



Annex 3: 2016 PIR Generic Offline Template

Basic Data / Basic Project & Finance Data

Basic Project Information

PIMS ID	4546
Project Title	Promotion of Non-fired Brick Production and Utilization in Viet Nam

Project Contact Information

Role	Name	Email Address
Project Implementing Partner	Ministry of Science and Technology	ndhau@most.gov.vn
Is the Project Implementing Partner a civil society organization/non-governmental organization?	No	
Project Manager/Coordinator	Do Giao Tien	dogiaotien@most.gov.vn
UNDP Country Office Programme Officer	Vu Thi Thu hang	vu.thi.thu.hang@undp.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP)	Do Nam Thang	dnthang@monre.gov.vn
Other Partners		

Terminal PIR

Is this the terminal PIR that will serve as the final project report?	No
--	----

General Comments on Basic Data

Please insert additional comments not explained above.

Development Objective Progress / Progress Toward Development Objectives

Objective/Outcome	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Target of year 1 (as Project Document And Inception Report)	Level at 30 June 2016
Objective: Reduce the annual growth rate of GHG emissions by displacement of fossil fuel use and the usage of good quality soil for brick making through the increased production, sale and utilization of non-fired bricks (NFBs) in Viet Nam	Cumulative direct and direct post-project CO2 emission reductions resulting from the NFB plant investments and technical assistance by EOP, Mtons CO2.	0	0.088 (This is the direct emission reduction during the course of the 5-year Project.) 1.270 (This is the direct post-project emission reduction from NFB plants that received technical assistance from Project Output 4.9 during Years 4 and 5 to be implemented after EOP.)	0	1500 tons CO2 S
	Cumulative direct energy saving (TOE) from displacement of coal through the demonstration NFB plants (3 CBB plants and one AAC plant) by EOP	0	30.782	0	323,4 toe S
Outcome 1: Approval and enforcement of an improved legal framework to encourage NFB production and use, and enhanced government capacity and knowledge to regulate NFB development and usage	Number of approved and enforced policies to encourage the increase in the production and usage of NFBs and decrease the use of FCBs by EOP	0	10	0	1 S
	Number of policies and standards developed for the local manufacture of NFB equipment and technology that are approved and enforced	0	3	0	0

Objective/Outcome	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Target of year 1 (as Project Document And Inception Report)	Level at 30 June 2016
	Number of developed regulations, building standards and codes governing the use of NFBs in the construction sector that are approved and enforced by Year 3	1	3	1	1
	Number of developed standards on energy efficiency and emissions reduction in NFB production that are approved and enforced by Year 3	0	2	0	0
	Number of trained government officers in NFB quality control standards and regulations and new building codes mandating the use of NFBs by EOP	0	100 (Assumes 10 officers trained in each of the 10 provinces.)	20 0	0
	Number of NFB plants that are compliant to new NFB quality control regulations and standards by EOP	0	6	0	0
	Number of building projects that are using new building codes that define and mandate the use of NFBs by EOP	0	6	0	0
Outcome 2: Increased availability of technically skilled and qualified local service providers for NFB plants, and enhanced stakeholder knowledge on NFB usage.	Number of new NFB plants that were designed and constructed by local engineering firms based on new NFB technical guidelines by EOP	0	6	0	0
	Number of local firms that can manufacture NFB plant equipment based on set standards developed under this project by Year 2	0	1	0	0
	Number of building developers and owners that use of NFBs as building construction material by EOP	0	300	0	0

Objective/Outcome	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Target of year 1 (as Project Document And Inception Report)	Level at 30 June 2016
	Number of visitors to NFB website and facilitation center at VABM by EOP	0	1000	200	0
Outcome 3: Improved availability and sustained access to financial support for NFB technology applications	Number of financing institutions providing financial products for NFB investments	0	63	0	1
	Number of SMEs and NFB entrepreneurs with confirmed financing through Project financial schemes by EOP	0	10	0	1
Outcome 4: Boosted confidence in NFB technology application resulting in an increased market share of NFBs	Number of operational NFB demonstration plants in operation with a 90% capacity factor by Year 3	0	3	0	2
	Number of AAC facilities with production at a 90% capacity factor by Year 3	0	1	0	0
	Cumulative annual production of NFBs from 3 NFB demonstration plants in Vietnam by EOP (SBUs)	0	65 million	0	6.7 million SBU
	MJ/standard brick unit (energy intensity) of CBB manufacture from demonstration NFB plants by EOP	3.554	0.455 (hollow bricks) 0.675 (solid bricks)	3689	1.047 ???
	MJ/standard brick unit (energy intensity) of AAC bricks by EOP	3.554	1.284	3689	3689
	Number of NFB plants with feasibility studies completed with technical assistance of Project associated consultants by EOP	0	24 (This assumes an average production rate of 20 million SBUs per CBB plant, and 100 million SBUs per AAC plant.	0	0

Objective/Outcome	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Target of year 1 (as Project Document And Inception Report)	Level at 30 June 2016
			GHG reductions from these potential projects will be counted as direct post-project emissions.)		
	Number of NFB plants that are planned by EOP	0	50 (This includes entrepreneurs who have expressed interest to VABM to develop an NFB plant but who will not have completed a feasibility study during the Project; as such, the GHGs from these developments will be counted as indirect (bottom up replication))	0	0
	% of market share of NFBs in the local brick market by EOP	13 (This is market share of NFBs in 2011 from MoC and VABM)	25 (This market share should include the 2.08 billion SBU productions from 72 NFB plants (20 with feasibility studies done during Project, and another 30 where entrepreneurs have expressed interest to VABM on implementing) that are planned in Years 4 and 5 of the Project, and implemented after the EOP)	13	18 % ¹

¹ Estimation by Experts VIBM and VABM

Development Objectives Rating

<p>Project Manager / Coordinator is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year? Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided? Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes? If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.). <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
	<p>Highly satisfactory</p> <p>After one year from Inception Workshop 29 May 2015, Project is under progressive implementation with 20/27 outputs of all 4 components are being implemented including one output completed. Project’s Implementation is following strategy set in project document and by Inception Report.</p> <p>All 25 indicators are updated to the end of June 2016 and compliant with project document and Inception report (2015); with 9/25 (36%) indicators achieve higher target than that of Year 1. The project fail to achieve the year 1 target for indicator “Number of visitors to NFB website and facilitation center at VABM” since the upgrade of VABM website will be implemented in 2016.</p> <p>Below is the summary of achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.</p> <p>1) Component 1: Policy support for non-fired brick (NFB) technology development with Outcome 1: During the reporting period, the Project has achieved the following results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + A draft on legal framework to enhance NFB usage and production has been prepared for getting comments from Provinces, S&T institutes, Universities, technical service firms etc. + 4 policies have been prepared for approval by 4 provinces as results of technical assistance provided to 10 provinces to prepare and approve the planning/plan/policies to promote NFB and reduce Fired clay bricks production and use. + Inputs provided for a newly chapter on green building materials which is stipulated in the revised Decree 24a/2016/ND-CP on Building Management.

+ A “Framework of Science & Technology tasks and Framework of standards & building codes” has been proposed with 9 national product standards and 6 national standards on NFB use including Standards on design and construction of works using NFB for implementation in 2016-2017.

2) Component 2: Technical capacity building on NFB technology application and operation and use of NFB products

During the reporting period, a comprehensive training program has been developed, this including training activities of 4 project components.

- Training need assessment has been made;
- 5 modules has been identified:
 - Module 1: PNFB-1: Introduction (basic knowledge) of NFB, policy and standards;
 - Module 2: PNFB-2: Design and construction of works using NFBs;
 - Module 3: PNFB-3: Production technology of autoclaved aerated concrete brick (AAC);
 - Module 4: PNFB-4: Production technology of Concrete Block Brick (CBB);
 - Module 5: PNFB-5: Investment planning of NFB project.
- Training materials of 3 modules has been prepared:
PNFB-1: Basic knowledge on NFB, policy and standards;
PNFB-4: NFB concret block technology
PNFB-5: investment Planning and loan documents;
- Training plan for 2 years 2016-2017 with 15 training courses prepared for being implemented during late 2016 and 2017

3) Component 3: Sustainable financing support for NFB technology application.

Following results have been achieved

- A Report on Recommendations and Findings on available financing sources for NFB investments;
- Guidelines on Loan Guarantee applications for NFB investors issued by National Fund for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED)
- Guidelines on Loan applications for NFB Investors issued by Viet Nam Environment Protection Fund (VEPF).
- Guideline on Loan Guarantee and energy awards issued by (Low Carbon Transition in Energy Efficiency Sector) LCEE project for NFB Projects.
- 01 demo project investor have received soft loan (3.5% interest/year) from VEPF.

4) Component 4: NFB technology application, investment and replication with following key results

- 3 demo projects has been selected and provided technical assistance for implementation of 2 demo projects on Concrete Bricks. 02 Feasibility Reports prepared; 02 demo project implemented.
- Operation of 02 demo project has produced 6,7 million SBU, that contributed to GHG emission reduction 1500 tons of CO₂, and 323 toe energy saving.
- 01 Workshop was conducted to advocate demo project performance and using NFB in 3 buildings with 100 participants and about 20 media agencies that provided information on success of NFB production technology application and NFB utilization to public.

<p>UNDP Country Office Programme Officer is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year? Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided? Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes? If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.). <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating, for example, if your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
	<p>High Satisfactory</p> <p>During the reporting period, most of the project results and targets are fully achieved. Some of the results exceed the set target such as cumulative direct and direct post-project CO2 emission reductions resulting from the NFB plant investments and technical assistance by EOP, Mtons CO2. There is only one indicator on visitor to project's website that the project did not meet the target but the activity is on track and under preparation for being implemented in late 2016.</p> <p>The project is on track toward achievement of project outcomes, annual targets and EOP targets to contribute to the global GHG emission reduction benefits.</p> <p>There are risks that affect the delivery of the project's outcomes in a timely manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of support from committed financial institution: Vietinbank who committed to co-finance 21.2 million was not keen to participate in the project and provide loans to NFB investors. The project has worked with other banks or funding source like LECC or Bank for Investment and Development of Viet Nam (BIDV) to explore the potential collaboration. - Unavailability of international expertise on Non-fired bricks that caused delays in implementation of training and demonstration activities: The project failed to identify and source qualified international expertise to support the implementation and improvement of NFB standards and NFB technology. The PMU and UNDP have been seeking for help from national institutions and regional office to reach out potential ones. The PMU will also explore the possibility of collaboration with relevant international institutions to fill the gaps of international expertise.
	<p>HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.</p>

<p>GEF Operational Focal point is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.</p>	<p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year? Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided? Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes? If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.). <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. <p>[DO rating in 2016]</p> <p>[comments]</p>
<p>Project Implementing Partner is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for projects under implementation in one country and regional projects.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year? Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided? Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes? If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.). <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. <p>[DO rating in 2016]</p> <p>[comments]</p>
<p>Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for jointly implemented projects.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p>

<p>the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year? Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided? Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes? If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.). <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps.
	<p>[DO rating in 2016]</p>
	<p>[comments]</p>
<p>UNDP Technical Adviser is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year? Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided? Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes? If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.). <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating (do not repeat the project objective). 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
	<p>[DO rating in 2016] - Satisfactory</p>
	<p>The 5-year NFB Project is now in its 1st year of implementation and this PIR 2016 report is its first PIR report. At the Goal/Objective level, on reducing the annual growth rate of GHG emissions by displacement of fossil fuel use and the usage of good quality soil for brick making through the increased production, sale and utilization of non-fired bricks (NFBs), 1,500 tons CO₂ cumulative direct and direct post-project CO₂ emission reductions (vs. target= 0 in Year 1) resulting from the NFB plant investments and technical assistance. The project also reported a cumulative direct energy savings of 323.4 toe from displacement of coal (vs. target = 0 for Year 1) through the demonstration of the design and operation of NFB plants (in 3 CBB plants and one AAC plant). This portrays a positive trend and momentum established</p>

at the early stage of the project. For this, the rating for the Goal/Objective is a conservative Satisfactory (S).

For Component 1 (Policy support for non-fired brick (NFB) technology development), the project produced 1 approved and enforced policy to encourage the increase in the production and usage of NFBs and decrease the use of FCBs and 1 set of regulations building standards and codes governing the use of NFBs in the construction sector that are approved and enforced. In this case, the DO Rating for Component 1 is Satisfactory (S).

For Component 2 (Technical capacity building on NFB technology application and operation and use of NFB products), the planned activities that will deliver the relevant outputs that will contribute to the realization of the expected outcome from this project component are still in the preparatory stage. In this regard, the DO Rating of Component 2 is Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

The DO rating for Component 3 (Sustainable financing support for NFB technology application) is Satisfactory (S). During the PIR 2016 reporting period, there was one financing institution (none targeted yet for Year 1) providing financial products for NFB investments and 2 SMEs and NFB entrepreneurs with confirmed financing through Project financial schemes (none targeted for Year 1).

Considering the levels of achievement in Component 4 (NFB technology application, investment and replication), the DO rating is Satisfactory (S). Among the accomplishments are: 2 operational NFB demonstration plants; 6.7 million SBU cumulative production of NFBs from 3 NFB demonstration plants; 1.047 MJ/SBU of CBB manufacture from demonstration NFB plants; and 18% market share (vs. 25% market share at EOP).

Thus far, the project framework (log frame) and the expected outputs for the first year of project implementation is still relevant and has been useful as guide in the implementation.

For the first year of project implementation, the critical risk that was highlighted was regarding operational aspect on the inability to source appropriate international expertise in a timely manner. This is one of the reasons for the delay in the delivery of the activities under Component 2 of the project.

Overall, the progress towards the achievement of the development objective of the project is rated Satisfactory (S). The project has achieved the momentum to produce the results early. Project is expected to achieve the target levels set in each of the project component to realize the agreed project outcomes that will collectively contribute to the achievement of the project objective. The performance during the first year if it will continue will ensure the realization of satisfactory global environmental benefits.

General comments on Development Objective Rating

--

Adjustments: evidence to support annual Implementation Progress Rating

Please complete all sections of this tab. **The IP Ratings on the next tab of this PIR should be informed by the inputs in the Adjustments tab.** The responses should also be used by the UNDP Country Office to complete the UNDP annual project quality assurance assessment during implementation; the questions under “Annual Project Quality Assurance Assessment” have been aligned with that system. If you have any general comments about the information in this section of the PIR, please note them at the bottom of this page. **Please upload the following documents as relevant on the approve/submit tab: project board meeting minutes; stakeholder consultation documents; lessons learned and other knowledge management materials.**

Annual Project Quality Assurance Assessment

Project Governance	
Are at least 40 percent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?	Yes: Project management Unit with 40 % of staff are female.
Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period (30 June 2015 to 1 July 2016)	May 14 th , 2015 (First meeting of PSC) January 13 th , 2016 (second meeting of PSC)
Did the Project Board function as intended this reporting period?	Yes.
Please add any comments on project governance.	Project steering Committee has considerable contribution to Project implementation by fulfilling the following tasks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on Approved Project Document and AWP, PSC give guidance on project implementation to ensure consistency with Project Document, and effectively coordinate with partners. - Mobilizing the active participation and contribution of co-financing of stakeholders and partners to project implementation. - Approving the AWP and APPR. - Monthly, NPD report to Chairperson of PSC the main issues of project implementation and get his endorsement on target task or event.
Annual Work Planning	
Have project inputs been procured and delivered on time and budget this reporting period?	Yes
Will the project be able to close on time as planned?	Yes
Please add any comments on annual work planning	Project worked closely with stakeholders and UNDP to develop the draft annual work plan. The draft work-plan then were presented to and approved by Steering Committee member. For Annual work plan 2015, Terms of Reference of

	some activities/outputs had not been prepared and got agreement with UNDP prior to the development of the AWP, this affected to delivery and implementation of AWP.
Stakeholder engagement and target groups	
Please discuss how stakeholders and target groups were directly engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project this reporting period.	(no more than 200 words) - Project management Unit conducted consultation meetings with relevant stakeholders on monthly basis and whenever needed, this including MOC, Institute of Building Materials, Institute of Science and Technology for Construction, National University of construction and others. - PMU conducted survey and visit to demo site, to NFB factories, to NFB equipment manufacturers to discuss and find out the measures to improve project implementation and inputs to project implementation. - PMU worked closely Provincial Departments of Construction to set up cooperation and mobilizing target group’s participation in the project activities such as identification of potential demo projects, replication projects, target groups for training courses, participants to Workshop etc... -PMU signed cooperation agreement with demo project investors to identify responsibility of each party and timeframe of activities for coordination.
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	
Please discuss how the project M&E Plan was implemented and used to support effective project management this reporting period (e.g. please consider whether progress data against the indicators in the project results framework was reported using credible data sources and collected according to the M&E plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant; whether lesson learned were used to take corrective actions as necessary; whether evaluations were conducted following the UNDP-GEF guidance available at www.undp.erc.org; and other issues as relevant).	- PMU conducted survey and study visit to demo sites, to NFB production factories, to NFB equipment manufacturers to discuss and find out the measures to improve project implementation and at the same time to evaluate the progress of activities and make adjustment if needed. - PMU reviewed reports made by local consultants are evaluated by project senior technical Adviser, national building material Expert, or by local experts. All comments were sent back to consultants for improvement.
Social & Environmental Standards	
Were any new social and environmental impacts and risks identified this reporting period?	Yes/No
Please discuss how social and environmental impacts and risks were managed this reporting period, as relevant.	(no more than 200 words)

Project Planning

If delays have occurred in reaching key projects milestones - the inception workshop, the Mid-term Review and/or the Terminal Evaluation - then note below the current status of that milestone, the original planned and actual/expected dates, and comments to explain the reasons for the delays and their implications.

Key Project Milestone	Status (pick one option below)	Original Planned Date	Actual/Expected Date	Comments including reasons for delays and their implications
Inception Workshop	On schedule	May 2015	May 2015	N/A
Mid-term Review	on schedule	N/A	May 2017	N/A
Terminal Evaluation	on schedule	N/A	August 2019	N/A
Project Closure	delayed/pending	June 2019	November 2019	The expected starting date as indicated in the ProDoc is July 2014. However, due to delay in Government approval of the project, the ProDoc was signed in November 2014.

Critical Risk Management

Select from below the **critical risks only** that appear in the **ATLAS project risk log and** briefly describe actions undertaken this reporting period to address each critical risk. Please ensure that any 'social' risks identified during the environmental and social screening of the project are reflected in the ATLAS risk log under type/description 'other'. Note that the total number of critical risks is used to calculate the overall risk rating of the project. The methodology to determine the overall risk rating is explained further on this page.

Current/Active Critical Risks (pick one option below; add rows as necessary)	Critical Risk Management Measures Undertaken in 2016
Operational risk (Inability to source appropriate international expertise in a timely manner).	Both UNDP and project team has consulted with UNDP regional technical advisor and national institution/government/enterprises respectively for recommendation of potential contacts for international expertise. The project then is able to identify qualified international experts on AAC training and expert on NFB standard and demonstration. The project team also discussed with national partners to identify alternative from qualified national sources in case there is no available qualified international expertise.

General comments on Adjustments

- Exclusion of Indicator “Number of officially approved and enforced regulatory framework mandating the replacement of fired clay brick kilns by Year 2” since the Decision No. 1469/QD-TTg dated 22/8/2014 on Planning of building materials Development to 2020 and with vision to 2030

has stipulated the timeframe for replacement of all kinds of old clamp kilns, the project will support the review and implementation of the timeframe for replacement

- Adjustment of Year 1 target of indicator “Number of trained government officers in NFB quality control standards and regulations and new building codes mandating the use of NFBs by EOP” Target for Year 1 is adjusted from 200 to 0 at the inception phase, however the EOP target is unchanged.
- Reducing the target for indicator “Number of financing institutions providing financial products for NFB investments” from 6 to 3 by EOP at the inception phase. In discussion with potential financial institutions during the inception phase, they were reluctant to provide loans/guarantees to NFB investors since there is very little trust by financial institutions in NFB investors due to experience in bad debts. With this baseline, and with the project’s intervention in enhancing the capacity of NFB investor and NFB market, the project can only expect the achievement of 3 instead of 6.

Implementation Progress Rating

Project Manager / Coordinator is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.

MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.

1. Please rate the **efficiency in delivery of outputs**. For example, in this reporting period, is project **delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan**? Is cumulative project delivery on track?
2. Please rate the quality of project **governance and project management**. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address **critical issues**? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board?
3. Please rate the quality of **risk management**. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,?
4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were **actions taken to address implementation issues** identified in the PIR last year?
5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation?

Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between **500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum**.

1. Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2. Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual work plans.
3. **Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness** of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.

Satisfactory

Project is under progressive implementing for the First Year. 20/27 outputs of all 4 components are being implemented including one output completed. Almost project's deliveries are on target with the Annual Work Plan. Cumulative project delivery is on track.

PMU signed a Letter of Agreement (LOA) with Ministry of Construction (Co-Implementing Partner) stipulating the responsibilities of MOC in implementing 5 outputs of Component 1 on policy intervention. PMU and CIP cooperated in recruiting National Consultants and work together on annual and quarterly work-plans, and undertake monthly meetings to review progress.

The PMU worked closely with the selected consultants through meetings, joint visits to stakeholders and selected enterprises in undertaking project activities.

The project conducted technical meetings or engaged external technical experts to review draft training materials submitted by consultants to ensure the quality of the products.

The project also conducted two workshops to share project's reports and results on financing component and demonstration projects, which receive high interest and participation by enterprises, financial institutions and mass media.

There is an operational risk of inability to get international expertise in NFB that caused delay in implementation of activities on training and NFB standards. The Project faced difficulties in identifying two international consultants during its early periods for development and implementation of training program and demonstration. In consultation with both UNDP technical advisor and national partners, local enterprises, the project team was finally able to engage 2 international consultants on AAC training and on NFB manufacturing demonstration and standards.

Based on approved AWP and quarterly work plans, Project Manager identifies monthly work plan and manage the work day by day, he conducts weekly PMU meeting on every Monday morning to identify issues and coordinate with stakeholders to solve. He coordinates with Partners to mobilize the inputs and co-financing.

Below is the summary of project expenditures:

Allocated resources	Approved budget (as in the originally approved AWP)	Actual budget (received as of 31 Dec /2015)			%
		NIP and CIP Viet Nam (based on the quarterly FACE forms)	UNCO/INGO	Total	
1	2	3	4	5	6= 5/2
Contribution of UN agency (USD):					
GEF	390,000	192,408		192,408	49.34%
Total:	390,000	192,408		192,408	49.34%
Government contribution:					
- In cash (VND):	450.000.000	421,353,450		421,353,450	93.63%
- In cash (USD):	20,136	18,855		18,855	93.63%
- In kind (VND):					
- In kind (USD):	15,000	15,000		15,000	
Total:	35,136	33,855		33,855	96.35%

UNDP Country Office Programme Officer is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.

MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.

1. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track?
2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board?
3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,?

4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year?
5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation?

Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.

1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why.
2. Summarize annual progress and address timeliness of project output/activity completion in relation to annual work plans.
3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.

Satisfactory

During the reporting period, the project is on track in delivering its outputs and expenditure as planned. The PMU managed close coordination with other partners like MOC, VABM, Viet Nam Institution of Building Materials, selected enterprises for demonstration and consultants in implementation of project activities. The Steering Committee duly provided guidance on project implementation through 2 meetings and through regular face to face/ad-hoc consultation by PMU.

There is smooth coordination between PMU and UNDP through regular (monthly and quarterly) meetings between UNDP PO and PMU to discuss project quarterly and annual work-plan, review project progress. Particularly, during the first months of project implementation, UNDP PO had weekly meetings with PMU staff to discuss operational matters and TORs of project activities. Besides, UNDP PO also had ad-hoc meetings with PMU to discuss and finalize TORs, review technical reports of the project. UNDP PO also monitor the project implementation through participation in workshop on results of NFB manufacturing demonstration and visits to demo site (Luu Xa company).

In terms of expenditures against 2015 annual budget, the delivery rate was at 50% of GEF fund. This was due to the fact that: i) the MOST was ambitious in delivering the project results; ii) the project was in its first years of implementation, it took time for drafting and finalizing the TORs particularly the one for training which cover all activities for the whole cycle of the project; iii) it also took time consult and get commitment from partners like financial institutions and NFB investors. For 2016 AWP, the project is on track in delivery activities and results as planned.

There is sufficient co-financing from national partners such as Government and NFB investors as committed to ensure the smooth operation of PMU office and implementation of all components of the project.

GEF Operational Focal point is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.

1. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track?
2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board?
3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,?

	<p>4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year?</p> <p>5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation?</p> <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. <p>[IP rating in 2016]</p> <p>[comments]</p>
<p>Project Implementing Partner is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? 2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board? 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,? 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation? <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. <p>[IP rating in 2016]</p> <p>[comments]</p>
<p>Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for jointly implemented projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? 2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board? 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,? 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation? <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. <p>[IP rating in 2016]</p> <p>[comments]</p>

<p>UNDP Technical Adviser is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? 2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board? 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,? 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation? <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the UNDP Country Office Programme Officer and/or the Project Manager please explain why. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual work plans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.
	<p>[IP rating in 2016] - Satisfactory</p>
	<p>For the PIR 2016 reporting period, the project was able to deliver the expected agreed outputs as stated in the 2015-2016 AWP. This created the necessary start-up momentum for the project implementation. The levels of achievement of some of the indicators were impressive. This manifests positive progress in the realization of the agreed and approved annual work plan. Almost all of the planned deliverables in the Annual Work Plan were realized. Cumulative project delivery is on track. In this regard, the efficiency of the delivery of outputs is rated Satisfactory (S).</p> <p>In terms of financial plan performance, based on the request budget in the 2015/2016 AWP amounting to US\$ 625,018.01, with the actual expenditure of USD 53,654.31, the delivery rate translates to only 8.58% as of July 13, 2016. At this stage of the project implementation, the overall expenditure since inception is USD 215,450.26 5 compared to the total GEF budget of USD 2,800,000.00 or 8% spent and fund balance of USD 1,717,118.45 as of 31 December 2015. Overall, the delivery rate (based on budget) is Moderately Satisfactory (MS).</p> <p>On project governance and project management, the Ministry of Construction (Co-Implementing Partner) has entered into a Letter of Agreement (LOA) with the PMU stipulating the responsibilities of the MOC in delivering 5 outputs of Component 1 on policy intervention. The PMU and MOC cooperated in recruiting National Consultants and worked together on annual and quarterly work-plans, and undertake monthly meetings to review progress. The PMU also worked closely with the selected consultants through meetings, joint visits to stakeholders and selected enterprises in undertaking project activities. Based on these, and considering that this is the first year of project implementation, the quality of project governance is rated Satisfactory (S).</p> <p>On risk management, the operational risk that was prominent during the PIR 2016 reporting period is the inability to get international expertise on NFB technologies. This has caused delays in the implementation of the activities on training and NFB standards. This was finally resolved in</p>

consultation with both UNDP-GEF senior technical advisor and national partners, local enterprises, and the project team. The project was able to engage 2 international consultants on AAC training and on NFB manufacturing demonstration and standards. Considering the above, the quality of risk management is rated Moderately Satisfactory (MS).

On M&E, the project has sufficient resources allotted for this exercise, and the PMU knows the GEF/UNDP standards for implementing the project M&E plan. The implementation of the project and the efforts being put in by the project team has been as per the planned schedule and in that regard the delivery of the planned project activities during the PIR 2016 reporting period is on track. Based on the approved AWP and quarterly work plans, the PMU monitors the monthly work plan and accomplishments, manages the project implementation work regularly, conducts weekly PMU meeting to identify issues and coordinate with stakeholders to address them. It also coordinates with the project partners to mobilize the inputs and co-financing. In this case, the quality of M&E is rated Satisfactory (S).

Overall, the project's IP rating is Satisfactory (S) since the Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the agreed and approved annual work plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.

General comments on Implementation Progress Rating

--

Gender

All projects must complete this section.

This information is used in the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP-GEF Annual Gender Report, reporting to the UNDP Gender Steering and Implementation Committee and for other internal and external communications and learning.

<p>Has a gender analysis been carried out this reporting period? <i>Please note that all projects approved in GEF-6 (1 July 2014 through 30 June 2018) are required to carry out a gender analysis.</i></p>	No
<p>If a gender analysis has been carried out what were the findings?</p>	NA
<p>Does this project specifically target women or girls as key stakeholders?</p>	No
<p>Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and improving the empowerment of women. Results reported can include site-level results working with local communities as well as work to integrate gender considerations into national policies, strategies and planning. Please explain how the results reported addressed the different needs of men or women, changed norms, values, and power structures, and/or contributed to transforming or challenging gender inequalities and discrimination.</p>	NA
<p>Please upload the gender analysis and any other documents related to the project's gender-related results.</p>	[uploading only possible in PIR system; list here the files that you plan on uploading]

General comments on Gender

Communicating Impact

All projects must complete this section.

Tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's lives.

Please use 500 words or less.

Avoid UN jargon, acronyms, and technical terms. Use plain language.

Include quotes from beneficiaries, if possible, and be sure to provide their names

The following questions can be used as guidance for your story:

What is this project about – the issue, interventions, and impacts?

Who are the beneficiaries of this project?

How have project interventions improved people's livelihoods?

What was the most notable achievement during this reporting period?

This text will be used for UNDP corporate communications, the UNDP-GEF website, and/or other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts.

“Promotion of Non-Fired Brick (NFB) Production and Utilization in Viet Nam” Ministry of Science and Technology is Implementing Entity, Ministry of Construction Co-implementing Agency.

Project Management Unit have signed Cooperation agreement with Luu Xa factory on implementation of NFB technology demonstration project. Project have main role to supply technical assistance to select technology and equipment, supervising the installation and testing operation, and supporting the factory in accessing loan from Viet Nam Environment Protection Fund.

First Demonstration Project on production of concrete bricks with compressing-vibration technology is being implemented successfully in Luu Xa Factory, in Province Thai Nguyen, Viet Nam.

Capacity of production line is 40 million SBU has been operated since December 2015. Up to June 2016 more than 6 million SBU has been produced. Demo project factory employed 30 employers with income of 4.5 million VND/month.

NFB products of Demo project Luu Xa factory has been used in Central Building of bus Station in Thai Nguyen City and Building of kindergarten in Cao Ngan Commune, Thai Nguyen.

Mr. Nguyen Cong Bang Director of LUUXA factory said that:

The main advantage of Concrete Brick Project at Luu Xa Cement Factory is to utilize the existing facilities like workshop, materials and available consumed construction materials network. Our Concrete Brick product is cheaper than the Clay Fired Brick by 15%-25% while the quality is much more outstanding. The current market demand is increasing rapidly. Sometimes, customers have ordered of more than 100.000 SBU/day. In order to meet with market demand and maximization the production, we will operate the production line 3 shifts/day, and install the automatic systems for brick drying and unloading.

The project has brought in economic-technical benefits, efficiency energy and environmental protection. When the production is at full capacity of 40 million standard bricks per year, the effective reduction of greenhouse gas emissions of 10,000 tonnes of CO₂ / year and save 2,165 TOE / year (Tons of oil equivalent / year) compared to Clay Fired manufacturing technology by tunne kilns.

Mr. Phan Dang Thien, Chairman of Thai NguyenTransportation JSC, Investor of THAI NGUYEN CITY CENTRE Bus Station (bus station project type 1; size: 4.3 hectares; capital investment: 52 billion; Commencement: December 2015) stated reasons for choosing non fired bricks (NFB): "Using NFB benefits our business and society. On the technical aspect, NFB's Luu Xa Cement Factory is less

waterproof, have a very high strength to ensure the robustness and stability of the building. Besides constructing the NFB bricks is much easier FCB thanks to its flat surface and no warping. Therefore, we support the use of NFB not only for a practical advantage in business but also for the purpose of protecting the environment and the trend of world civilization."

Mr. Nguyen Hung Thang, Director of Hai Binh Construction and Commercial Joint Stock Company, Thai Nguyen, construction Unit of: CAO NGAN KINDERGARTEN, THAI NGUYEN (School 2 floors; size: 1,200 m2; Capital investment: 5.8 billion; Commencement: January 2016; Owner: Cao Ngan commune People Committee) stated reasons for choosing NFB: "There are too many reasons for us to choose the NFB. Firstly, NFB is cheaper compared to fired clay bricks, so we reduce costs. Second, NFB is more durable and less breakage during construction so it minimizes the wastage. On average, the breakage rate of NFB is only about 1% to compare with 5% of FCBs. Third, the size of NFB bricks is precise, flat surface then it is easy to calculate the volume, precision construction, mortars and plaster savings while considering construction of FCBs. We are very satisfied with the quality of the NFBs produced by Luu Xa Cement Factory. According to us, the NFBs is very suitable for construction of civil works and housing.

What is the most significant change that has resulted from the project this reporting period?

The most significant change could be positive or negative and could relate to any aspect of the project such as direct beneficiaries, communities, partnerships, policy. The purpose of this section is to capture lessons learned and changes that many not be revealed through the project's logical framework or other parts of the PIR.

This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region. **N/A**

Describe how the project supported South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation efforts in the reporting period.

Describe the main focus of the efforts. What is the evidence that the initiative(s) contributed to results?

This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region. **N/A**

Project links & social media

Please list below the website addresses (URLs) that exist for this project, including any links to social media sites. Please include: Project website, Project page on the UNDP website, Adaptation Learning Mechanism (UNDP-ALM) platform, Facebook, Twitter, Flickr, YouTube, Google +

<p>Please share hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example, stories written by an outside, external source.</p>	<p>http://www.vn.undp.org/content/vietnam/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2015/05/29/new-initiative-to-increase-non-fired-bricks-market-share-to-40-percent.html http://english.vov.vn/economy/unbaked-brick-production-encouraged-in-vietnam-322350.vov http://english.thesaigontimes.vn/41182/Project-initiated-to-increase-non-fired-bricks-market-share.html http://en.vietnamplus.vn/unbaked-brick-production-encouraged-in-vietnam/94599.vnp</p>
<p>Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents.</p>	<p>[uploading only possible in PIR system; list here the files that you plan on uploading]</p>

General comments on Communicating Impact

Partnerships

All projects must complete this section. Please enter "N/A" in cells that are not applicable to your project.

This information is used to get a better understanding of the work GEF-funded projects are doing with key partners, including the GEF Small Grants Programme, indigenous peoples, the private sector, and other partners. The data may be used for reporting to GEF Secretariat, the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP Corporate Communications, posted on the UNDP-GEF website, and for other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts. The RTA should view and edit/elaborate on the information entered here.

Partners	<i>Give the name of the partner(s), and describe the partnership, recent notable activities and any innovative aspects of the work. Please do not use any acronyms. (limit = 2000 characters for each section)</i>
Civil Society Organisations/NGOs	Viet Nam Association for Building materials: support VABM to conduct 3 workshops on NFB production technology and utilization.
Indigenous Peoples	N/A
Private Sector	+ Factory Luu Xa in Thai Nguyen Province on demo project implementation; + JSC Hong Hoang Hong in Da Nang City on demo project implementation; + Duc Thanh Investment & Technology JSC.: Cooperation on consultancy of Equipment suppliers for demo and replication project
GEF Small Grants Programme	N/A
Other Partners	N/A

General comments on Partnerships

Environmental or Social Grievance

This section must **be completed by the UNDP Country Office** if a grievance related to the environmental or social impacts of this project was addressed this reporting period.

It is very important that the questions are answered fully and in detail.

If no environmental or social grievance was addressed this reporting period then please do not answer the following questions.

If more than one grievance was addressed, please answer the following questions for the most significant grievance only and explain the other grievance(s) in the comment box below.

What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?	[Environmental/Financial/Organizational/Political/Operational/Regulatory/Strategic/Other]
What is the current status of the grievance?	[Resolved / On-going / Both]
How would you rate the significance of the grievance?	[Minor / Significant / Serious]
Please describe the on-going or resolved grievance noting who was involved, what action was taken to resolve the grievance, how much time it took, and what you learned from managing the grievance process (maximum 500 words). If more than one grievance was addressed this reporting period, please explain the other grievance (s) here.	

Rating	Description
Minor	The grievance had/has a low impact on the day-to-day implementation of the project.
Significant	The grievance had/is having a significant impact on the day-to-day implementation of the project, but the project is still expected to achieve its objective.
Serious	The grievance had/is having a serious impact on the day-to-day implementation of the project, and there is a risk (50% or higher) that the project may not be able to achieve its objective.

Sustainable Development Goals

The UNDP-GEF Technical Advisor and Programme Associate must complete this section. Please select one or more Sustainable Development Goals that align with the results, impact and type of work of the project. For more information on the Sustainable Development Goals please visit <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/>.

Goal 1	End poverty in all its forms everywhere
Goal 2	End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
Goal 3	Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
Goal 4	Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
Goal 5	Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
Goal 6	Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
Goal 7	Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
Goal 8	Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
Goal 9	Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation
Goal 10	Reduce inequality within and among countries
Goal 11	Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable
Goal 12	Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
Goal 13	Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
Goal 14	Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development
Goal 15	Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss
Goal 16	Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

	Goal 17	Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development
--	---------	--