

Country Name	Project for Sustainable Forest Management in the Northwest Watershed Area
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam	

I. Project Outline

Background	The Vietnamese Government made efforts to increase forest coverage and to improve living conditions of local people by taking various policy measures, including 5 Million Hectare Reforestation Program (1998). However, forest degradation was continuing in the Northwest region, including Dien Bien Province, due to over harvesting for fuelwood, shifting cultivation and conversion to farmland, which were derived from the high-poverty ratio.												
Objectives of the Project ¹	<p>The project aimed to promote participatory forest management and livelihood development in the project pilot sites² in Dien Bien Province through the implementation of the Provincial REDD+³ Action Plan (PRAP) by way of (i) verification of the effectiveness and feasibility of the Commune RAPs (C-RAPs) in the additional project pilot sites (APSS), (ii) strengthening of technical and institutional capacities of executing and partner agencies in implementing the PRAP, and (iii) preparation of necessary plans and technical documents for the implementation of the provincial REDD+ in Dien Bien Province, thereby promoting participatory forest management and livelihood development in the areas with similar conditions to the APSS in Dien Bien Province through the implementation of the PRAP.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overall Goal: Participatory forest management and livelihood development are promoted in the areas with similar conditions to the APSS in Dien Bien Province through the implementation of the PRAP. Project Purpose: Participatory forest management and livelihood development are promoted in the project pilot sites through the implementation of the PRAP. 												
Activities of the Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Project site: Dien Bien Province Main activities: Formulation and implementation of participatory forest management plans and livelihood development plans in each initial project pilot site (IPS); implementation of the C-RAP in each APS; monitoring and evaluation of pilot activities; training and support to the government staff for implementation of pilot activities and PRAP, including improvement of Provincial Forest Monitoring System (PFMS); preparation of technical guidelines and manuals, etc. Inputs (to carry out above activities) (As of Terminal Evaluation in June 2015) <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Japanese Side</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Vietnamese Side</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1) Experts: (long-term) 6 persons, (short-term) 4 persons, (consultant team) 2 teams.</td> <td>1) Staff allocated: 31 persons</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Trainees received: 48 persons</td> <td>2) Building and facilities: Project Office, etc.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) Equipment: Vehicles, office equipment, etc.</td> <td>3) Local cost: Cost of travel for the staff allocated, etc.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4) Local cost: Cost for local consultants (LCs) for various surveys, materials for pilot activities, etc.</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			Japanese Side	Vietnamese Side	1) Experts: (long-term) 6 persons, (short-term) 4 persons, (consultant team) 2 teams.	1) Staff allocated: 31 persons	2) Trainees received: 48 persons	2) Building and facilities: Project Office, etc.	3) Equipment: Vehicles, office equipment, etc.	3) Local cost: Cost of travel for the staff allocated, etc.	4) Local cost: Cost for local consultants (LCs) for various surveys, materials for pilot activities, etc.	
Japanese Side	Vietnamese Side												
1) Experts: (long-term) 6 persons, (short-term) 4 persons, (consultant team) 2 teams.	1) Staff allocated: 31 persons												
2) Trainees received: 48 persons	2) Building and facilities: Project Office, etc.												
3) Equipment: Vehicles, office equipment, etc.	3) Local cost: Cost of travel for the staff allocated, etc.												
4) Local cost: Cost for local consultants (LCs) for various surveys, materials for pilot activities, etc.													
Project Period	August 2010 – August 2015	Project Cost	(ex-ante) 627 million yen, (actual) 603 million yen										
Implementing Agency	Dien Bien Provincial Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD)												
Cooperation Agency in Japan	Forestry Agency/Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries; OYO International Corporation; OPMAC Corporation; KRI International Corporation; Global Link Management, Inc.; Japan Forestry Technology Association.												

II. Result of the Evaluation

<Constraints on Evaluation>

- Regarding achievement status of the Overall Goal, a questionnaire and interview survey at commune level and site visits could not be conducted due to time constraint: information was basically collected through the implementing agency at provincial level and document review.

<Special Perspective Considered in the Ex-Post Evaluation>

- Observed statuses of continuation of the project effects, achievement of the Overall Goal, and institutional, technical and financial aspects of Sustainability included both outcomes/impacts of this project and the above mentioned succeeding technical cooperation of JICA “Sustainable Natural Resource Management Project (SNRMP)” (2015-2020), which includes further enhancement of capacity of implementation of the PRAP in Dien Bien Province. It was difficult to separate outcomes/impacts of this project from those of the SNRMP.
- As for the Project Purpose Indicator 1 (“More than 80% of the households in the IPSs indicated forest management is promoted through livelihood development activities”), interpretation at the time of terminal evaluation (“...indicated that livelihood improvement support is main reason to undertake forest management activities”) was used for making evaluation judgement in order to apply the same perspective as that of the terminal

¹ The logical framework of the project was modified based on the recommendation of mid-term review in January 2013 to integrate achievements of a JICA’s technical cooperation project “Dien Bien Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) + Pilot Project (REDD+PP)” (2012-2013) such as Provincial REDD+ Action Plan (PRAP), Commune RAPs (C-RAPs) for 2 communes, and Provincial Forest Monitoring System (PFMS) using tablets. (The PRAP was approved in 2014.)

² Pilot project sites consisted of 7 initial project pilot sites (IPSs) selected in the first half of the project (15 villages in total) and 2 additional project pilot sites (APSS) selected in the second half of the project for implementation of the C-RAPs developed in the REDD+PP (36 villages in total).

³ Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries.

evaluation. Its continuation status was confirmed using qualitative data (opinion of village heads) since it was difficult to obtain the data comparable to the one collected during the project in the internal ex-post evaluation.

- Regarding continuation status of the Project Purpose Indicator 3 (“Average household cash income is increased by 5% (after inflation adjustment) in the APSs by the end of the project”), qualitative data (opinion of the village heads on the change of the level of average household cash income) and statistical data on the average per capita income was collected since the existing data on the average household income was not available. In addition, the statistical data on the ratio of the households certified as “poor” was collected.
- With respect to the undetermined part of the Overall Goal Indicator 2 (“Net forest change is positively increased in the communes with C-RAP for the period 2015-2020 as compared to the average net forest change in the commune/district (to be decided later) for the reference period (e.g. 2000-2010)”)), those defined in a similar Indicator of the SNRMP (“In the pilot communes..., net forest change is positively increased for the period 2015-2020 as compared to the average net forest change for the period 2010-2015”) were used.
- As for the Overall Goal Indicator 3 (“Average household cash income is increased by 10% (after inflation adjustment) in the communes with C-RAP between 2015 and 2020”), it was difficult to obtain the data on the average household cash income because it is not included in the statistical report on poverty and income specified as the means of verification of the logical framework. Therefore, statistical data on the average per capita income and the ratio of households certified as “the poor” was collected.

1 Relevance

<Consistency with the Development Policy of Viet Nam at the time of Ex-Ante Evaluation and Project Completion>

At the time of ex-ante evaluation, the project was consistent with the Five-Year Socio-Economic Development Plan (SEDP) (2006-2010), which referred to review of the effectiveness of the 5 Million Hectare Reforestation Program (1998) in the orientation of multi-purpose afforestation. At the time of project completion, the project was consistent with the Socio-Economic Development Strategy (SEDS) (2011-2020), which included environment protection and improvement as a key issue. It was also consistent with the government decree on Payments for Forestry Environment Services (PFES)⁴ in 2011.

<Consistency with the Development Needs of Viet Nam at the time of Ex-Ante Evaluation and Project Completion>

At the time of ex-ante evaluation, the project was consistent with the needs of promotion of forest management in the Northwest region as described in <Background>. At the time of project completion, the project was consistent with the needs of implementation of the PRAP approved in 2014 in Dien Bien Province, which was the first province in the country that initiated development of the PRAP.

<Consistency with Japan’s ODA Policy at the time of Ex-Ante Evaluation>

At the time of ex-ante evaluation, the project was consistent with the Country Assistance Program for Viet Nam (2009), which includes “Environmental Conservation” in one of the priority areas.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, the relevance of the project is high.

2 Effectiveness/Impact

<Status of Achievement of the Project Purpose at the time of Project Completion>

The Project Purpose was achieved at the time of project completion (judged based on the status of achievement of the three indicators: partially achieved, achieved, and achieved, respectively). Through the project activities, village forest management plans (FMPs) and livelihood development plans (LDPs) were formulated and implemented in all pilot villages, and more than 50% of the villages started to provide loans/grants through village funds (VFs) established by the project. As a result, in the IPSs, 42% of the household (target: more than 80%) indicated that livelihood improvement support was the main reason to undertake forest management activities (Indicator 1). In the APSs, more than 95% of the existing natural forest area (target: more than 90%) was protected and the area designated for regeneration and afforestation largely exceeded the reduced natural forest area as compared to 2013 (Indicator 2), and average household cash income was increased by 31% (target: 5%) after inflation adjustment between 2012 and 2014 (Indicator 3).

<Continuation Status of Project Effects at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

The project effects have continued to the time of ex-post evaluation. According to the 39 village heads in the IPSs and APSs, forest management activities have continued thanks to PFES and the livelihood improvement activities have continued except for a few ⁵with budget from various government programs although the number of villages using VFs has been decreased by about 30%⁶. In the IPSs, all the village heads stated that their forests are better managed, and their livelihood and income have been much improved and indicated that there is a strong connection between continuation of forest management and livelihood improvement activities. In the APSs, 100% of the existing natural forest area was kept protected in 2018 as compared to the project completion (i.e. 2015). All the village heads who were interviewed answered that the average household income has been maintained or increased in their villages mainly due to payment from PFES. In addition, average per capita income (after inflation adjustment) was increased because, according to the official statistics, the average per capita income (before inflation adjustment) in 2018 was increased by 133% as compared to 2015 while increase rate of the consumer price index (CPI) from 2016 to 2018 was below 4% per year. The ratio of the households certified as “poor” in 2018 decreased by 19% as compared to 2015 as well. The PFMS improved by the project has been continuously utilized in both of the APSs, too. Furthermore, the PRAP (2014) has been revised based on the recommendations and financial analysis of the project, etc. under the succeeding project of JICA (i.e. the SNRMP), which was approved by the provincial government in 2017.

<Status of Achievement for Overall Goal at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

Achievement status of the Overall Goal was not verifiable (judged based on the status of achievement of three indicators: partially achieved, not verifiable, and not verifiable, respectively), and it is not certain whether it will be achieved by the target year (i.e. 2020).

⁴ PFES is a system which collects funds from watershed users such as hydroelectric power, water supply treatment plants, tourism companies and distributes to the local community for forest protection services

⁵ For example, number of households involved in pig raising and Lao stove have decreased due to low price from the diseases and an external condition (people use electric and gas stoves as they are more convenient), respectively.

⁶ These villages stopped providing loans/grants mainly because they do not get any guidance from DARD on continued operation of the VFs and repayment ratio was relatively low at around 45 % in APSs.

According to DARD, new C-RAPs in other communes have not been prepared as it requires additional resources (both manpower and budget). Moreover, C-RAPs are no longer required under the revised PRAP (2017)⁷. It is noted that two kinds of FMPs/LDPs have been developed in 37 new communes with similar conditions to the APSs to implement the PRAP, applying the skills and/or experiences of the project partially. First, village FMPs/LDPs have been prepared in a newly selected pilot commune (Pa Khoang) under the SNRMP, applying the methods and contents of the participatory village planning of the project, which were approved by the Commune People's Committee (CPC) in 2016. Then, commune-level FMPs/LDPs were prepared by DARD in 36 communes in accordance with the revised PRAP in 2017, applying the idea of the project of implementing forest management and livelihood development activities in the same place. These commune-level FMPs/LDPs were integrated in the communes' annual socio-economic development plans (CASEDPs) and have been updated every year. At the time of ex-post evaluation, there is no plan to replicate village and commune-level FMPs/LDPs in other communes by the target year (Indicator 1).

In the pilot commune of the SNRMP with the village FMPs/LDPs, net forest change for the period of 2015-2018 was not positively increased but reduced as compared to the same for the reference period (but 2013⁸-2015)⁹. Data on the net forest change in the 36 communes with the commune-level FMPs/LDPs was not available. Although DARD stated that forest area in the province is increasing year by year mainly due to PFES, it is difficult to verify whether the net forest change in the 37 communes with the FMPs/LDPs for the period of 2015-2018 were increased positively as compared to the same for the reference period of 2010-2015. It is also difficult to forecast whether it will be positively increased by 2020 as compared to the above reference period (Indicator 2).

As for average household cash income (after inflation adjustment), data was not available. For reference, in the pilot commune of the SNRMP (Pa Khoang) with the village FMPs/LDPs, average per capita income (before inflation adjustment) was increased by 214% and the ratio of the households certified as "poor" was decreased by 17% in 2018 as compared to 2015. The remaining 36 communes with the commune-level FMPs/LDPs may have similar tendency to the pilot commune of the SNRMP with village FMPs/LDPs due to payment from PFES; however, it could not be verified because the data could not be obtained due to time constraint. Therefore, it is difficult to judge whether the average household cash income was increased by 10% (after inflation adjustment) in the 37 communes with the FMPs/LDPs between 2015 and 2018. It is also difficult to forecast whether it will be increased by 10% by 2020 (Indicator 3).

<Other Impacts at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

Various positive impacts have been observed while negative impacts have not been observed. According to DARD, the PFMS improved by the project is utilized in the entire province as routine work with support from the SNRMP. The revised PRAP (2017), which incorporated the recommendations and experiences of the project, has been used as overall guidance for forest protection and its associated livelihood improvement activities in the whole province. The project has also contributed to protection of watershed because most of natural forests of the villages in the IPSs and APSs are protection forests. Meanwhile, 39 village heads and 17 households in the IPSs and APSs confirmed that the project has contributed to improvement of disparity between urban and rural areas. According to them, many households have obtained a large amount from PFES and have invested their received money into animal raising and crops cultivation to increase income. With increased income, many have built new houses or equipped their houses with TV sets for better living conditions.

<Evaluation Result>

Therefore, the effectiveness/impact of the project is fair.

Achievement of Project Purpose and Overall Goal

Aim	Indicators	Results																													
(Project Purpose) Participatory forest management and livelihood development are promoted in the project pilot sites through the implementation of the PRAP.	For IPSs: 1: More than 80% of the households in the IPSs indicate that forest management is promoted through livelihood development activities by the end of the project.	Status of the Achievement: partially achieved (partially continued) (Project Completion) - According to the household interview in May 2015 (sample size: 224 out of 816 households), 42% of households indicated that livelihood improvement support is main reason to undertake forest management activities in IPSs. (Ex-post Evaluation) - All the village heads in the IPSs indicated that there is a strong connection between continuation of forest management and livelihood improvement activities. (Ratio of the households could not be confirmed.)																													
	For APSs: 2: More than 90% of the existing natural forest area is protected (remaining), and the area designated for regeneration and afforestation is at least equal to the reduced natural forest area, by the end of the project as compared to 2013 in the APSs.	Status of the Achievement: achieved (continued) (Project Completion) <Comparison between 2013 and 2015> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Commune</th> <th>Protection rate</th> <th>Deforested area</th> <th>Regeneration area</th> <th>Afforestation area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Muong Phang</td> <td>98%</td> <td>29ha</td> <td>207ha</td> <td>230ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Muong Muon</td> <td>96%</td> <td>270ha</td> <td>343ha</td> <td>59ha</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> (Ex-post Evaluation) <Comparison between 2015 and 2018> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Commune</th> <th>Protection rate</th> <th>Deforested area</th> <th>Regeneration area*</th> <th>Afforestation area*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Muong Phang</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0ha</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Muong Muon</td> <td>100%</td> <td>0ha</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> * According to Dien Bien District and Muong Phang Special Use Forest Management Board (FMB), areas designated for regeneration/afforestation are unclear because all activities on regeneration and afforestation depend on budget given to village forest management boards (FMBs) by the central government.	Commune	Protection rate	Deforested area	Regeneration area	Afforestation area	Muong Phang	98%	29ha	207ha	230ha	Muong Muon	96%	270ha	343ha	59ha	Commune	Protection rate	Deforested area	Regeneration area*	Afforestation area*	Muong Phang	100%	0ha	N/A	N/A	Muong Muon	100%	0ha	N/A
Commune	Protection rate	Deforested area	Regeneration area	Afforestation area																											
Muong Phang	98%	29ha	207ha	230ha																											
Muong Muon	96%	270ha	343ha	59ha																											
Commune	Protection rate	Deforested area	Regeneration area*	Afforestation area*																											
Muong Phang	100%	0ha	N/A	N/A																											
Muong Muon	100%	0ha	N/A	N/A																											

⁷ According to the former Chief Advisor of the project, it was concluded that C-RAPs would not be required under the PRAP at the end of the project.

⁸ The pilot commune of the SNRMP (Pa Khoang) was established in 2013; therefore, the data for the period of 2010-2012 does not exist.

⁹ Net forest change in the period of 2015 -2018 was 65 ha (or an average of 22ha/year) while net forest change in the reference period of 2013-2015 was 472 ha (or an average of 236ha /year). Net forest increase will be naturally slow down as less land would be available as more forest grows over time.

	<p>For APSs: 3: Average household cash income is increased by 5% (after inflation adjustment) in the APSs by the end of the project.</p>	<p>Status of the Achievement: achieved (continued) (Project Completion) -According to the household interview in May 2015 (sample size: 429 out of 1,596 households), the average changes of household cash income in the APSs between 2012 and 2014 were; 45% increase (nominal), and 31% increase (real after the inflation adjustment). (Ex-post Evaluation) -Data on the average household income was not available. <No. of villages which answered level of average household income maintained or increase d></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="547 309 1541 443"> <thead> <tr> <th>No of villages</th> <th>No of villages participated in C-RAP</th> <th>No. of villages which answered the question (=A)</th> <th>No. of villages which answered level of average household income maintained or increased (=B)</th> <th>Ratio (%) (=B/A)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>36</td> <td>35</td> <td>24</td> <td>24</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><Average per capita income (before inflation adjustment)> (Unit: Vietnamese Dong (VND))</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="547 472 1366 544"> <thead> <tr> <th>2015 (Base Year)</th> <th>2016</th> <th>2017</th> <th>2018</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>9,000,000</td> <td>13,000,000</td> <td>19,000,000</td> <td>21,000,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><Ratio of households certified as "poor"></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="547 573 1366 645"> <thead> <tr> <th>2015 (Base Year)</th> <th>2016</th> <th>2017</th> <th>2018</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>56%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>37%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No of villages	No of villages participated in C-RAP	No. of villages which answered the question (=A)	No. of villages which answered level of average household income maintained or increased (=B)	Ratio (%) (=B/A)	36	35	24	24	100	2015 (Base Year)	2016	2017	2018	9,000,000	13,000,000	19,000,000	21,000,000	2015 (Base Year)	2016	2017	2018	56%	54%	50%	37%																																								
No of villages	No of villages participated in C-RAP	No. of villages which answered the question (=A)	No. of villages which answered level of average household income maintained or increased (=B)	Ratio (%) (=B/A)																																																																
36	35	24	24	100																																																																
2015 (Base Year)	2016	2017	2018																																																																	
9,000,000	13,000,000	19,000,000	21,000,000																																																																	
2015 (Base Year)	2016	2017	2018																																																																	
56%	54%	50%	37%																																																																	
<p>(Overall Goal) Participatory forest management and livelihood development are promoted in the areas with similar conditions to the APSs in Dien Bien Province through the implementation of the PRAP.</p>	<p>1. More than XX¹⁰ commune REDD+ action plans (C-RAPs) are prepared in Dien Bien Province in accordance with PRAP by 2020.</p> <p>2. Net forest change is positively increased in the communes with C-RAP for the period 2015-2020 as compared to the average net forest change in the commune/district (to be decided later) for the reference period (e.g. 2000-2010).</p> <p>3. Average household cash income is increased by 10% (after inflation adjustment) in the communes with C-RAP between 2015 and 2020.</p>	<p>(Ex-post Evaluation) partially achieved -New C-RAPs have not been prepared due to shortage of manpower and budget. <Annual number of communes in which the FMPs/LDPs were newly prepared></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="547 741 1382 842"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> <th>2017</th> <th>2018</th> <th>2019</th> <th>2020</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Plan</td> <td>0</td> <td>1*</td> <td>36**</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Actual</td> <td>0</td> <td>1*</td> <td>36**</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>37</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Village FMPs/LDPS in the pilot commune of the SNRMP. **Commune-level FMPs/LDPs as part of the CASEDPS.</p> <p>(Ex-post Evaluation) not verifiable <Net forest change in the pilot commune of the SNRMP (Pa Khoang) with the village FMPs/LDPs > (Unit: ha)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="547 958 1541 1128"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Reference period</th> <th colspan="3">Target period</th> <th rowspan="2">Difference (=B-A)</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2">Forest Area</th> <th>Net forest change (=A)</th> <th colspan="2">Forest Area</th> <th>Net forest change (=B)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>2015</td> <td>2013-2015</td> <td>2015</td> <td>2018</td> <td>2015-2018</td> <td rowspan="2">-407 (ref. -214/year)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2,074</td> <td>2,546</td> <td>472 (ref. 236/year)</td> <td>2,546</td> <td>2,611</td> <td>65 (ref. 22/year)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>-Data on the net forest change in the 36 communes with the commune-level FMPs/LDPs was not available.</p> <p>(Ex-post Evaluation) not verifiable -Data on the average household income (after inflation adjustment) in 37 communes with the FMPs/LDPs was not available. <Average per capita income (before inflation adjustment) in the pilot commune of the SNRMP with the village FMPs/LDPs> (Unit: VND)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="547 1350 1514 1451"> <thead> <tr> <th>2015 (Base Year)</th> <th>2016 (Year of approval of FMPs/LDPs)</th> <th>2017</th> <th>2018</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>7,000,000</td> <td>11,000,000</td> <td>13,000,000</td> <td>22,000,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><Ratio of households certified as "poor" in the pilot commune of the SNRMP with the village FMPs/LDPs></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="547 1480 1514 1581"> <thead> <tr> <th>2015 (Base Year)</th> <th>2016 (Year of approval of FMPs/LDPs)</th> <th>2017</th> <th>2018</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>53%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>-Data on the average per capita income and poverty ratio in the 36 communes with the commune-level FMPs/LDPs was not available.</p>		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total	Plan	0	1*	36**	0	0	0	37	Actual	0	1*	36**	0	0		37	Reference period			Target period			Difference (=B-A)	Forest Area		Net forest change (=A)	Forest Area		Net forest change (=B)	2013	2015	2013-2015	2015	2018	2015-2018	-407 (ref. -214/year)	2,074	2,546	472 (ref. 236/year)	2,546	2,611	65 (ref. 22/year)	2015 (Base Year)	2016 (Year of approval of FMPs/LDPs)	2017	2018	7,000,000	11,000,000	13,000,000	22,000,000	2015 (Base Year)	2016 (Year of approval of FMPs/LDPs)	2017	2018	53%	47%	44%	36%
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total																																																													
Plan	0	1*	36**	0	0	0	37																																																													
Actual	0	1*	36**	0	0		37																																																													
Reference period			Target period			Difference (=B-A)																																																														
Forest Area		Net forest change (=A)	Forest Area		Net forest change (=B)																																																															
2013	2015	2013-2015	2015	2018	2015-2018	-407 (ref. -214/year)																																																														
2,074	2,546	472 (ref. 236/year)	2,546	2,611	65 (ref. 22/year)																																																															
2015 (Base Year)	2016 (Year of approval of FMPs/LDPs)	2017	2018																																																																	
7,000,000	11,000,000	13,000,000	22,000,000																																																																	
2015 (Base Year)	2016 (Year of approval of FMPs/LDPs)	2017	2018																																																																	
53%	47%	44%	36%																																																																	

Source: Terminal Evaluation Report; Project Completion Report; questionnaire and interview survey with DARD and Dien Bien District, Muong Phang and Muong Muon Communes, Muong Phang Special Use FMB, and Muong Cha village FMB in the APSs, and 39 village heads in the IPSs and APSs; Project Management Unit of the SNRMP.

3 Efficiency

Both the project cost and the project period were within the plan (ratio against the plan: 96% and 100 %). The Outputs of the project were produced as planned. Therefore, the efficiency of the project is high.

4 Sustainability

<Policy Aspect>

There are several government policies that provide support on sustainable forest management and livelihood improvement together with REDD+ such as SEDS and the government decree on PFES mentioned in <Relevance> and the National REDD+ Action Programme (2017).

<Institutional Aspect>

At different administrative level of Dien Bien province, organizational structure is well established in order to implement the PRAP in

¹⁰ The target figure of the Overall Goal Indicator 1 was not determined by the project completion.

general. The roles and responsibilities of the relevant organizations for the PRAP implementation are clearly defined and the number of staff is considered appropriate as it satisfies the quota. Although there was a shortage of personnel at commune level to develop new C-RAPs as stated in “Effectiveness/Impact”, implementation of the existing C-RAPs is managed by the existing commune officers in the APSs. Development / update and implementation of commune-level FMPs/LDPs in 36 communes is also conducted by the existing officers. In view of the above, necessary staff is likely to be secured to continue and replicate these on-going activities. Meanwhile, village FMPs/LDPs in the pilot commune of the SNRMP have been supported by 7 officers from one of the communes in the APSs, who are assigned as facilitators/extension workers in addition to the existing officers. According to DARD, implementation arrangement for replication of village FMPs/LDPs after the completion of the SNRMP is not determined yet.

<Technical Aspect>

Officers of the implementing agencies trained by the project still engage in promotion of participatory forest management and livelihood improvement through the PRAP implementation and maintain the knowledge and skills by applying them in their respective duties and utilizing the technical guidelines and manuals developed under the project. Capacity of some of the commune officers trained by the project has been further enhanced through participating in the SNRMP as facilitators/extension workers. They have also transferred the experiences acquired from the project to the officers and local people in the pilot commune of the SNRMP. On the other hand, it was observed that some villages stopped providing loans /grants because they do not get any guidance from competent authorities on continued operation of the VFs and repayment ratio was relatively low at around 45 % in APSs.

<Financial Aspect>

The budget for the PRAP implementation in Dien Bien Province, including forest protection of local villages and households, forest plantation, and administration, has increased from 180 billion VND in 2016 to 384 billion VND in 2018. According to DARD, enough budgets have been prepared for the PRAP implementation except for the C-RAP development as mentioned in “Effectiveness/Impact”. It is noted that some local cost for the village FMPs/LDPs in the pilot commune (Pa Khoang) of the SNRMP was borne by JICA (e.g. cost of procurement of satellite images, LCs for various surveys, materials for pilot activities, etc). According to DARD, it does not have an idea about necessary budget and prospect of budget allocation for replication of village FMPs/LDPs: it is waiting for the compiled achievements and lessons learned for further replication to be produced by the end of SNRMP in 2020.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, slight problems have been observed in terms of the institutional, technical and financial aspects of the implementing agency. Therefore, the sustainability of the effectiveness through the project is fair.

5 Summary of the Evaluation

The project achieved the Project Purpose (“Participatory forest management and livelihood development are promoted in the project pilot sites through the implementation of the PRAP”) and the effects of the project have continued. Achievement status of the Overall Goal (“Participatory forest management and livelihood development are promoted in the areas with similar conditions to the APSs in Dien Bien Province through the implementation of the PRAP”) was not verifiable (C-RAPs were not developed in other communes because they were time and resource consuming at commune level but the village or commune-level FMPs/LDPs were developed in 37 new communes, partially applying the experience of the project. However, sufficient data could not be obtained to verify the overall net forest change and average household income of those communes). Regarding the sustainability, slight problems have been observed in terms of the institutional, technical and financial aspects (i.e. uncertainty regarding implementation arrangement and budget allocation for replication of the village FMPs/LDPs and insufficient utilization of guidelines/manuals at village level) but no problems have been observed in terms of the policy and technical aspects. Considering all of the above points, this project is evaluated to be satisfactory.

III. Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Recommendations for Implementing Agency:

- It is recommended that DARD continue the current integrated approach on forest management and livelihood improvement to ensure the sustainable development of forestry in Dien Bien Province.
- It is recommended that DARD continuously utilize and provide the incentive to the extension officers of the IPSs and the APSs whose capacities have been developed by support from the project to participate in replicating gained knowledges and skills to other communes.
- It is recommended that DARD carry out analysis on enabling and blocking factors that have led to different development level of livelihood improvement activities in the IPSs and APSs by the end of March 2020 so that more proper (feasible) livelihood improvement activities would be applied upon situation of each site.
- It is recommended that DARD make sure to examine the implementation arrangement and clarify the necessary budget to replicate the village FMPs/LDPs in consultation with the JICA expert team of the SNRMP by the end of March 2020.
- It is recommended that competent authorities in Dien Bien (DARD and related CPCs) should: 1) review the current management and operation of village funds at IPSs and APSs and 2) take necessary countermeasures to ensure accountability, transparency and effectiveness usage of the VFs, including the issuance of regulatory guidance on VFs management.

Lessons Learned for JICA:

- Before completion, the project should have made sure/discussed with the counterparts to request the concrete plan on the continued usage of the operational guidelines/ manuals developed by the project so that not only the counterparts but also the village heads who were engaged in the project activities at the grass-roots level could notice that these activities should follow the guidance provided by the project.



Acacia plantation in Sai Luong Village in the IPS



Vegetable garden in Muong Phang Village 1 in the APS