



# Evaluation of the Cash Transfers for Development Project in Vietnam

Annexes

Oxfam GB Programme Evaluation

December 2008

Commissioned by: Oxfam GB

Evaluators: Rowena Humphreys

## **ANNEXES**

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	2
ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED .....	5
ANNEX 3: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CONSULTATIONS .....	7
ANNEX 4: FIELD WORK PLAN AND METHODOLOGY .....	8

## ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

### TERM OF REFERENCE

#### Periodical Review of the Cash Transfers for Development Project

##### 1. Background

Oxfam Great Britain in Vietnam (OGB) is implementing a pilot project that provides once-off significant cash transfer to poor households in a non-emergency context in An Loc commune of Loc Ha district (formerly Can Loc district), Ha Tinh province. The project design is based on a rationale that over the past decade, there has been a growing body of writing that questions the impact of the work done by development and humanitarian organisation. As an INGO, OGB challenges itself whether as an INGO it truly add value it think it does. And is it sure that giving poor people a relatively large amount of cash will not generate sustainable positive change? By providing an amount of cash with minimum conditions and interventions, it is expected that the project will provide an appropriate answer for the question. The project has been started by providing once-off cash to selected beneficiaries in early 2007 with expected impacts that:

- Poor people increase their assets, so improve their well-being;
- Women's control over resources and assets is increased;
- Asset inequality between households is reduced.

If successful, the project will challenge:

- The standard approach of development projects which is for professional experts to lead in identifying suitable livelihoods, rather than empowering individual households to make diverse choices;
- The high level of administrative and consultancy costs faced by international NGOs and donors due to the high number of project staff and partners involved in designing and implementing standard livelihood projects;
- Beliefs in the development community about poor people's ability to make wise and rational use of cash.

The project is now in its second year of operation, as part of its regular monitoring and evaluation process, OGB would like to seek an individual consultant to conduct an exercise with specific requirements as follow:

##### 2. Objective

To conduct a periodical review and documentation of the project 'Cash Transfers for Development: an Oxfam Learning Project in Vietnam' (hereafter called *Cash Transfer Project*)

### **3. Specific tasks**

- To document what have been implemented by the project in last six months (March – August 2008);
- To process, interpret and analyze data on beneficiaries' use of cash granted in last 6 months which have been collected, entered by the PRO-POOR CENTRE;
- To compare and analyze people's use of cash granted in review period versus previous one year (February 2007 – February 2008). Identify changes in trend (if any) compared to earlier periods;
- To document the effectiveness (or impact if any) of the project to beneficiaries, local authorities, community-managed groups, government authorities etc.;
- To capture constrains, difficulties or challenges faced by implementing partner, government authorities, local people and, beneficiaries over past 6 months;
- To draw lessons and recommendations for OGB in next six months/remaining time.

### **4. Process and methodology**

The review bases primarily on statistical data analysis which has been collected by PPC. In addition, the consultant will visit project sites to conduct interviews, group discussions with beneficiaries, community-based groups, government authorities at different levels and the local NGO to seek supporting data, seek clarifications or collect case studies for review purpose. Though statistical analysis remains the primary mean of the review, the consultant is encouraged to apply participatory tools and techniques to ensure full participation of project stakeholder, especially the poor during the fieldwork exercise.

### **5. Output of the assignment**

Output of the assignment should be documented in a report that covers above-mentioned aspects (specified in 'Specific tasks' section), the report should be presented in English, follow OGB's format and, should not exceed 30 pages in length.

### **6. Consultant qualifications**

- High competency in processing of statistical data; familiar with technical software e.g. SPSS, STATA;
- At least 5 years of experience with demonstrated monitoring and evaluation knowledge, skills and experiences of rural development programme;
- In-depth knowledge of research methods with particular focus on participatory methods, including in-depth interviews, focus group discussions and product or behavior trials;

- Excellent English writing and analytical skills.
- At least a Bachelor's degree in development studies, economics and social sciences.

## 7. Indicative timeframe

The review should be conducted in October 2008 with an indicative timeframe as follow:

No.	Activity	Number of consultant-days
1.	Designing	2
2.	Fieldwork	3
3.	Data processing (statistical and qualitative)	3
4.	Report writing	4
5.	Report finalisation	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>

## 8. Contact person

Interested consultant is requested to submit a proposal which proposes methods, process, timeframe, report outline, budget projection and CV to:

**Nguyen Quang Minh**  
 Programme Coordinator - Livelihoods  
 Oxfam Great Britain in Vietnam  
 16 Mai Hac De St., Hanoi  
 Tel: +84 4 945 4362 (Ext: 119)  
 Fax: +84 4 945 4365  
 Email: nqminh@oxfam.org.uk

Applications are welcome before 5pm, **8<sup>th</sup> October 2008**

## ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED

<b>Pro-Poor Centre</b>			
Bui Van Linh	M	Pro-Poor centre	<a href="mailto:vanlinh@199yahoo.com">vanlinh@199yahoo.com</a>
Phan Thi Le Thuy	F	Pro-Poor Centre	<a href="mailto:Planlethuy@gmail.com">Planlethuy@gmail.com</a>
Trinh Thi Thuong	F	Pro-Poor Centre	-
Nguyen Thi Hien	F	Pro-Poor Centre	<a href="mailto:hienppc@gmail.com">hienppc@gmail.com</a>
<b>Government Staff</b>			
Nguyen Quoc Thu	M	Commune Peoples Committee	-
Nguyen Dinh Tuy	M	Commune Peoples Committee	-
	M	District Peoples Committee	
<b>Household Interviews</b>			
Heo Van Tinh	M	Village 1	
Tran Tuan	M	Village 1	
Nguyen Dinh Quy	M	Village 4	
<b>Group Discussion 1 – Village Heads</b>			
Nguyen Tring Dung	M	Village 6	
Ho Van Ha	M	Village 1	
Tran Van Nguyen	M	Village 3	
Tran Vam Tuan	M	Village 2	
Nguyen Quang Thang	M	Village 8	
Nguyen Quang Thanh	M	Village 5	
Nguyen Tung Ha	M	Village 7	
Nguyen Dinh Tuy	M	Village 4	

<b>Group 2 – Discussion with Households beneficiaries</b>			
Ngo Thi Tham	F	Aged 40	Received 6.5 million
Ho Thi Tan	F	Aged 27	Received 6.5 million
Tran Thi Hien	F	Aged 39	Received 6.5 million
Tran Van Tinh	M	Aged 43	Received 6.5 million
Nguyen Duy Linh	M	Aged 47	Received 6.5 million
Ngo Dui Thanh	M	Aged 43	Received 6.5 million
<b>Group 3 – Focus Group Discussion with Women’s Union representatives</b>			
Ho Thi Trinh	F	Aged 70	Received 6.5 million
Nguyen Thi Ha	F	Aged 48	Received 3 million
Nguyen Thi Tieng	F	Aged 36	Received 3 million
Nguyen Thi Xoa	F	Aged 60	Received 6.5 million
Nguyen Thi Hong	F	Aged 45	Received 6.5 million
Nguyen Thi Thuy	F	Aged 44	Received 3 million
Tran Thi Ty	F	Aged 38	Received 6.5 million
<b>Group 4 - Focus Group Discussion with Non-Beneficiaries</b>			
Nguyen Thi Ly	F	39	Non-Beneficiary
Nguyen Thi Thuy	F	45	Non-Beneficiary
Nguyen Duy Linh	M	52	Non-Beneficiary
Nguyen Dinh Lanh	M	48	Non-Beneficiary

## **ANNEX 3: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CONSULTATIONS**

### **Guiding Questions for Focus Group Discussions**

- Tell me about your involvement in the project
- What project related tasks have taken place since March 2008?
- Did you notice any changes in your life since this project began?
- What was the biggest change for you?
- Have you faced any difficulties as a result of the project?
- Also see the methodology in Appendix 4

### **Guiding Questions for Household Interviews**

- Has your life changed as a result of the project?
- If yes, how?
- What did you spend the money on?
- Also during the questioning I tried to gauge labour divisions, debt levels, shocks and coping mechanisms, accumulation of different forms of capital, control of resources, access to goods and services
- Also see the methodology in Appendix 4



## ANNEX 4: FIELD WORK PLAN AND METHODOLOGY

### **FIELD WORK PLAN SUBMITTED TO OGB NOVEMBER 2008**

The following schedule of events outlines the fieldwork component of the review. This is subject to revisions and we welcome comments from OGB and the Pro-Poor Centre.

#### ***Day 1 – Interviews***

It is essential to consider the role of stakeholders (other than the beneficiaries) who can either obstruct or support the project.

A semi-structured interview which revolves around two areas of discussion:

- How do external stakeholders benefit or lose from the project and how does this shape their contribution?
- How do they affect the nature and scale of project impact on local people?

We will need to have discussions with the Pro-Poor Centre to identify other stakeholders the following stakeholders however the following have so far been identified:

- Commune chief (Mr Hanh)
- Pro-Poor Centre (Ms Phan Le Thuy & Ms Tu Thi Phuong Nga)
- Others?

#### ***Day 2 - Focus group discussions***

Focus group discussions (FGDs) are group discussions of approximately 6-12 persons guided by a facilitator, during which group members talk freely and spontaneously about a certain topic.

A FGD is a qualitative method that aims to obtain in-depth information on concepts, perceptions and ideas of a group. These sessions aim to be more than a question-answer interaction. The idea is that group members discuss the topic among themselves, with guidance

Each FGD will take place consecutively and last approximately 2 hours each. The FGD's will follow the format outlined below.

#### **Timeline exercise**

The aim of carrying out a timeline exercise is to gauge what has occurred during the projects life. Each group will yield different responses and allow us to the perspectives of all the stakeholders.

*Directions:*

A previously prepared, blank time-line will be presented and the group will write on pieces of coloured card the activities and events that have taken place since the projects inception. We will leave it open and allow them to write significant impacts, these may be external or internal to the project but will serve to triangulate the information in the reports.

*Timing:*

5 minutes explaining the task and distributing materials  
5 mins to think and write about the tasks achieved  
5 mins to stick the tasks on the board –maybe rearrange them slightly  
15 mins group discussion – does everyone agree? Is there anything missing?  
10 mins extra to account for translational queries etc  
40 mins total

**Brainstorming Exercise**

Brainstorming is a broad task that will allow participants to think freely about the project. The exercise aims to gauge *what changes/impacts has the project had on peoples lives?* It is envisaged that the outcomes of this will be a selection of positive, negative and indifferent comments.

Participants will be encouraged to think about what life was like before the project and what life is like now. This will again assist in adding value and triangulating the quantitative data collected in the household record books. It is envisaged that this will provide understanding of the motivations behind certain spending patterns.

*Directions:*

There will be three headings on a wall (positive, negative and neither) and people will write the change on a piece of card and then affix it under the appropriate heading.

As the participants discuss and post their cards on the wall we may simultaneously attempt to sort their comments perhaps into three board groups such natural and economic context, capitals/assets, and the institutional and policy environment of their livelihoods. If time allows participants will be encouraged to classify groups of issues themselves and in doing so engage in more discussion.

*Timing:*

5 minutes explaining the task and distributing materials  
5 mins to think and write about the tasks achieved  
5 mins to stick the tasks on the board –maybe rearrange them slightly  
15 mins group discussion – does everyone agree? Is there anything missing?  
10 mins extra to account for translational queries etc  
40 mins total

**Pair-wise ranking**

The aim of this exercise is to prioritise the projects impacts and therefore triangulate and ground-truth the quantitative data collected in the household record books. This draws upon the previous brainstorming exercise and will utilise the identified positive

impacts and then rank them accordingly. E.g. if the highest ranked change is increased attendance at school we could potentially expect this to follow through to the household record books in terms of expenditure. Whilst the sample size will be indicative of those involved it is not necessarily representative when

*Directions:*

Each topic is compared to the other and the preferred choice is represented by a coloured dot. Depending on the size of the group it might be useful to further sub-divide groups according to their characteristics e.g. gender and age. However time is limited and therefore this may not be possible.

*Timing:*

5 minutes explaining the task  
 20 mins rearranging and prioritising impacts and discussing  
 5 mins extra to account for translational queries etc  
 30 mins total

*Materials required:*

Coloured sticky dots (IDL to provide), markers

**Schedule for activities** *(To be confirmed)*

8am	Pro-Poor Centre
10:30am	Group of villagers (poor, non-poor) – Pro-poor group to select but cannot be present during the FGD.
2pm	Women’s union – Pro-poor group to select but cannot be present during the FGD.
3:30pm	Farmers union – Pro-poor group to select but cannot be present during the FGD.

**Day 3 - Household interviews**

Attend 3 households – One poor, one pro-poor and one non-beneficiary (totally unrelated to the project)

These interviews allow triangulation of the data recorded in the household books as well as information given in the FGD’s. It is therefore imperative that any household selected have full household records with which we can triangulate and verify our findings.

The aim of these interviews is to speak with households to gauge what life was like before the project and what it was like after; if possible attempts will also be made to gauge the differences since Feb 2008 and now. The HH interviews will be informal and semi-structured. The focus areas of discussion are outlined below:

- **The division of labour within the family and the community**  
*Has it changed/ how/ positive or negative?*

- **Access to goods and services**  
*Any changes? Increased/decreased/no change? Why?*
- **Control over resources**  
*Any changes? Increased/decreased/no change? Why?*
- **The exercise of rights and obligations**  
*Any changes? Increased/decreased/no change? Why? Has one group increased significantly e.g. women?*
- **The accumulation of capital (physical, natural, economic, human, social, political)**  
*Has it increased/decreased/not changed as a result of the cash transfers?*
- **Vulnerability and marginalization issues**  
*How do the HH's adapt/cope with these shocks? If their ability to adapt/cope has improved/declined is it because of the cash transfers?*
  - Environmentally based (e.g. floods, droughts);
  - Economically based (e.g. macro-economic decline);
  - Socially based (e.g. breakdown of community management structures);
  - Politically based (e.g. rights denial, government policies that adversely affect prices, tenure, service provision); and
  - Conflict derived (e.g. ethnic rivalries, religious insurgency).

Respondents will be asked to verify their responses so that we can gauge whether or not the change that they highlight is actually a direct/indirect result of the cash transfers/the project. We will be very careful not to lead the respondents during the interview, we would hope that they illicit as much as much as possible themselves.

### **Schedule for activities**

Household 1: 9am  
Household 2: 11:30am  
Household 3: 2pmss

### **Wrapping Up**

Given time restraints we would prefer not to be over-ambitious on the last day of field work. We envisage spending any extra time with the Pro-Poor Centre getting any final reflections about the state of the project.

© Oxfam GB 2008

First published online by Oxfam GB in 2010.

This document is part of a collection of programme evaluations available from Oxfam GB in accordance with its evaluation policy.

This document was originally written for internal accountability and learning purposes, rather than for external publication. The information included was correct to the evaluator's best knowledge at the date the evaluation took place. The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect Oxfam's views.

The text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for reuse in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email [publish@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:publish@oxfam.org.uk)

For further information on the issues raised in this document email [phd@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:phd@oxfam.org.uk)

Oxfam is a registered charity in England and Wales (no 202918) and Scotland (SC 039042). Oxfam GB is a member of Oxfam International.

**[www.oxfam.org.uk](http://www.oxfam.org.uk)**