

**REPORT  
IMPACT MONITORING OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAM IN 7 PILOT COMMUNES**



Prepared by: **Truong Quoc Dat**

September 2009

## **REPORT ON IMPACT MONITORING OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN 7 PILOT COMMUNES**

### **1.1. Background of Community Development Program in 2009**

The present report regards the project's impact indicator No. 4:

**"In the pilot communes supported by the project, the percentage of households below the poverty line decreases annually by at least 4.5% (referring to data of DOLISA according to new poverty definition of 2006)".**

In 2008, poverty reduction in pilot communes achieved the indicator No. 4, except for Minh Hoa commune, where the poverty reduction did not decrease but tended to increase by 1 %, according to the impact monitoring report in 2008. The main reason was due to inflation in Vietnam (over 20%) and harsh natural calamity from 2007 until early 2008. Minh Hoa commune had to suffer from serious damages for livestock (died of cold weather). In addition, the percentage of poor-nearly households in pilot communes was quite high. The challenge was that these poor-nearly households had a high risk of becoming poor again under the situation of economic decline. Therefore, the project continued the support of the Community Development Program in 7 pilot communes (Dong Hoa, Duc Hoa, Kim Hoa, Thanh Thach, Hoa Phuc, Hoa Hop and Minh Hoa), aiming at minimizing external impacts on poverty reduction for communes involved in the program.

The target group of the program was poor households (based on survey result on poverty of communes in 2008), mainly focused on poor households with the conditions to well implement designed objectives of the program and to become the basis for scaling up activities of the program whenever opportunities arise. The main activities of the program were short term implementation of agricultural models, with an emphasis on quick returns and a significant impact on the economic situation of households and the locality.

To strengthen the pro-activeness of the target groups in the development and implementation of the program, the project supported commune staff and Commune Extension Workers (CEW) in applying the Participatory Agricultural Extension Method (PAEM) into needs assessment, plan development, monitoring and evaluation of the program implementation. Based on this approach, the project was to draw lessons learnt from the community development programme to help poor households get out of poverty and participate in local economic development activities.

### **1.2. Purpose of the assignment**

The assignment aimed to

- (1) evaluate the effectiveness of the program in minimizing external impacts on poverty reduction in pilot communes,
- (2) evaluate the capacity of local authorities (commune and village level) in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the program (for poor households);
- (3) formulate recommendations for the project and target groups (local authorities and local people) as a basis for future pro-poor activities (for poor households).

### 1.3. Schedule and methodology of the assignment

#### 1.3.1. Schedule and timeframe

No.	Activity	Time frame	Location	Responsible
1	Prepare evaluation plan	5/2009	Project office	Project M&E staff
2	Inform the evaluation plan in pilot communes (Instruction letter and format)	Before 28/05/2009	CPCs of 7 pilot communes	Project M&E staff
3	Carry out the evaluation of the program (based on format provided by the project)	01/06- 10/06/2009	Involved households	Commune leaders, CEWs, village heads, households in 7 pilot communes
4	Aggregate and randomly evaluate 3-5 households/ commune	05- 15/06/09	Households and CPC offices	M&E staff, field technical staff, CEWs and randomly selected households
5	Collect, aggregate and process data	12- 20/06/09	Project office	Project M&E staff
6	Write report	(25/06 – 5/07)/ 2009	Project office	Project M&E staff

#### 1.3.2. Methodology

- Evaluated (1st round) all households involved in the program (based on provided format) by CPC,
- Selected randomly and evaluated households in the 1st round, then selected 3-5 households per commune. Project staff and commune staff were responsible for the evaluation and verification of data of the 1st round,
- Collected information from involved households, recommendations from commune, and village staff in implementation of the program for poor households,
- Combined information collection of poverty data of the first 6 months in 2009.

#### 1.4. Limitations of the assignment

- The assignment was carried out when most households had not yet sold out their products. At that time, weight of animals estimated according to personal experience and market price was for reference only (or represented for each commune), thus profits were relative low.
- During the assignment, the working group agreed not to include labour cost of households in 3 months of program implementation. Therefore, profits of households were only relative, then results of the assignment are only on short-term impacts of the program on poor households. The economic effectiveness factor is for reference only.
- The report was prepared based on agreed information among members of the working group. The report is internal, only aiming to provide impact monitoring report for the Project Management Board and information sharing among technical staff.

## 2. RESULTS OF THE ASSIGNMENT

### 2.1. Activities of Community Development Program in 7 pilot commune

- The Community Development Program in 2009 was implemented in 7 pilot communes: Dong Hoa, Duc Hoa, Kim Hoa and Thanh Thach of Tuyen Hoa district; and Minh Hoa, Hoa Phuc, Hoa Hop of Minh Hoa district.
  - Target group were the poor households selected by CPC in 2008, villages based on criteria agreed between CPC of pilot communes and the Project Management Board.
1. Poor households (below the poverty line referring to data of DOLISA according to new poverty definition of 2006) had an average income below 200,000 VND/person/ month and capacity (resources in terms of labour and materials) for the program involvement).
  2. The program was implemented in a short time period (3 months), thus focused on animal husbandry (raising of chicken, pigs and beekeeping)
  3. The project signed contracts with pilot communes and supported CPCs in implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the program.

#### 2.1.1. Inputs

The CPCs carried out quick needs assessments of households, aggregated the data and did the registration of households (See Table 1)

**Table 1: Number of households supported with breeding animals**

Commune	No. HHs	Model type			Breeding			Remarks
		Pig raising	Chicken raising	Bee keeping	Pig (pax)	Chicken (pax)	Bee hives	
Duc Hoa	25	x			50			100% of households implemented pig fattening
Dong Hoa	25	x	x		46	70		23 pig raising households and 2 chicken raising households
Kim Hoa	25	x			50			100% of households implemented pig fattening
Thanh Thach	25	x	x		20	750		10 pig raising households and 15 chicken raising
Hoa Phuc	10	x		x	6		28	3 pig raising households and 7 beekeeping households
Hoa Hop	25	x			50			100% of households implemented pig fattening
Minh Hoa	30	x			60			100% of households implemented pig fattening
<b>Total</b>	<b>165</b>				<b>282</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>28</b>	

- CPCs together with the project conducted quick trainings for households on (1) Techniques of food mixture and pig disease prevention; (2) Techniques of chicken raising disease prevention; trainers of these trainings were district and commune extension workers.
- Supported animal food for households (See Table 2)

**Table 2: Number of households provided animal food**

Commune	No. of HHs	Model type			Food/ other materials		
		Pig	Chicken	Bee	Food for pig raising (Kg)	Food for chicken raising (Kg)	Honey extractor (VND)
Duc Hoa	25	x			73.24		
Dong Hoa	25	x	x		62.09	42	
Kim Hoa	25	x			75		
Thanh Thach	25	x	x		131	146.5	
Hoa Phuc	10	x		x	76		600
Hoa Hop	25	x			59.4		
Minh Hoa	30	x			50		

### 2.1.2. Outputs.

Until the time of evaluation (31/05/ 2006) about 1/ 3 of the households sold out their products in the market (pig, chicken and bee honey). Detailed results can be seen as follows:

- Pig raising households (see Table 3)

**Table 3: Result of pig raising**

Commune	At the beginning		Achieved result as of 31/5/2009				Profit (*) compared to input (**)
	No. of breeding pig (con)	Average weight per con (kg)	No. of pig (con)	Average weight per con (kg)	Average income from pig (thousand )	Loss rate	
Minh Hoa	60	20.08	59	57.47	3.164.933	2 %	+465.933
Hoa Hop	50	19.18	47	47.36	2.472.720	6 %	- 228.280
Hoa Phuc	6	20	6	51.67	2.893.333	0 %	+194.333
Duc Hoa	50	20	50	58.72	2.892.720	0%	+193.720
Dong Hoa	46	17.07	45	55.91	2.795.565	2 %	+96.565

Thanh Thach	20	17.9	19	40.79	2.048.500	5 %	- 650.500
Kim Hoa	50	18.02	38	38.03	1.502.800	24 %	- 1.196.200

**Note:**

(\*) Profits here are not inclusive of labour and additional food cost of households

(\*\*) The amount of 2,699,000 VND was supported as input for each household

- Beekeeping households (see Table 4)

**Table 4: Result of beekeeping**

Bee keepers	At the beginning	Achieved result as of 31/5/2009					Net profit (*) A= B-C (**)
	No. of beehives (hive)	No. of beehives (hive)	Bee honey (bottle)	Income from bee honey (thousand)	Income from bee hive (thousand)	Total income	
Mr. Hoa	4	5	17	1.700	500	2.200	1.600
Mr. Van Hoa	4	6	10	1.000	1.000	2.000	1.200
Mr. Chung	4	6	12	1.200	1.000	2.200	1.600
Mr. Duc	4	4	11	1.100	-	1.100	500
Mr. Hoa	4	7	6	600	1.500	2.100	1.500
Mr. Cuong	4	4	7	700	-	700	100
Mr. Thuyet	4	4	30	3.000	-	3.000	2.400
Total	28	36	93				430

**Remark:**

(\*) Net profits here are inclusive of initially provided beehives (500,000 VND per hive) and profit exclusive of labour cost.

(\*\*) A: Net profit gained; B: Total income at the evaluation time; C: Cost for technical consultation and other materials (hive net, knife, honey extractor, etc) averagely 600.000 VND per household.

- Chicken raising households (see Table 5)

**Table 5: Result of chicken raising**

Commune	At the beginning		Achieved result as of 31/5/2009				Profit (*) compared to input (**)
	No. of breeding chicken (con)	Aver. weight per con (kg)	No. of chicken providing meat (con)	Aver. weight per con (kg)	Average income for chicken raising (thousand)	Loss rate	
Dong Hoa	70	0.45	67	1.1	3.145.000	4.3 %	+446.000
Thanh Thach	750	0.47	592	1.45	2.494.667	11.1 %	- 204.333

### 2.1.3. Short-term impacts of the Community Development Program in 2009.

- Amongst models implemented by poor households, the beekeeping implemented by 7 households in Hoa Phuc commune is the most effective (exclusive of labour cost). Average net profit is 430,000 VND per household; the number of beehives increases by 129 % from 28 to 36 hives in 3 months ; number of bee honey bottle is 93 (65 litres bee honey), (please refer to figures in Table 4. Remarkable is the fact that the inputs (breeding and technical consultation) for models were supplied by the Minh Hoa beekeeping Association and implemented quite successfully by involved members, indicating the right choice of the project in beekeeping value chain promotion and also the capacity of Minh Hoa beekeeping Association.

- 4 out of 7 involved pilot communes implemented the selected models (quick needs assessment of households) realized a significant profit compared to inputs. A limiting factor was that during the time period of model implementation, a major pig flu occurred in the districts, causing a negative impact on the market of consumers and a significant decrease in the market price for pigs. Pig raising households were unprofitable affecting effectiveness of their pig raising. Besides, remaining communes have decrease in profit compared to input. The reason is that pigs got disease leading to big loss rate (for example, Kim Hoa commune had loss rate of more than 20%); and some households said that disease prevention method was not good. Pigs were treated only when they got seriously ill, and high doses of medicine were used for treatment. That's why pigs were undersized and could not gain weight (in Kim Hoa average gained weight was not over 3 kg per pig per month while the common gained weight is from 7 to 10 kg per pig per month).

- Success of models, loss rate of animal and its effectiveness also depended on local (district, commune) inputs such as breeding, experience (see Table 6 ). Most communes succeeding in the implementation were communes which had advantages in traditional pig raising, such as Minh Hoa commune. Breeding input supplied in the locality is suitable with the plan implementation and nearly no loss rate occurred (died of disease), for example, communes of Duc Hoa and Hoa Phuc were supplied with breeding bee by Minh Hoa beekeeping Association.

**Table 6: Breeding suppliers for households**

Commune/ district	Program type	Strength/ experience	Breeding original	Loss rate (%)	Effectiveness compared to input
Minh Hoa, Minh Hoa district	Pig raising	Tradition in pig raising	Ha Tinh	2	+ 465.933
Hoa Phuc, Minh Hoa district	Pig raising		Ha Tinh	0	+ 194.333
	Beekeeping		Minh Hoa Beekeeping Association	Increase	+ 430.000
Duc Hoa, Tuyen Hoa district	Pig raising	Pig raising in form of clubs	Commune farm	0	+ 193.725
Dong Hoa, Tuyen Hoa district	Pig raising		Ha Tinh	2	+ 96.565
	Chicken raising		Ha Tinh	4.3	+ 446.000
Kim Hoa, Tuyen Hoa district	Pig raising		Ha Tinh	24	- 1.196.200
Hoa Hop, Minh Hoa district	Pig raising		Ha Tinh	6	- 228.280
Thanh Thach, Tuyen Hoa district	Pig raising		Ha Tinh	5	- 650.000
	Chicken raising		Ha Tinh	11.1	- 204.000

- The program progress is evaluated as meeting the designed requirements of the plan. If unexpected factors (such as the pig disease disease in Minh Hoa) are not considered, households could sell their products in the period from late May to mid- June 2009. This is also the time when poverty data collection in 2009 is carried out. In spite of short-term income generation, it contributes to remarkable income increase for poor households involved in the program in 2009 and helped them get out of poverty in the first 6 months under the situation that economic difficulties have strong impact on poor households.

- Capacity of key staff (leaders of CPCs) and CEW is improved in proactively making plan, monitoring and evaluating the program; most of the responsible staff were proactive in planning, seeking breeding and food for households to implement the program in time.

- Although due to economic change, high price of material and low price of product in the first six months 2009, all involved households have average net income of over 200,000 VND/month per person (over the poverty line 2006).

**The impact of the program on poverty reduction is shown in Table 7, below.**

**Table 7: Impact of the Community Development Program on Poverty Reduction**

Commune	Total number of hhs	Number of poor households 31.12.2008	Percentage of poor households 31.12.2008	Number of poor households 11.06.2009	Percentage of poor households 11.06.2009	Reduction of Poverty Rate (%)
Thanh Thạch	420	221	52,62	196	46,67	<b>11,3</b>
Đồng Hoá	739	254	34,37	229	30,99	<b>9,8</b>
Kim Hoá	1126	408	36,23	373	33,13	<b>8,6</b>
Đức Hoá	1244	401	32,23	376	30,23	<b>6,2</b>
Hoá Phúc	121	42	34,71	37	30,6	<b>11,9</b>
Hoá Hợp	729	269	36,90	244	33,5	<b>9,3</b>
Minh Hoá	713	370	51,89	345	48,4	<b>6,8</b>

In Table 7, the figures for poverty in first 6 months were compiled by the Sections of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs of 2 the two districts and are not yet completed. Official figures are not yet available. The status of poverty reduction is evaluated based on evaluation report of communes evaluating the status of those households attending in the Community Development Program. These figures do not yet include households which might have slipped back into poverty for any other reason. Therefore, the figures are for purpose of reference only.

The reduction of the poverty rate in the first six months of 2009 is calculated as the difference between the rates of 12/2008 minus the rate in 06/2009, in relation to the rate of 12/2008, expressed in percent. As shown in the last column of Table 7, the poverty reduction rate in all pilot communes has decreased by significantly more than the targeted reduction of 4.5% for the full year.

**In summary, the Community Development Program has fulfilled its objective and has met the expectation as designed that supports poor households in reducing external impacts on their poverty.**

### **3. LESSON LEARNT**

Based on the results of the monitoring and evaluation of short-term impacts in 7 pilot communes, the community development program was successfully implemented and has met the planned objectives. This success was achieved, inspite of the short time period for the program implementation (3 months) and the fact that the target groups were poor households, who are the most disadvantaged in accessing and approaching community development activities.

Lessons learnt can be drawn as follows:

- Through effective beekeeping model in Hoa Phuc commune, it is concluded that models are effectively implemented and rolled out only when inputs such as breeding, food and and training on techniques are provided to the locality.
- Agricultural models must be selcteded strictly as a function of market demand. The success depends on the experience and strength of each commune as well as the support by associations and producer groups.