

## 4 Synthesis – Conclusions and Lessons Learned / Recommendations

Support for D/HR has played an increasingly important role in Sida co-operation with developing countries since the early 1990s as demonstrated in a plethora of policy documents including: Shared Responsibility: Sweden's Policy for Global Development, Gov. Bill 2002/03:122 (2003), Change for Freedom. Policy for D/HR in Swedish Development Cooperation, 2010-2014 (2010), Freedom from Oppression. Gov't Communication on Swedish Democracy Support (2008), D/HR in Sweden's Development Cooperation, Gov't Comm. 1997/98:76 (1998), Human Rights in Swedish Foreign Policy, Govt Comm. 2007/08:109 (2008), to name a few<sup>7</sup>.

This review of selected investments in Vietnam and Cambodia used the 7 broader strategic policy strategies (Section 3) which guided Swedish D/HR from 1998 to today. Eleven evaluation questions (devised by SADEV's team evaluating D/HR in Serbia, Guatemala, and Kenya) based on the 7 strategies were also used (see Appendix A<sup>8</sup>). A sample of 11 investments (2000 and 2010) in Vietnam and Cambodia were selected with assistance from Swedish Embassy personnel in the two Embassies.

This final section contains the triangulated results which include: Comparison of D/HR ODA using PD/AAA, General Conclusions, Lessons Learned/Recommendations and finally the Evaluation Criteria ratings for key OECD-DAC categories for D/HR.

The evaluators noted that Sweden's ODA in the two countries differs in delivery mechanisms i.e., Vietnam focussed on a long-term bilateral relationship between the two countries which slowly over time expanded to work with others, i.e., civil society, media, professional organizations, local government etc. while Cambodia used a multi-entry approach with those same actors while slowly engaging with the RGC over time. Both models comply with the PD agenda, particularly on ownership and harmonization, and with the AAA in expanding dialogue with civil society etc. Sweden's principled approach to ODA in Vietnam was compliant with the PD even before it was conceptualized and formalized. Given this compliance with the PD by Swedish ODA, the evaluators looked at **contributions** towards development results rather than trying to focus on finding evidence of attribution. For example, if one promotes harmonization it is more difficult to attribute development results to efforts of one development partner.

The evaluation concludes that the approach used by Sweden (i.e. compliance with PD and AAA) is evident in both countries. As Section 4.1 indicates, with respect to **Ownership**, Swedish support helped increase capacity and ownership by government and assisted in systemic strengthening in sectors including, to some extent, D/HR. Notwithstanding the 'special relationship' in Vietnam, in both countries **Alignment** has only been partially successful since weak local systems have made it difficult for Sweden to fully align investments with local policy frameworks. Neither country has strong policies in D/HR. **Harmonization** has shown progress through PBAs i.e. in rural development, but the need for development partners to retain direct accountability has not overcome aid fragmentation even though Sweden is a leader promoting harmonization. **Managing for Results** in D/HR could be stronger in both countries. **Mutual Accountability** is difficult in D/HR due to sensitivity but needs to be addressed. **Expanding the Dialogue** to CSOs and others is well done in Cambodia and beginning in Vietnam.

<sup>7</sup> Evaluation of Swedish Democracy and Human Rights Support, 2011-03-02

<sup>8</sup> These questions were slightly modified to ensure that they were appropriate for the country context. Both the both Embassies were consulted prior to their being used with respondent.

## 4.1 Swedish Models of D/HR ODA

<b>SWEDISH MODELS OF D/HR ODA IN VIETNAM AND CAMBODIA</b>		
Conclusions -Paris Declaration/AAA	‘Special Relationship’ developed over long-term leading to D/HR focus <b>( Vietnam)</b>	Multi-Leveled support for D/HR through multiple stakeholders with CSO focus <b>(Cambodia)</b>
1. Ownership	Support for GOV ownership from the outset has led to D/HR programming and policy influence	Strong support for local ownership from outset on D/HR and especially for local CSOs and increasingly RGC
2.Alignment	Alignment with changing GOV priorities over 45 years (from infrastructure, health and humanitarian assistance to economic reform) helped build the ‘special relationship’ which has led to input on sensitive D/HR issues.	Development partners including Sweden tried to align their investments on D/HR with the RGC but were only partially successful due to lack of trust of RGC systems. PSDD put out substantial effort to support the NCDD Secretariat.
3.Harmonization	Sweden led efforts towards harmonization in D/HR since the 1990s. Most recently, Sweden played a strong role leading 9 anti-corruption dialogues. They turned the leadership over to the UK for the 10 <sup>th</sup> meeting. Sweden also linked both anti-corruption and justice work with other donors. Harmonization effort within media sector through Media Coordination initiative (which began in 2009).	Sweden has worked to harmonize with other donors in supporting a variety of D/HR investments. For example, Sweden supported the PSDD project working in a basket fund with DFID and UNDP which were entrusted with the administration of PSDD from its beginning.
4.Managing for Results	Early Swedish development support demonstrated significant results in poverty reduction. It is early to show similar results in sensitive D/HR areas i.e. access to justice, media and anti-corruption but acceptance and activities are positive indicators.	Through such important investments in D/HR as the 6 investments reviewed, Sweden includes support for development of monitoring and evaluation and MIS systems which should improve managing for results as well as reporting on results.
5.Mutual Accountability	Although it is not easy due to the sensitive nature of D/HR subjects such as anti-corruption, both parties work hard to be mutually accountable. Change is slow but the ‘special relationship’ helps a lot.	Inclusion of joint monitoring indicators for many areas including HR/D, gender equality etc. in the National Strategic Development Plan has improved the possibility to improve mutual accountability.
6.Expanding the Dialogue (AAA)	As the ‘special relationship’ has evolved, Sweden has been able to support evolution of independent civil society orgs working on D/HR issues such as Towards Transparency (TT) and others.	Through Forum-Syd and Diakonia (Swedish Framework Organizations) and their work with national and local level CSOs, Sweden has supported many D/HR issues including legal aid, land disputes, gender equality etc.

## 4.2 General Conclusions:

### 1. Coherence with Swedish Policies and D/HR Interventions in Vietnam and Cambodia (1998 and 2012)

With respect to the extent of coherence between Swedish policies and D/HR interventions in Vietnam and Cambodia between 1998 and 2012, documents and evaluations reviewed, as well as interviews with Swedish Development officials and others in both countries, indicate that there is substantial coherence. (Please see Chapter 3 on Findings for verification)

### 2. Coherence in programming in Vietnam and Cambodia with the Seven Broader Policy Objectives for Swedish D/HR (1998 and 2012)

As described in detail in Chapter 3 on findings, there are challenges in each of the seven policy areas but overall, the preponderance of evidence from reports and evaluations reviewed and from interviews with 50 people in the two countries, is that the strengths and evidence of programming coherence is high in both Vietnam and Cambodia.

### 3. Extent to which context in Vietnam and Cambodia is reflected in D/HR support

In both countries, the programming has been well constructed to match the context. In Vietnam, as described in this report, Swedish support for primary concerns of Vietnam led to a ‘special relationship’ being built which allowed as progressive D/HR programming and policy input to the Government of Vietnam as possible for outsiders. In Cambodia, as described in this report, the context is different. Therefore the D/HR program is necessarily different. Cambodia has substantial civil society activity which has allowed Sweden to program through Swedish CSOs (Diakonia and Forum Syd) as well as to support organizations at many other levels including a research think tank (CDRI), an international HR organization (OHCHR), a local organization documenting human rights violations (DCCAM), and a government program (PSDD). Notwithstanding medium appetite by the RGC, this approach has responded well to the local context in Cambodia and led to some Swedish influence on D/HR.

### 4. Extent Swedish D/HR support has contributed to improved democracy and increased respect for human rights in Vietnam and Cambodia

Given the many challenges to democracy and human rights in both countries, as described in this report and many reports and evaluations and by interviewees, it is clear that Swedish support is viewed by local government officials, other donors, and CSOs as having made, and continuing to make, a significant contribution to improving the D/HR situation in both countries (but there remains a long way to go). From this short evaluation, it does appear that Sweden’s ODA in both Cambodia and Vietnam has been effectively absorbed by most of its partners and has not duplicated the support of other donors.

## 4.3 Lessons Learned/Recommendations

### 1. Relationships

**Lesson Learned:** Building a long term ‘special relationship’ based on mutual trust with another country, in this case Sweden with Vietnam, has the major

benefit for the development partner of being able to enter into dialogue about sensitive issues in D/HR that can lead to change.

**Recommendation:** Sweden should continue to focus its efforts on institutionalization of gains made in D/HR with the GOV (and CSOs), and continue to leverage up those gains by transferring responsibilities to like-minded donors. At the same time, to ensure maximum benefit from the ‘special relationship’, all respondents and documents reviewed see great benefit in Sweden maintaining a presence in sensitive D/HR areas i.e. access to justice, media, anti-corruption, and gender equality.

## 2. Multileveled Approach

**Lesson Learned: Lesson Learned:** Sweden’s multileveled approach working with a variety of types of partners (wide range of CSOs, think tank, documentation center, multilateral HR agency and the government) is a good way to leverage up the impact of interventions in D/HR as viewed by interviewees, evaluation and reports.

**Recommendation:** Sweden should continue to use its present multileveled approach supporting a wide range of key investments (as described above). To this range of partners, major effort should be placed on supporting D/HR at the institutional level i.e. RGC at Ministerial level, development of Cambodia National Human Rights Body which follows Paris Principles, and increased support for linkages among government, CSOs and private sector. Cambodia, being Chair of ASEAN in 2012, offers an opportunity to leverage all of this.

## 3. Being a Catalyst

**Lesson Learned:** Sweden’s role as a catalyst and facilitator, as demonstrated in both Vietnam and Cambodia, is appreciated by partners and allows Sweden to influence D/HR in both countries and, most certainly at the Senior Government level in Vietnam.

**Recommendation:** Build on Sweden’s positive reputation in Vietnam (and to a lesser extent in Cambodia) and its long term implementation of partner-driven development principles, to increase D/HR role as a networker linking donors, governments and CSOs in each country and at ASEAN to promote D/HR.

## 4. Future D/HR Programming

**Lesson Learned:** Future D/HR programming should use lessons learned in Vietnam and Cambodia—building deep relationships through long term commitment in Vietnam and developing a multileveled programming approach in Cambodia.

**Recommendation:** Sweden’s future D/HR programming in other countries/regions should be influenced by lessons learned in Vietnam (placing serious effort on building a deep relationship and working with partner countries on a long term basis) and Cambodia (where multileveled partners carry out activities which complement each other, and contribute to achieving the same D/HR goals). This approach, linked with harmonization with other donors, should leverage up the value of Swedish funding.

## 4.4 Evaluation Criteria Ratings

### Summary Evaluation Criteria Ratings<sup>9</sup> AusAID Criteria for Rating OECD-DAC Categories

Evaluation Criteria	Explanation	Rating (1-6)
Relevance	Sida project results reviewed in both Vietnam and Cambodia are relevant to the Swedish mandate of supporting HR/D and gender equality. These projects support national priorities by providing their government and other stakeholders i.e., CSOs with needed capacity building, technical assistance and programme support appropriate to their contexts and relevant to the stated needs of local partners and beneficiaries.	-
	The <b>Vietnam</b> - Sweden <i>special relationship</i> placed Sweden in the role of trusted advisor, facilitator and catalyst in the key thematic areas of: Poverty Reduction, Anti-Corruption, and Capacity-Development (i.e., of Journalists, Media, Justice Sector Support, Local Participation in Governance, etc.). A good example of how this relationship has helped shape the dialogue is the Chia Se (Phase 1 and 2) poverty alleviation programme operating in three provinces which have some of the highest levels of poverty in Vietnam. The program, which builds on GoV approaches to poverty reduction, is designed to have an impact on national policies and initiatives and facilitate the GoV system at local levels (mainly commune and district) to apply the LDFs and LPMD tool for planning and management of all the government development resources at such levels. This program has been called innovative and has promoted the Paris Declaration Agenda's ownership criteria as well.	5
	In <b>Cambodia</b> , where there has not been an opportunity to develop this type of relationship, Swedish ODA is more 'traditional'. However, the Swedish ODA in the country also strives to live up to the Paris Declaration in projects dedicated to: Decentralization and De-concentration, Local Governance, Civil Society Empowerment, Human Rights training, Media training etc. and in Sweden's leadership in promoting particularly local ownership and harmonization among donors.	4
Effectiveness	Sweden's ODA was overwhelmingly perceived as effective in achieving its objectives by the stakeholders who were met during the evaluation missions to both countries and in reading the documentation. This finding was verified in other evaluations of Swedish ODA in both countries.	-
	In <b>Vietnam</b> , it is clear that the so-called special relationship and the trust it has generated between these two nations has been the platform on which Sweden's ODA has built its success, and the reason it has been so effective. Thanks to this trusting relationship over a long period of cooperation (45 years), many effective and innovative programmes have been made possible, such as Chia Se and, Anti-Corruption and the Justice Initiative. All are very sensitive topics but not too problematic because of the trust built between the two countries: Vietnam and Sweden.	5
	In <b>Cambodia</b> , multi-entry points are used to deliver Swedish ODA – i.e. government, multilaterals, civil society networks and human rights and gender training programmes. The projects together are a good development strategy but do require more facilitation to achieve integration. Examples of Sweden's many partners in Cambodia are Forum Syd and DC-CAM. Forum Syd has worked in Cambodia since 1994 strengthening civil society efforts to improve <b>democracy and legal rights</b> with an emphasis on human rights. Form Syd works closely with the natural resources sector, mostly working to counter land-grabbing and violations of civil and political rights. According to the WB, 80% of all landowners in Cambodia lack legal property rights. DC-CAM supports justice after the genocide including gathering information on war crimes and supporting war crimes trials.	4
Efficiency	N/A	-
Impact	N/A	-

<sup>9</sup> Of the OECD DAC's five basic criteria for evaluating development cooperation (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability), the evaluation of Vietnam and Cambodia primarily applied the *relevance* and the *effectiveness* criteria. The *efficiency* criteria was not applied as the intention of this evaluation is not to look at the cost-benefit aspects of the development interventions, but rather to look at the results more broadly in the area of democracy and human rights. Sustainability is also touched about.

Evaluation Criteria	Explanation	Rating (1-6)
Sustainability	Sustainability was not meant to be central to this evaluation. There are a few key points that can be made in terms of Swedish ODA in Vietnam and Cambodia but with a stronger emphasis on Vietnam, where the issue of legacy and sustainability is most pressing.	-
	In <b>Vietnam</b> , continued efforts to transfer the extensive knowledge gained from years of development cooperation into local institutions is a priority, particularly since Sweden plans to change the nature of its development assistance to partner-driven initiatives. The transition has been difficult for the GoV to accept since they are not close to other development partners. It is important that this transition process (which has already begun) continues and is strengthened to ensure continuity and sustainability. Sweden has already stepped back from lead donor on a number of important projects: i.e., Anti-Corruption, Justice Sector Reform, and Reduction, to name a few and has encouraged the leadership of other donors, i.e., DfID for the Anti-Corruption Initiative and Denmark for the Access to Justice Initiative. In doing so however Sweden still champions these initiatives behind the scenes. There is an openness that would not have been possible without the approach taken by Sweden to build relationships over the long term and lay the groundwork for sustainability. It is truly a unique case study in the annals of international development work.	5
	In <b>Cambodia</b> , institutionalization is also necessary for sustainability. This is being achieved primarily through work with on the ground partnerships in Cambodia as opposed to a close relationship with the RGC.. In Cambodia it is important to try and forge a closer relationship with the central Government but this will take time. The programme in Cambodia has many promising elements from the PSDD decentralization and de-concentration program which works with the RGC and local commune governments as well as a cadre of other donors to ensure better participation in governance at all levels of government. Working with the RGC to design the mechanism for accountability and transparency will help to transform governance in Cambodia. In addition work with Forum Syd and Diakonia is sustainable because they build the capacity of local CSOs which implement projects focused on election freedom, human rights, natural resources, climate change, legal aid, women's rights etc. These partners are the owners of these initiatives and receive support from Forum Syd and Diakonia through core support and technical assistance. Reports state that the cooperation between Sida, Forum Syd and Diakonia in Sida's ongoing support to Cambodian Civil Society is working well, which is in line with Sweden's policies for global development. The ability of CSOs to defend the interests of their members seems to have developed as a result of improved contacts between communities facing similar problems, closer cooperation with national NGOs, and increased donor interest in the work of these groups.	4
Gender Equality (and other Cross cutting issues)	Sweden's programming is responsive to a wide range of cross cutting issues. Specifically re gender equality, there is little criticism of Sida's approach. Gender mainstreaming is used in all Sida programming. In fact, gender equality is an integral part of its definition of D/HR programming. Indeed the correct heading is: Democracy, Human Rights (D/HR) and Gender Equality.	-
	In <b>Vietnam</b> , the programme has a strong gender equality slant. Gender is mainstreamed in all projects reviewed. In local governance and justice initiatives, it is obvious the point is to involve women in governance (particularly vulnerable, ethnic minority, and rural women). Women are also encouraged to participate in governance at higher levels of government. Sida supports increased participation of women in political decision making through supporting the Centre for Education, Promotion and Empowerment of Women (CEPEW) which does advocacy work including public discussions on rights-based issues. However, much work remains to be done especially in rural areas and among certain ethnic groups with high incidences of violence against women.	5
	In <b>Cambodia</b> , Sida has support Gender Equality and the relevant TWG (which has its own gender equality indicators). Thanks to the PSDD project, more women than ever before have been involved at the local commune level in politics. Many women are also part of women parliamentary strengthening initiatives.	5
Monitoring & Evaluation	The 2010 DAC Review applauds Sweden for moving forward with results based approaches to managing results. The fact is that some initiatives in both countries have good RBM indicators while others require more work. Thus M & E is somewhat uneven and requires further assistance.	4

Rating scale: 6 = very high quality; 1 = very low quality. Below 4 is less than satisfactory

## Appendices

### APPENDIX A – Table 1: Evaluation Questions

**TABLE 1: Evaluation Questions (Sub-questions may be added after the context & desk reviews)**

EQ on the consistency of policies, strategies and operations
1. To what extent have cooperation strategies at country level been consistent with policies?
2. To what extent has operations (the Swedish D/HR support, development interventions) been consistent with the cooperation strategies?
3. To what extent has operations (development interventions) been consistent with policies?
EQ on results per sector and total D/HR-support
4. To what extent has Swedish D/HR support contributed to <b>freedom of expression</b> , including independent media and access to information?
5. To what extent has Swedish D/HR support contributed to developments of democratic <b>procedures and institutions</b> for <i>decision making</i> , including electoral processes, political parties and parliaments?
6. To what extent has Swedish D/HR support contributed to improvements in the areas of democratic, accountable and efficient <b>public administration</b> at all levels, including public financial management and anti-corruption?
7. To what extent has Swedish D/HR support contributed to improvements in <b>rule of law</b> and the legal sector, including equal access to justice?
8. To what extent has Swedish D/HR support contributed to strengthening <b>civil society</b> , including social movements and interest groups such as watch dog organisations, as well as relations between civil society and the state?
9. To what extent has Swedish D/HR support contributed to improvements in the areas of <b>gender equality</b> , including women’s participation in political processes and human rights of women?
10. To what extent has Swedish D/HR support contributed to <b>general human rights situation</b> , including national HR Commissions, HR ombudsmen and HR defenders for the support of all rights (emphasis on rights of children, people with disabilities, and LGBT persons)?
11. To what extent has Swedish D/HR support contributed to improved <b>democracy and increased respect for human rights</b> ?

## APPENDIX B - Table 2: Coverage of Sida's sub-sectors

**Table 2.** Coverage of Sida's sub-sectors in the three original case studies + the Two case studies in SE Asia<sup>10</sup>

	Guatemala	Kenya	Serbia	Cambodia	Vietnam
Public administration					
Public financial management					
Decentralisation, reg./local democracy					
Anti-corruption					
Justice sector					
Civil society					
Elections					
Parliament and political parties					
Media & free flow of information					
Human rights					
Gender equality					
Culture and recreation					
Statistical capacity development					

<sup>10</sup> This table was taken from Evaluation of Swedish Democracy and Human Rights Support (Revised Project Document 2011-03-02). It is slightly revised to reflect some areas of coverage in Cambodia and Vietnam



## APPENDIX C - Interviewees

### Cambodia

1. Karl-Anders Larsson, Counsellor/Economist, Swedish Embassy
2. Anette Dahlstrom, First Secretary, Human Rights
3. Erik Wallin, First Secretary, Democratic Governance
4. Asa Thomasson, Regional Director, SE Asia, Forum Syd
5. Nhek Sarin, Programme Manager, Forum Syd
6. James Heenan, Deputy Representative, Cambodia Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
7. Touch Huan, Assistant to the Representative, Cambodia Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
8. Joakim Anger, Senior Consultant, Indevlop
9. Scott Leiper, Program Management Consultant, National Committee for Sub-national Democratic Development (NCDD) Secretariat
10. Ouk Vandeth, Country Director, International Bridges to Justice (IBJ)
11. Philip Courtnadge, Advisor, Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board, Council for the Development of Cambodia, RGC
12. Larry Strange, Executive Director, CDRI (Cambodia Development Research Institute)
13. UNG Sirn Lee, Director of Operations, CDRI
14. KIM Sedara, Senior Research Fellow/Advisor, CDRI
15. HENG Seiha, Research Associate, Democratic Governance and Public Sector Reform Programme, CDRI
16. THON Vimealea, Research Associate, Democratic Governance and Public Sector Reform Programme, CDRI
17. Martin Gemzell, Director, Diakonia, Cambodia
18. Arthur Delvecchio, Advisor, VBNK, Phnom Penh
19. Doug Broderick, UNDP Resident Representative, Cambodia
20. YOUK Chhang, Chairman, Documentation Center of Cambodia (DCCAM)
21. Farina So, Team Leader of Cham Muslim oral history and author of the Hijab of Cambodia
22. Khamboly Dy, Team Leader of Genocide Education and author of a History of Democratic Kampuchea
23. Vanthan Peou Dara, Deputy Director in charge of legal affairs
24. Bunthan Meas, Chief Accountant and responsible for Endowment
25. Ratanak Leng, Team Leader of Film project
26. Dany Long, Team Leader of promoting accountability (PA)
27. Soheat Nhean, Team Leader of magazine Searching for the Truth
28. Pechet Men, Team Leader of Victim Participation Project and Trial Observation
29. Sophorn Huy, Director of Finance
30. Sayana Ser, Team Leader of student outreach and Tuol Sleng museum
31. Sok-Kheang Ly, Team Leader of Living Documents

## Vietnam

1. Marie Ottosson, Minister, Deputy Head of Mission, Swedish Embassy
2. Mong Thi Chien, Administrative Assistant, Development Cooperation
3. Pham Thi Ngan Hoa, Programme Officer – Environment and Climate Change, Development Cooperation - Chia Se Poverty Alleviation Program
4. Nguyen Thi Phuong Nga, Programme Officer – Environment and Climate Change, Development Cooperation Section, - Chia Se Poverty Alleviation Program
5. Anh Nguyen Hong, Programme Officer – Good Governance – Anti-corruption and Legal and Judicial Reform
6. Ms. Phuong, Programme Officer – Good Governance – Legal and Judicial Reform
7. Carol Backman – First Secretary, Development Cooperation Section
8. Dung Ngo Thi Phuong, Programme Officer – Good Governance (Media)
9. Mr. Do Suan Thong, Former desk officer for Sweden and retired Head of European Section, Foreign Economic Relations Department (FERD), Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI) (Anh acted as interpreter)
10. Vanessa Vega Saenz, Counselor, Governance, Embassy of Denmark
11. Le Thi Thu Ha, Senior Programme Manager, Embassy of Denmark
12. Dr. Ta Thi Minh Ly, General Director, Ministry of Justice, National Legal Aid Agency
13. Nguyen Nhat Huy, Expert, Ministry of Justice, International Cooperation Department
14. Vu Thi Thu, Project Officer, Ministry of Justice
15. Dr. Tran Duc Luong, Deputy Inspector General, Senior Inspector, Government Inspectorate of Vietnam
16. Trinh Nhu Hoa, Head of Multilateral Cooperation Division, Government Inspectorate of Vietnam, Department of International Cooperation
17. Nguyen Xuan Son, Head of Division on UNCAC Implementation, Government Inspectorate of Vietnam, Anti-Corruption Bureau
18. Drew Smith, Head of Aid, Counselor (Development) Embassy of Canada
19. Giao Vu Cong, PhD, Vietnam National University Hanoi – School of Law and Research Center for Human and Citizen’s Rights

## APPENDIX D - Communication Strategy

### *Communication Table*

<b>-Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV)</b>	Mid -November –(throughout the evaluation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contract signature and evaluation kick-off meetings and <b>agreement on communication strategy</b></li> <li><b>-Arrangements by SADEV for preliminary meetings with MFA and Sida in both Cambodia and Vietnam prior to the consultants contacting or meeting them.</b></li> <li>- Discussion with AusAID re quality assurance</li> <li>-Discussion on documentary evidence and gather and use of data available in each country</li> <li>- Ongoing communication with SADEV</li> </ul>
<b>-Meeting with MFA and Sida (In Cambodia)</b>	Late –November and early December	<b>-Introductions made by SADEV and meetings established (in both countries prior to consultant contact) and ongoing communication and follow-up<sup>11</sup></b>
<b>-Meeting with MFA and Sida (In Vietnam)</b>	Early January	
<b>-Other Development Donors and Stakeholders</b>	Late –November	-Through Swedish embassies and local contacts in each country
<b>-SADEV and consultants</b>	Mid-November-through mid-January	-Establish communication plan with SADEV to share information and communicate on issues and opportunities in the field etc.

<sup>11</sup> . Representatives from the Swedish Embassy (MFA) and SIDA in both Cambodia and Vietnam were interviewed as planned.

**APPENDIX E - Documents/Sources (Selections only)**

Category	Title
Cambodia	<p>Grant Assessment – Cambodia Development Resource Institute (“CDRI”) 2011 - 2015</p> <p>Final Evaluation of “Project to Support Democratic Development through Decentralization and De-concentration (PSDD)” Final Report 11 November 2010</p> <p>Partner Driven Cooperation: Protection of LGBT rights through development of representative organization of LGBT in Vietnam submitted to: The Embassy of Sweden in Hanoi on: September 20, 2010 for period: 1 October 2010 – 31 December 2012</p> <p>PSGR COUNTRY CASE STUDY Public Sector Governance Reform in Cambodia, 2001-2010: What has been learnt?</p> <p>Phase Two Evaluation of the Paris Declaration December 2010</p> <p>Sida Evaluation: Sida’s Regional Strategy for Cooperation with South East Asia, 2005–2009</p> <p>Country Programme Document for Cambodia (2011-2015)</p> <p>MID-TERM REVIEWS OF SIDA’S SUPPORT TO CIVIL SOCIETY IN CAMBODIA THROUGH FORUM SYD AND DIAKONIA 2007–2009</p> <p>Mid term review of Sida’s core support to the Cambodia Development Resources Institute (CDRI) Final report March 2009</p> <p>CAMBODIA DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE INSTITUTE PROGRESS REPORT TO SIDA and DFID January - December 2008</p> <p>Democratic Governance and Public Sector Reform Unit Activity Report No. 2 to DFID and SIDA Kéchnay programme, January – December 2008</p> <p>Democratic Governance and Public Sector Reform Unit Activity Report No. 2 to DFID and SIDA January – December 2008</p> <p>Cooperation strategy for development cooperation with Cambodia, 2008–2010 May 2008</p>
Vietnam	<p>Sida Vietnam Report Final 2011</p> <p>Assessment Memo: Strategic intervention: “Supporting the Government of Vietnam Visioning process and setting the road map for visioning” December 2011</p> <p>Assessment Memo: Vietnam Anti-Corruption Initiative Program – For a Corruption-free New Day! May 2011</p> <p>Programme Document Justice Partnership Programme Vietnam 2010-2015</p> <p>Assessment Memo: Swedish contribution to Chia Se Poverty Alleviation Programme – 2nd phase, 2009 – 2012</p> <p>TI Vietnam Programme “Strengthening Anti Corruption Demands from Government, Private sector and Society, 2009-2012” Progress Report Reporting Period: March – August 2011</p> <p>Final Report on the Interim Programme M&amp;E Framework November 2010</p> <p>Partner Driven Cooperation: Protection of LGBT rights through development of representative organization of LGBT in Vietnam September 2010</p> <p>Assessment on the support to the Centre for Education, Promotion and Empowerment of Women (CEPEW) August 2010</p> <p>PROJECT "SUPPORT TO THE MEDIA TRAINING CENTER (MTC) IN THE PHASE 2010-2013"</p> <p>General Comments to 2nd phase of Chia Se Poverty Alleviation Programme. 2009</p> <p>SPECIFIC AGREEMENT BETWEEN SWEDEN AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM ON SUPPORT TO THE SECOND PHASE OF “CHIA SE” VIETNAM – SWEDEN POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMME DURING 2009 - 2011</p> <p>Assessment Memo: Assessment of the proposed National Training Program on Management for Vietnamese Media Leaders 2010-2013</p> <p>Assessment Memo: Phase 2 of Support to NGO CSAGA and their work in defending LGBT –rights and involving men in gender based violence prevention.</p> <p>Assessment Memo: Joint Partnership Programme – Access to justice for all. 2009</p> <p>Assessment Memo: Joint Partnership Programme – Swedish contribution to Chia Se Poverty Alleviation Programme – 2nd phase, 2009 – 2012</p>