mezzanine, which is essential for personal safety to move to in case of flooding and storage of essential possessions/assets. A few households met built a mezzanine with the support provided by the project. While the 3,323 houses restored with project funding are safer, others are still susceptible, and those who are not supported by the initiative are at risk. Although many still face challenges,

---

\(^{21}\) Twenty years ago, DWF estimated that more than 50 per cent of rural houses in the Central Provinces were vulnerable.
households met to focus on their economic development and stabilise their lives.

While the project targeted 3,323 houses, more than 380,000 houses were damaged to varying degrees.\(^{32}\) Most houses in the provinces built in recent years belonging to low-income families are built by local builders, using ‘common practice’ without an architect or structural engineer.

**Verifiable changes in affected areas**

In communes visited in the five provinces, significant changes had been bought to recipient households in the affected area who have improved their living conditions despite the limited financial support for the house repairs. Some knock-on effect was reported in the vicinity by others benefiting from observing the repairs and understanding the value of these resilient features.

For poor people, US$ 50 for NFI is relatively a high amount, and people were happy with the large capacity (60 to 80l) buckets received, which helped store water or other possessions. The rice cooker, which is likely more economical than the common practice of using wood and certainly safer, also helps to reduce their workload – mainly of women responsible for food preparation. Blankets were particularly welcome as the beginning of the year after Tet was still cold.

The reputations of the five Red Cross chapters and Women’s Union in Quang Tri improved among the local people and the LGA at the commune, district, and provincial levels. For example, the Quang Nam Provincial People’s Committee Vice Chairman spoke highly of the effectiveness of the Red Cross in implementing the house repair programme. Stating the Red Cross was excellent and had worked successfully as the Project focal point and critical implementer. He also welcomed the continuation of such a programme, which would benefit households living in flood-prone areas in the province.

The capacity of staff in the communes increased through understanding the process, implementation, monitoring, besides technical aspects of resilient house repairs/construction. Similarly, households who understood more resilient house features and were more aware of making their homes stronger and withstand floods and storms in the future. Critical was the training imparted to local masons expected beyond the project’s life to continue using resilient house repair/construction knowledge in their future work.

The mobilisation of members from different socio-political organisations at the commune/ward level to provide support was crucial. Households’ members belong to different groups who became involved and had the responsibility to help their membership – and improved connections between different organisations working at the commune/ward level; coordination skills of the CPC staff also improved.

\(^{32}\) NB. It is unknown by the consultant how many of these houses belonged to poor and near-poor households.

**BOX 3**

**NGUYEN TAN DAT & LE THI XUAN**

*(Quang Tri)*

Nguyen Tan Dat and Le Thi Xuan are a young couple with three children. With the support from the project, they reinforced their roof with V3 bars every metre. They also repaired damage to their walls and had a new front door fitted. Besides the money from the project, they used an extra VND 1 million from their savings to cover the cost of their ‘safe house repair plan.’

Nguyen Tan Dat is a construction worker and did the work himself, learning a lot from attending the half-day training event. He said he found this helpful and has already shared information learned with others in the neighbourhood.

Each year they are flooded, but the floods in 2020 were so far the worst, with a metre of floodwater affecting their house.

They now feel safer with the new roof and door.

*(Photos: UNDP Viet Nam / Ian Wilderspin)*
4. KOBO-BASED MONITORING SYSTEM

Achievements
UNDP piloted the KoBo monitoring tool to assess the damage and collect house repair data in all five provinces. Discussions with several Provincial Engineers and a Youth Union member who used the monitoring software spoke of its ease of use in data collection and for tracking information over time. Several Provincial Engineers had used the KoBo system with the GCF project and were familiar with it. It is not a new tool and had few problems using the programme (one Provincial Engineer had used it for seven years). Each stated it was an easy tool to manage the house repair activities when the works are scattered geographically over a large area, not focused in one place, and simultaneously in many different locations. The tool is useful primarily where large numbers of households need monitoring. The UNDP and Red Cross team could keep track of each house repair and provide prompt support as needed. They could enter and check information in each province before the house repairs (Phase 1) and after completing the repairs (in Phase 2). They would not be able to do this without the system.

The KoBo system can work in phones with Android and iOS operating systems. It also works offline to collect data and then needs a simple internet connection (not necessarily high-speed) to transfer data from the phone to a centralized database.

Challenges
The system presented several technical problems. Some users reported its use as complicated in the field and did not supply some critical elements for managing the project, such as a signed agreement with the household on works. It also proved challenging to get readings to pinpoint geographic location, especially in remote areas, during poor weather or cloudy conditions. Access to high-speed and a robust Internet connection when uploading information into the system was not always feasible in more remote areas. Users transferred data when back in the provincial centres.

The KoBo system was complicated for older people to understand. However, an example where the Commune Red Cross President – an older man – worked closely with several younger RCV, familiar with mobile apps, and inputted data into KoBo.

KoBo is a free online tool popularly applied in programmes and projects for monitoring and evaluation in Viet Nam and elsewhere. It is easy-to-use to collect information and flexible for differing demands and contents.

UNDP translated the questionnaire into Vietnamese to ease use.
**KoBo Images of House Repairs**

**KoBo Code QT420:**
Nguyen Thi Loan, Gia Lam village, Vinh Long commune, Vinh Linh district, Quang Tri province.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1a) Before</th>
<th>(1b) After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**KoBo Code H593:**
Nguyen Thi Ky (88 years old), Thuy Yen Thuong village, Loc Thuy commune, Phu Loc district, Thua Thien Hue province.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2a) Before</th>
<th>(2b) After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. FEEDBACK MECHANISM

Several local Red Cross staff mentioned the feedback mechanism set up by UNDP specifically for this operation. It supplied beneficiary households with a secure, confidential means of reporting any concerns arising in project delivery, thereby supporting an effective humanitarian response. The purpose and elements of the feedback mechanism were explained clearly to households and RCV, and others involved by the local Red Cross staff.

**Distributing brochures describing the feedback mechanism**

The project promoted ‘Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, PSEA), which UNDP staff introduced in training events to Provincial Red Cross chapters and the Quang Tri Women’s Union staff, volunteers, local artisans, other workers and local people during different stages of the project. Also, the project promoted gender equality and social inclusion prioritising vulnerable groups, including women-headed households, pregnant or lactating women, older people, and people with disabilities. The household kits distributed reflected specific gender needs expressed in the localities.

The mechanism comprised a dedicated email, a hotline mobile phone number, and Zalo, made available to all households. Besides acting as a channel for feedback on the house repairs and household kits, this also helped protect women from exploitation and the risk of sexual abuse. Besides, the communications materials available (posters and handouts) indicated the purpose of the hotline and the contact details.
6. LESSONS LEARNED

I. **Timely funding support from CERF** enabled UNDP project partners – the Red Cross and Women’s Union – to respond to the felt needs of some of the most vulnerable households in five of the provinces worst affected by the succession of tropical storms and floods in late 2020.

II. **Direction from the People’s Committee at the provincial and commune level and clear guidance from UNDP** enabled the project partners to complete activities on schedule. Officials from the province to the village level implemented the project according to the procedures, selection criteria, and transparency to create consensus and trust among the local people.

III. The **timely and coordinated implementation by the project partners with the LGA at all administrative levels** (and related departments), which took place in the five provinces, enabled the actions to be completed despite the tight deadline and complicated procedures, e.g., for procurement of NFI, and under challenging conditions. The Red Cross and Women’s Union staff displayed competency and commitment, particularly commendable at the commune/ward levels.

IV. **Enthusiasm and dynamicity** of UNDP officials in Hanoi, DWF consultants, Provincial Engineers, and RCV during the implementation of the project, especially supporting poor and near-poor people in challenging circumstances to repair their damaged houses, contributed to accelerating the progress of the project according to the plan.

V. Similarly, the **enthusiastic participation and patience of people during the implementation of the project accelerated the repair of the houses** – from beneficiary selection to assessment of house damage, budgeting, and planning for repairs, mobilising financial and labour support, attending training, and repairing houses, together with local builders.

VI. **Direction from the People’s Committee at the provincial and commune level and clear guidance from UNDP** enabled the project partners to complete activities on schedule. Officials from the province to the village level implemented the project according to the procedures, selection criteria, and transparency to create consensus and trust among the local people.

VII. Some challenges arose in selecting beneficiaries due to the project’s limited resources for house repairs. In some communes, people’s homes have been damaged by disasters in the past, and family circumstances are relatively similar.

VIII. **The implementation and organisation of the project faced difficulties.**

VII. Some challenges arose in selecting beneficiaries due to the project’s limited resources for house repairs. In some communes, people’s homes have been damaged by disasters in the past, and family circumstances are relatively similar.

VIII. Although the need to reinforce and repair people’s houses is high, the funding was limited and of a standard amount/household, which was often insufficient to implement some more critical measures. As funding for home repairs for households is low, urging households to undertake the necessary repairs is also tricky. Some activities appeared lacklustre, such as the participation of households in the training events, and many did not take part.
7. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter proposes the conclusions and recommendations of the review based on the main findings organised according to the evaluation criteria. As required by the ToR, the consultant rated each criterion using Annex 1 of the ToR for the Rating Scale. The justification for each is provided in the preceding section.

PROJECT OUTCOMES

Monitoring & evaluation

**RATING: 5 – Highly Satisfactory (HS)**

UNDP worked effectively with the two project partners, the Red Cross and the Women’s Union, who took responsibility for day-to-day monitoring and supervision.

The five provincial Red Cross chapters played an essential role in the technical monitoring of house repairs, undertaking, in four of the five provinces, beneficiary selection, assessment of house repair needs (with the Provincial Engineers), and verification. Besides, supervising and monitoring the procurement and distribution of household kits – tasks undertaken by the Women’s Union in Quang Tri.

Five Provincial Engineers assured technical monitoring of repair works, guiding and supporting Red Cross staff and volunteers in situ.

Implementing agency (UNDP)

**RATING: 5 – Highly Satisfactory (HS)**

The project confirms UNDP capabilities and responsibilities for implementing a US$1 million project involving a rigorous, comprehensive, and advanced operation. Such a level of professional competence continues to ensure increased donor trust and confidence to fulfil other similar projects in the future.

Executing agencies (Red Cross and Women’s Union)

**RATING: 5 – Highly Satisfactory (HS)**

The five Red Cross chapters and the Quang Tri Women’s Union implemented the project activities effectively and efficiently. The process indicated clear roles and responsibilities.

Relevance

**RATING: 2 – Relevant (R)**

❖ Government priorities in the aftermath of natural disasters in the Central Provinces

The project is in keeping with existing GoV legislation and programmes related to housing.

Provincial People’s Committees appreciated that the house repairs met priority needs, especially for poor and near-poor households living in high-risk areas.

UNDP selected the most suitable partner, the Red Cross, to implement house repairs.

Without exception, local people met were happy with the support provided for their house repairs.

The comprehensive non-food items set comprised necessary and valuable items for beneficiary households.

**R1: Investigate prospects for similar interventions for safe housing repairs and construction, aligning with government housing programmes in central Viet Nam.**

❖ UNDP mandate

UNDP fulfilled the humanitarian mandate of the Resident Coordinator’s Office in Viet Nam and the theme of the Sustainable Development Goals to ‘leave no one behind’, its functions under the Partnership for DRR, besides building the capacity of LGAs and project partners.

**R2: Explore opportunities for building capacities at sub-national levels in safer, resilient housing to help ensure ‘no one is left behind’.**

❖ Needs of affected households

The criteria for beneficiary selection were valuable and straightforward, focusing on the most vulnerable poor and near-poor households whose homes were damaged between 30 and 50 per cent. Besides, project partners further prioritised households in challenging circumstances.

Project partners worked closely with the Commune or Ward People’s Committees and Heads of Hamlets, critical in project implementation. Engaging DoLISA was prudent, as too was involving other socio-political organisations.
While many poor and near-poor households received food and clothing during the emergency response, support for house repairs was significant, as they would not otherwise have been able to repair their homes.

The use of a consistent level of US$ 200 for house repairs, while most straightforward to explain and administer, enabled households to carry out urgent house repairs/fixes as it was not intended to repair the damaged house fully. However, not all households could complete their ‘safe house repair plan’ with this amount due to high prices. Increasing the level of support for each would likely have ensured that more work on repair plans was completed, helping reduce the level of borrowing among households.

People appreciated the comprehensive set of NFI provided in household kits. Further tailoring to suit local needs and context was welcomed. UNDP provided timely support and a source of encouragement to the LGA and project partners and helped local people resume everyday life and restart economic development.

**Effectiveness**

*RATING: 4 – Satisfactory (S)*

*Achieving expected outputs*

The project repaired the 3,323 houses and distributed 3,571 gender-responsive household kits to poor and near-poor households in 113 communes/wards of 25 districts in five provinces.

Close monitoring and follow-up by UNDP staff and partners were different from the other projects and crucial for its success.

The LGA agreed with the beneficiary selection process – which they considered transparent and fair – ensuring the correct people were selected. Involving Heads of Hamlets and engaging DoLISA to support beneficiary selection was prudent.

Red Cross planning and implementation in the five provinces were good and well-coordinated from the provincial to commune/ward level. A similar process for house repairs took place in each province, following project regulations.

Mobilisation of local labour was crucial for undertaking house repairs – households were encouraged to rally support from friends and relatives to provide labour. The CPC encouragement for support from the Fatherland Front and Youth Union was significant for households with limited labour, such as single-headed households or older people.

The regulations and instructions were clear for the implementation process from selecting beneficiary households, instalments of cash for house repairs and the cash distribution system.

Households meant had all completed their house repairs before Tet.

**R3:** Consider increasing the level of financial support for house repairs, given inflation of construction materials and wages in the aftermath of disasters triggered by natural hazards or climate change impacts.

**R4:** Continue to address women and men’s needs through differentiated and tailored assistance, allowing flexibility in determining a shortlist of NFI.
Households appreciated support from the RCV and Provincial Engineers throughout implementation. The LGA in all localities also spoke highly of the RCV, Provincial Engineers and the CPC staff.

In four of the five provinces, the Red Cross had responsibility for the house repairs and the gender-sensitive household kits and completed the work effectively. Engaging the provincial Women’s Union in Quang Tri for the household kits was sensible. Given the project scale and deadline, the Women’s Union could have had responsibility for the household kits in all five provinces, enabling the Red Cross to focus exclusively on the house repairs and lessening their burden. Besides, the Women’s Union actively promoted ‘Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, PSEA’ throughout the project.

Despite their lack of experience in the new online procurement procedures, the project partners (aided by specialist consultants) completed the process before Tet. Unfortunately, households could not receive their household kits until March, primarily due to the lengthy government procurement process.

**R5: Continue to engage DoLISA in beneficiary selection processes of poor and near-poor households in future humanitarian response operations. Also, encourage engagement from other socio-political organisations – besides the Red Cross and Women’s Union – including the Fatherland Front and Youth Union to enable their members to support the humanitarian support to vulnerable households.**

**R6: Continue to build the capacity of the Women’s Union in the central provinces, including training and awareness-raising on PSEA. Consider a fuller engagement of the Women’s Union in future response operations by giving them responsibility for gender-sensitive household kits.**

- **Training of partner staff, households, and artisans on resilient house repairs and construction**

UNDP made an excellent choice selecting DWF to be the technical consultant for the house repairs. As too was the decision to deploy Provincial Engineers, one for each province with a Chief Engineer in Quang Tri.

One day, provincial-level training seemed adequate for Red Cross staff and others to teach beneficiary households, local artisans, CPC staff, and others during half-day events in the communes. Because of the number of communes involved in some provinces, it was not practical to run such courses in each commune.

A greater emphasis on the training and capacity of masons and other local artisans in resilient house repairs/construction would have been beneficial in all provinces.

**R7: Continue to build on the partnership with DWF to develop the capacity of local artisans in these disaster-prone provinces to increase knowledge and understanding of safe, resilient house construction and repairs, so gradually more houses are built to resilient designs.**

**R8: Seek opportunities to provide training and capacity building for the Red Cross chapters in safe, resilient house repair and construction, particularly for their permanent staff and RCV in each province as part of their ongoing disaster preparedness measures.**

**Efficiency**

**RATING: 4 – Satisfactory (S)**

- **Cost-effective**

The project supplied US$ 200 as unconditional or conditional cash assistance for house repairs for 3,323 households and US$ 50 for gender-responsive household kits to 3,571 households – totalling 6,894 equivalent to 27,576 people.

At least 83 per cent of CERF resources – a total of US$830,750 – directly reached poor and near-poor households.

It is common practice for families to borrow money to repairs (and construct) houses anywhere in Viet Nam. While acknowledging that households should contribute to their house repairs, the limited finance available per house from the project meant that many poor and near-poor households borrowed between VND 1 to 4 million, mainly from close relatives, towards their ‘safe house plan’.

- **Financial process**

The financial processes were transparent. Households understood the procedures. Households felt that the support they received was quick and appreciated, although they all still had unmet needs.

- **Use of project resources**

Project partners completed house repairs and the procurement and distribution of household kits within the timeframe.

Procuring the NFIs took a long time using the new government online procurement process and hiring five
government-certified procurement consultants [at a nominal fee]. An uncomplicated and more cost-effective distribution of unconditional cash grants to selected households would have been more efficient and effective in meeting expressed needs.

Much paperwork was required at the local levels to implement the project, which was time-consuming.

Support costs for the RCV/others were too little, which affected morale, especially when the timelines were tight, urging households to undertake home repairs time consuming, overall workload high, and working conditions in the affected localities difficult. UNDP needs to be more mindful when drawing up budgets to allow adequate remuneration for project partners considering the Red Cross and Women’s Union staff and volunteers also had other projects to conduct concurrently.

More consideration of the challenges facing project partners and LGA was required given the ongoing impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic throughout project implementation.

**Impact**

**RATING: 3 – Significant (S)**

❖ Positive or negative, intended, or unintended

The project repaired 3,323 houses, while in the succession of floods and storms affecting the Central Provinces damaged more than 380,000 houses\(^5\) to varying degrees.

---

\(^5\) NB. It is unclear how many of the total number of houses damaged in the region belonged to poor and near-poor households.

---

**R11:** Investigate ways to increase efficiencies to reduce the paperwork required by the project partners in future operations. Increasing digitalisation while at the same time ensuring transparency and accountability needs considering.

**R12:** Improve support costs for project partner staff and volunteers in future operations, ensuring they adequately cover actual implementation costs and provided sufficient remuneration.

**R13:** Consider impacts of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic in the disaster affected areas in the CERF application, e.g., large numbers of people had become unemployed and household finances negatively impacted.

---

The Red Cross, Women’s Union, and UNDP visibility increased among local people, who appreciated their work and that of the Commune and Ward PC.

Repaired houses included new doors and windows, sealed vents, reinforced roofs, and improved connectivity between the roofs and walls. Households reported feeling safer and secure and considered the training about resilient house repairs helpful. Other households gained indirectly from their neighbours, who had received project support for house repairs.
Knowledge, skills, and awareness of resilient repairs and house construction benefit those engaged in the roll-out of the government housing programmes.

The capacity of Quang Tri Women’s Union staff increased, and their knowledge of government procurement procedures was significant.

Project partners used surplus finance to purchase more household kits to support other households.

- **Verifiable changes in affected areas**
  Local artisans can replicate the skills learned and experience gained through repairing houses. Although many households still face challenges, people stated they could now focus on their economic development and stabilise their lives.

UNDP estimate that the total number of people who indirectly benefited from project activities could reach as many as 1.5 million people.

### R14: Continue working with the government, UN agencies, mass organisations, INGOs, the private sector and others to support resilient housing programmes outside times of disasters, to increase the number of households living in safe, resilient homes. Seek opportunities to promote awareness of safe and resilient house repairs and construction through mass media and promotional materials.

### KOBO-BASED MONITORING SYSTEM

The use of KoBo software proved a sensible decision. The KoBo tool provided clear and transparent information and rapid real-time progress reports to programme managers in Ha Noi.

Experience using the KoBo software varied – UNDP Provincial Engineers, younger volunteers used the system effectively, but it was more challenging for older staff.

Some difficulties due to inclement weather and access to networks occurred in more remote locations.

### FEEDBACK MECHANISM

The feedback mechanism set up expressly for this humanitarian operation was used. The UNDP focal point received calls/feedback from local people related to information on the cash or household kit distributions or express gratitude for the project support or when they would receive the goods. These calls showed that the system worked and helped UNDP follow up with the relevant Red Cross chapter. UNDP reported that they had not received any negative feedback, which is encouraging considering the project involved more than 6,600 households, challenges in some selection procedures, and significant delays in receipt of household kits.  

Given the scale of the operation and the number of people involved, the feedback mechanism could be reviewed to see whether such a mechanism could improve future operations.

No problems related to sexual exploitation or abuse arose.

### R16: Explore opportunities to promote a feedback mechanism in future humanitarian response operations by development partners, INGOs, UN agencies and the government to ensure the principles of transparency and accountability. Check the mechanism to ensure its effectiveness through further information sharing and public awareness.

For example, one woman [during the FGD in Quang Ngai] complained that the roofing repairs made did not match her existing, traditional roofing, although she had not used the feedback mechanism to report this concern. Also, some people were embarrassed to access or share information regarding PSEA.

---

36 For example, one woman [during the FGD in Quang Ngai] complained that the roofing repairs made did not match her existing, traditional roofing, although she had not used the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and feedback mechanism</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>IA &amp; EA Execution</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design at entry</td>
<td>5: Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
<td>Quality of UNDP implementation - Implementing Agency (IA)</td>
<td>5: Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan implementation</td>
<td>4: Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>Quality of execution - Executing Agency (EA)</td>
<td>5: Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality</td>
<td>4: Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>Overall quality of implementation/execution</td>
<td>5: Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>2: Relevant (R)</td>
<td>Impact on beneficiaries</td>
<td>3: Significant (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>4: Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>Changes in communities</td>
<td>2. Minimal (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>4: Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>Overall impact rating</td>
<td>2. Minimal (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Project Outcome Rating</td>
<td>4: Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROJECT SUCCESSES**

The following is a list of project accomplishments:

- **3,323 resilient house repairs** completed in 117 communes/wards of 25 districts in five central provinces of Quang Binh, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Tri, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai for poor and near-poor households whose homes had been damaged by 30 to 70 per cent by the succession of tropical storms, floods, and landslides in October to November 2020.

- **3,571 gender-sensitive household kits** (248 kits more than the target), comprising NFI distributed to other, similar households in these locations in the five provinces.

- **6,894 direct beneficiaries**, equivalent to **27,576 people**. Considering the widespread media coverage and interest, an estimated **1,520,000 people** indirectly benefitted.

- **83 per cent of project funds** went directly to beneficiaries.

- **Capacity building** for project partners – the Red Cross and Women’s Union – artisans, and other local people in five provinces.

- In a large-scale humanitarian response, experience in using the **KoBo monitoring system** and the **feedback mechanism**, including PSEA and promotion of gender equality and social inclusion, can potentially be used by other UN system agencies, INGOs, mass organisations, and LGA.
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GENERAL BACKGROUND

Since October 6th, 2020, central Viet Nam has been impacted by a series of successive intense storms, cyclones, and record-level floods. According to the findings of the three inter-sectoral Joint Assessment Teams during 21-23 October, the flood levels and storms have been unprecedented, causing widespread damage to people and property and affecting the lives and livelihoods of over 1.5 million people.

More than 230 people have been reported dead or missing. At least 380,000 houses have been flooded, damaged, or destroyed. In the aftermath, tens of thousands of the most vulnerable have been left with nothing but damaged houses, destroyed livelihoods and ruined crops. Many people have lost almost all of their household possessions, and many others have become homeless. Poor and near-poor people will not have the means to invest in house repairs, reconstruction, or purchasing basic necessities.

UNDP has mobilized financial resources for emergency humanitarian assistance, including USD 1 mil from the UN’s Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). The targeted provinces under this CERF funded project are Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai. The assistance primarily aimed at house repairs and provision of gender-responsive household kits.

1. REVIEW PURPOSE

The purpose of the review is to primarily examine the degree to which the Project has met its objectives and key outputs of providing i) House repair support to 3,323 households through cash assistance to ensure safe and dignified lives, & ii) Basic needs of 3,323 households addressed through provision of gender-responsive household kits. As part of this review process, UNDP Viet Nam aims to learn from this project experience to explore options for enhancing UNDP’s emergency programming approaches for potential replication in future disaster response interventions.

Considering the independent nature of this exercise, findings from the review will provide a transparent basis for similar interventions by UNDP, the Government and provincial authorities, and potential donors in future disaster events, which may require similar interventions.

The review report is intended for the following key users:

- Management members of UNDP and UN agencies in Vietnam;
- Officials from the Vietnam Disaster Management Authority and other ministries;
- Officials from the five provinces of Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, Quang Ngai (and potentially other disaster-prone provinces).

2. REVIEW OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The overall objective of the review is to:

1. Assess the effectiveness of the Project in achieving the objectives and targets;
2. Examine the impacts (positive or negative, intended, or unintended) as the results of and or contributed by the Project; and
3. Document lessons learned and potential opportunities to inform future emergency response programming and house resilience building programs by the Government and development partners in central Viet Nam.
4. The review will cover two Project outputs which have been implemented from December 2020 to April 2021 in all the five provinces.

Specifically, the consultant will undertake the following tasks:

1. Carry out a desk review (reviewing the Project documents and related materials);
2. Conducting primary data collection (using qualitative methods and analysis) in selected communes in 5 provinces;
3. Debriefing preliminary findings to UNDP;
4. Developing the review report;
5. Sharing review findings at the final sharing workshop;
6. Finalising and submitting the final report to UNDP.

3. REVIEW APPROACH AND METHOD

UNDP expects that the consultant follows a qualitative approach which utilises a mix of data collection tools such as interviews, focus-group discussions, and observations from project site visits.

The consultant will need to review all relevant sources of information, such as the disaster assessment reports, project document, project reports, project files, national housing programs, disaster risk reduction documents, and any other materials that the consultant considers useful for the review. A list of documents will be provided to the consultant at the onset of the review.
The consultant is expected to conduct a field mission to five target provinces of Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai. Interviews and focus-group discussions will be held with the following organizations and individuals (at a minimum):

- Key stakeholders
- Direct beneficiary households having their houses repaired by the Project;
- Community members, local mason groups, local authority officials;
- Representatives from UNDP’s partners such as the Red Cross chapters in Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, Quang Ngai, and the Women Union in Quang Tri;
- Provincial authority representatives;
- Viet Nam Disaster Management Authority.

The consultant is expected to propose a methodology with a clear intent to provide credible answers to the review questions. Proposed methodology will need to ensure that the information collected is valid, reliable, and sufficient to meet the review objectives and that the consultant’s analysis is logical, coherent, and complete. At the same time, triangulation principles (utilizing multiple sources of data and methods) should be applied in order to validate the findings.

4. Review Criteria and Ratings

The review will cover the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the review executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex 2.

| RATINGS |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Monitoring and feedback mechanism | Rating | IA & EA Execution | Rating |
| Design at entry | | Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA) | |
| Plan implementation | | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA) | |
| Overall quality | | Overall quality of implementation/execution | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall impact rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Review Criteria Matrix

This Matrix must be fully completed or amended by the consultant and included in the report as an Annex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: How does the project relate to the priorities of the authorities, donor, and the needs of households in targeted provinces?</td>
<td>Immediate housing repair needs</td>
<td>Gov’s damage assessment reports</td>
<td>Desk review Focus group discussions Interviews with project team, UNDP, and other partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leave no one behind mandate of UNDP Humanitarian mandate of UN in Viet Nam (RCO) donor</td>
<td>UNDP LNOB policy</td>
<td>Desk review Interviews with UNDP and the RCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the project outputs relevant to the needs of affected households in the five provinces?</td>
<td>Expressed needs to ensure safe and dignified lives post-disaster by households</td>
<td>Project documents and reports</td>
<td>Desk review interviews focus-group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s and men’s needs differentiated and tailored assistance provided to particularly vulnerable households</td>
<td>Gov’s damage assessment reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint needs assessment reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary data sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DWF(^{37}) final assessment reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outputs of the project been achieved?</td>
<td>Quality of houses repaired(^{38})</td>
<td>Project document</td>
<td>Desk review interviews focus-group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of provision of gender-responsive household kits provided</td>
<td>DWF final assessment reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information, knowledge, and skills transferred</td>
<td>Project team and stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project delivered committed trainings, house repair with resilient features, gender-responsive household kits?</td>
<td>Quality and content of trainings delivered</td>
<td>Training reports</td>
<td>Desk review interviews focus-group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DWF final assessment reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project team and stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What innovative solutions have been introduced to maximize effectiveness in needs assessment, beneficiary selection, and in monitoring?</td>
<td>KOBO tool</td>
<td>Dashboard</td>
<td>Desk review interviews with UNDP consultants interviews with beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency: To what extent were the financial and technical resources planned and used efficiently in delivering the outputs?</td>
<td>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</td>
<td>Preliminary financial report(^{39})</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</td>
<td>Project documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the direct cash payment to households work efficiently / save time in delivering humanitarian assistance?</td>
<td>Cash payment scheme</td>
<td>Project documents</td>
<td>Desk review interviews key interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from beneficiaries and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the project activities carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</td>
<td>Efficiency of disbursements and financial management</td>
<td>Project documents</td>
<td>Desk review interviews key interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outputs achieved relative to costs; value for money</td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from beneficiaries and key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enable progress towards, or reduce threats in housing sector?</td>
<td>Satisfaction / gratitude from communities</td>
<td>Project documents</td>
<td>Interviews document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social change caused by the project’s support</td>
<td>Provincial level plans and documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary data sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the intended and unintended impacts on beneficiaries (positive and negative) resulted from the Project?</td>
<td>Improvement of living conditions</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Interviews document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer living environment</td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>particularly for vulnerable groups (elderly, children etc.)</td>
<td>Feedback from beneficiaries and key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are verifiable changes in the affected communities now compared to 05 months ago?</td>
<td>Improvement of living condition</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Interviews document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer living environment</td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>particularly for vulnerable groups (elderly, children etc.)</td>
<td>Feedback from beneficiaries and key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project contributed to social stability in housing conditions of the poor households post-disaster?</td>
<td>Improvement of living condition</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Interviews document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer living environment</td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>particularly for vulnerable groups (elderly, children etc.)</td>
<td>Feedback from beneficiaries and key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{37}\) Development Workshop France (DWF) has carried out an independent assessment of house repair component, focusing on technical aspects related to application of resilient repairs.

\(^{38}\) No technical assessment of repairs will be required, as this has already been done by DWF. Questions related to ‘quality’ can be broad enough to collect overall feedback from beneficiaries and local authorities to see if there are any complaints from any of the stakeholders on the overall quality of works carried out.

\(^{39}\) To be provided by UNDP.
### Rating scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings for:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and feedback mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA&amp;E Execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes (Effectiveness, Efficiency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Highly Satisfactory (HS):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Satisfactory (S):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Unsatisfactory (U):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance Ratings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relevant (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Not Relevant (NR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Ratings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Significant (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minimal (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Negligible (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Ratings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not Applicable (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unable to Assess (U/A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION

- Ministry of Construction Decision No. 01/VBHN-BXD dated 4th March 2020 regarding housing support policies for poor households according to poverty standards in the period 2011-2015 (Housing Poverty Assistance Program Under Decision No. 167/2008/QD-TTg Phase 2).
- Prime Minister’s Decision No. 167/2008/QD-TTg Phase 2 dated 12th December 2008 on policy support to poor households in housing.40
- Prime Minister’s Decision No. 33/2015/QD-TTg dated 10th August 2015 housing support policy for poor households according to the poverty line 2011-2015 (Housing poverty support program according to Decision No. 167/2008/QD-TTg Phase 2) came into force from 1st October 2015, as amended and supplemented by:
- Decision No. 33/2019/QD-TTg dated 14th November 2019 of the Prime Minister amending and supplementing a number of articles of the Prime Minister’s Decision No. 33/2015/QD-TTg dated 10th August 2015 of the Government on housing support policy for poor households for the 2011-2015 period (the Housing Assistance Program for Poor Households under Decision No. 167/2008 / QD-TTg phase 2), effective from 31st December 2019.
- Decision No. 48/2014/QD-TTG of the Prime Minister, dated 28th August 2014, on the policy support for the poor households to build houses to prevent floods and storms in the Central region. 41
- Prime Minister’s Decision No. 2127/QD-TTg dated 30th November 2011 approving the national housing strategy up to 2020 and a vision to 2030.
- Decision No. 67/2010/QD-TTG of the Prime Minister dated 29th October 2010 on adjusting policies to support poor households in housing, according to Decision 167. 42

UNDP

- Final proposal dated 23rd November to CERF ‘Provision of emergency shelter and NFI assistance to vulnerable households affected by floods’ (the approved project document).
- Project implementation plan.
- CERF Interim Update Viet Nam, RR: Flood 20-RR-VNM-45780.
- A sample letter from Quang Tri PPC that appreciated UNDP humanitarian assistance.
- Presentation on monitoring the progress of house repairs using the KoBo programme. Quang Binh.
- Presentation on CERF Interim Update Project Response to disasters in Viet Nam.
- Presentation on a Feedback mechanism.

DWF

- Independent quality assurance reports for each province).

RED CROSS

- PowerPoint presentations made in each province.

40 This concretizes the National Target Programme on poverty reduction in the period 2006-2010, and regulates the subjects, priorities, and principles of support, stipulates the level of support, loan levels and lending methods, as well as the implementation process.
41 This decision set criteria for selecting low-income families, the priority order of support, loan support level, loan method and how to implement.
42 Decision 67 expands the low-income families who not only live in rural areas but also to the wards of urban areas.
ANNEX III: QUESTIONNAIRE USED

QUESTIONS
A review of the CERF component under the Project ‘Response to Disasters in Viet Nam’.
A brief word of thanks, an introduction to the review team, the Project, and the purpose of the review.

Semi-structured questions
The reviewer will use the evaluation matrix – as provided by UNDP – with some slight modifications.
The following questions will be tailored to suit different stakeholders:

Relevance – Goal
1. What do you think the most critical life-threatening living conditions were of some of the most vulnerable after the floods and storms of 2020? Did this project help to address these needs?
2. Was the project relevant to the provincial authorities view of a response for housing needs for poor households whose homes were damaged by disasters? How did the project align with provincial programme/projects for building and renovating houses of the floods and storms?
3. Do you think the project aim to repair 3,323 houses is in support of government policies and community needs after typhoons and floods?
4. How have the repaired houses addressed differences between women’s and men’s needs?
5. Where are immediate recovered needs for non-food items (NFI) fully addressed by providing 3,323 gender-responsive household kits?

Effectiveness – Outcome
1. Did the project deliver its outcomes fully or partially?
2. In what ways are the repaired houses safer and more secure for households? [Or if they are not, why not?]
3. What difficulties (if any) did you experience during the repair of the house(s)? For example, in buying the materials. With the Red Cross/Women’s Union? What support did you receive from the Red Cross, the commune authorities, and volunteers in the process of repairing the house?
4. Did you participate in a training event through the project? If so, what are the three crucial things you learned during the project about resilient housing/repairs?
5. What went well? With hindsight, what could have been done differently or be improved in the future?
6. Would you use the innovative solution (KoBo) introduced in the project in future projects? How did the KoBo improve the project implementation or impact?

Efficiency – Outputs/Activities/Inputs
1. Did the project stay within budget?
2. Did cash transfers result in funds being disbursed more quickly and transparently than through other possible payment schemes?
3. Were project activities implemented more quickly, more slowly, or at the same pace as other similar projects?
4. Did you need to mobilize other funding to support the repair of your home? For buying NFI? If so, from whom?

Impact – Goal
1. What were the impacts of the project on the lives of the vulnerable households supported?
2. What are the intended and unintended effects on beneficiaries (positive and negative) resulting from the project?
3. What do you think was the most critical impact of the project?

What more would you like to see achieved through the consequences of the actions taken? For example, improvements in legislation around humanitarian response after disasters? Improved capacity building or training of local government authorities? Artisanal training in safer/resilient housing/retrofitting? More culturally appropriate and attractive resilient housing designs? Greater involvement of local people in the reconstruction efforts after a major disaster?
1. What are some of the evident changes in the areas affected by the succession of typhoons and floods compared to a year ago?
2. To what extent has the project contributed post-disaster to poor and near-poor households’ social stability and well-being?
**Sustainability – Goal/Outcome**

1. What aspects of the project, comprising flood and typhoon resilient house repairs, knowledge of resilient housing design; gender-responsive household kits; cash grants; innovative solutions, do you think could be sustained locally?
2. What ideas or approaches implemented during the project might be replicable in geographical areas in a similar context in the aftermath of other comparable disasters?
3. What positive aspects of the project could be replicated in the future? For example, resilient house repairs, training courses for local artisans and household members, improved knowledge of disaster preparedness and prevention, self-construction/repair of resilient houses, construction solutions, increased finance, risk insurance, improved social protection?

**Further suggestions for semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions**

1. **Households**
   Focus on two main points:
   
   ❖ **Housing**
     - Safety and security from the impacts of future natural hazard risk – especially in the context of climate change impacts (for example, increased flood risk in low areas and typhoons); physical structure (roof, floors, and walls)
     - The level of contentment or satisfaction of the household members with the repaired house – are people happy with their homes? Did they feel sufficiently engaged/consulted throughout the process?
     - Construction material – reuse or local traditional materials used in-house repair, feelings of recipient households as to the house repairs.
     - The desire to continue living in the repaired house – different ideas from beneficiary households for improvements in resilient house design, future construction, and living conditions.
     - Cash contributions – did families have enough money? Did they seek to borrow more?
   
   ❖ **Training and workshops**
     - The number of training courses, workshops, and their subjects – the usefulness, clarity, and applicability.
     - The level of confidence – of household members in putting into practice resilient repair designs; views on costs.
     - Impact on the local artisans – increased level of faith and the likelihood of using new skills learned in resilient house design/repairs in the future and construction; views on costs; knowledge of retrofitting; applicability.
     - Household members knowledge changes – solutions to minimise the effects of future natural hazards/climate change impacts; how can families protect their house and secure their living during and after a disaster? How can they build or repair the house to have a higher level of resilience?

2. **Local government authorities, socio-political organisations (Red Cross and Women’s Union), and local people**
   - Plans of the local government authorities in promoting resilient house repairs and resilient models. Provincial governments/socio-political organisations increased commitment and support for similar projects like this to be implemented in the locality (pre-disaster). Changes in legislation or strategy regarding resilient house repairs and future construction? Increased availability of funding, including grants and loans?
   - Replication of the project model – repairs, retrofitting resilient houses, and training.
   - Assessment of the Red Cross and (where applicable) the Women’s Union in the project activities.

3. **Central and provincial GoV and UNDP**
   - Priorities in legal documents of the GoV related to repair of houses using resilient designs, building capacity for local government staff.
   - Comments on the project to what extent it is relevant to the GoV point of view.
   - Humanitarian response mandate of UNDP as fulfilled through the implementation of the actions of the Project.

**Evaluation Criteria**
The review uses the five DAC evaluation criteria. The review will use the following figure, illustrating this relationship:
The shaded cells show where the consultant will focus on investigating each evaluation criterion:

a) In analysing the relevance of the Project, it is necessary to examine impacts and outcomes whether project purpose and overall goal set by the needs of local communities, target groups and the government policies.

b) In reviewing the effectiveness of the Project, it is critical to see the degree to which project purpose has been achieved through the attainment of outputs.

c) In analysing efficiency, the focus will be on how inputs were converted into outputs through activities.

d) For impact, the level of achievement toward the overall goal about the achievement level of the Project purpose is examined, and

e) in analysing sustainability, the focus is on whether the benefits obtained by achieving the Project results and the overall goal will be maintained.