

# **QUANG NGAI RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (RUDEP) - PHASE 2**

Risk Management and Contingency Planning  
Workshop 1 December 2003



**VIETNAM-AUSTRALIA**

*Prepared for*

**URS Sustainable Development and the Quang Ngai Rural  
Development Program**

December 2003

VIE1506

*Prepared by*

**Dee Hartvigsen and Ted A'Bear**

URS Sustainable Development  
in association with Kellogg Brown & Root and  
World Wide Project Management Services  
Project Managers and Consultants  
Adelaide Australia

## **DONOR AGENCY**

### **AusAID**

GPO Box 887

Canberra ACT 2601

Ph: +61 2 6206 4769 (Desk Officer), Fax: +61 2 6206 4696

## **LEAD COUNTERPART AGENCY**

### **Department of Planning and Investment**

96 Nguyen Nghiem Street, Quang Ngai Town

Quang Ngai Province, Viet Nam

Ph: +84 55 825701

## **PROGRAM MANAGEMENT UNIT**

No 4 Pham Van Dong Street, Quang Ngai Town

Quang Ngai Province, Viet Nam

Ph: +84 55 816261-6, Fax: +84 55 816260

## **AUSTRALIAN MANAGING CONTRACTOR**

### **URS Sustainable Development**

25 North Terrace

Hackney SA 5069

Ph: +61 8 8366 1000, Fax: +61 8 8366 1001

Program ..... URS Australia Pty Ltd  
Manager: Dee Hartvigsen 25 North Terrace, Hackney  
International Projects Manager South Australia 5069 Australia  
Tel: 61 8 8366 1000  
Program .....  
Director: Ted A' Bear  
Vice President  
Sustainable Development  
Fax: 61 8 8366 1001

Date: December 2003  
Reference: VIE1506  
Status: Final

#### Limitations Statement

URS Australia Pty Ltd (URS) has prepared this report for the use of Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) in accordance with the scope of work and for the purpose outlined in the Quang Ngai Rural Development Program (RUDEP) – Phase 2 Contract between URS and AusAID.

This report should be read in full. No responsibility is accepted for use of any part of this report in any other context or for any other purpose or by third parties.

## CONTENTS

<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Risk Identification and Priority Ranking</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 Group 1.....	1
2.2 Group 2.....	1
2.3 Group 3.....	1
2.4 Group 4.....	2
<b>3 Risk Management and Contingency Plan</b>	<b>2</b>

## ANNEXES

- Annex 1: Risk Management and Contingency Planning Workshop Schedule
- Annex 2: Risk Identification and Priority Ranking
- Annex 3: Risk Mitigation and Contingency Plan
- Annex 4: Workshop Participants

## Acronyms

AG	Activity Group
AMC	Australian Managing Contractor
APD	Australian Program Director
ATL	Australian Team Leader
CBO	Capacity Building Officer
CO	Communications Officer
DDOs	District Development Officer
FCO	Finance and Credit Officer
I/EO	Infrastructure and Environment Officer
MEGO	Monitoring, Evaluation and Geographic Information Systems Officer
PDA	Participatory Development Adviser
PM	Project Manager
RUDEP	Quang Ngai Rural Development Program
VCBO	Vietnamese Capacity Building Officer
VPDA	Vietnamese Participatory Development Adviser

## Summary

The Risk Management and Contingency Planning Workshop was held in the Son Tra Hotel on 1 December, 2003. The workshop ran from 8.15am to 6.00pm and there were 25 participants. Mr Ted A'Bear, Australian Program Director (APD), facilitated the Workshop with assistance from Ms Dee Hartvigsen, Program Manager (PM), Quang Ngai Rural Development Program (RUDEP).

The outcomes of the Workshop were an extensive, prioritised list of perceived risks to the Program, indicators for these risks, appropriate mitigation strategies, and treatment should the risk be unavoidable.

# 1 Introduction

Mr Ted A'Bear (APD) opened the Workshop at 8.15am with an explanation of the aims and expectations of the workshop, an introduction to the terms that would be used throughout the workshop, how to identify different types of risks and a brief description of the schedule (full schedule at Annex 1). At 9.30am, the participants broke into four groups to discuss the risks that they felt their group would encounter while working on the Quang Ngai Rural Development Program (RUDEP). These were recorded on butchers' paper and prioritised according to the criteria of consequences, likelihood and the risk level (Annex 2). After a 15-minute break, a spokesperson from each sub-group reported back to the large group – discussing how the risks were identified and the reasoning applied to priority ranking.

After lunch, the same four groups met to develop contingency plans for the priority risks previously identified (Annex 3). Once again, this plan was presented to all workshop participants.

## 2 Risk Identification and Priority Ranking

### 2.1 Group 1

The two Australian Participatory Development Advisers (PDAs), the Vietnamese Participatory Development Adviser (VPDA) and the Communications Officer (CO) formed Group 1. As expected from this group, the risks identified related primarily to high level risks that would ultimately result in the Program not being able to continue should they occur and not be dealt with effectively. They identified three levels of priorities, with the first priority risks being a lack of marketing knowledge (the households not getting a good price) and contradictory views between the Australian Managing Contractor (AMC) staff and the counterparts. For a full presentation of the risks identified, please see Annex 2.

### 2.2 Group 2

Six of the District Development Officers (DDOs) formed the second group of Program personnel. The risks identified They also had three priority levels, with the top priority risks being natural disasters, poor farmer participation in RUDEP activities and local staff creating unpleasant the working conditions of the DDOs. The risks identified by the DDOs primarily related to incidents that would adversely affect their working conditions (bad working relationships, medical issues, safety etc), and difficulties in implementing activities in the field (limited skills, natural disasters, low technology adoption etc). For a full presentation of the risks identified, please see Annex 2.

### 2.3 Group 3

Group 3 was the technical specialists, including the Monitoring, Evaluation and Geographic Information Systems Officer (MEGO), the Finance and Credit Officer (FCO), the Infrastructure and Environment Officer (I/EO), the Capacity Building Officer (CBO) and the Vietnamese Capacity Building Officer (VCBO). The technical specialists ranked their priority risks to 13 levels, and there were four primary risks identified at level one.

These four risks were: a drop in prices; a difference in perspective between AMC and counterparts; the Program having difficulty when collecting information from the province, district and communes; and the educational level of beneficiaries (knowledge of market, accounting etc) affecting access to Program. The primary focus of the risks ranked highly by the technical specialists were on relationships between the AMC and counterparts/the Program and other stakeholders (district/commune officials/participants in study tours), market issues, misuse of funds, onerous procedures, and the ability of people to access/benefit from the Program. For a full presentation of the risks identified, please see Annex 2.

## **2.4 Group 4**

The RUDEP Office Manager, three drivers, the secretary/trainee MEGO, office assistant and the Australian Team Leader (ATL) formed the fourth group. This group had five levels of priority risks, and there were two primary risks: drowning in a flood, as they are unable to swim, and having a motorbike accident. As with other groups there were concerns regarding working relationships (between AMC staff in this instance rather than between AMC and counterparts in this instance), workloads, damage to items crucial to their work (vehicles, computers, photocopier) and availability of funds. For a full presentation of the risks identified, please see Annex 2.

The Representative from AusAID attended the afternoon session sitting in with several of the groups.

## **3 Risk Management and Contingency Plan**

The afternoon was spent in the four small groups previously identified and the task was to identify indicators for the highest-ranked risks, develop mitigation strategies to avoid these risks becoming reality and to develop treatment strategies should the risks prove to be unavoidable.

The follow up to the workshop needs to be discussed at the next monthly PMU meeting and actions and responsibilities agreed.

## **Annex 1**

---

# **Risk Management and Contingency Planning Workshop Schedule**

## **Annex 1: Risk Management and Contingency Planning Workshop Schedule**

This workshop was conducted in Quang Ngai involving all of the PMU staff to identify the risks to the program and how to mitigate or treat them. The participants worked in 4 groups:

1. PDAs, VPDAs, VTL, VPD, CO
2. DDOs
3. Technical Specialists (4 AMC plus 2 DPI plus 2 DARD)
4. Support Staff plus ATL

**Definitions** to be used for the Workshop are as follows:

**Risk:** the possibility of an action or event causing harm or loss to the Program

**Risk Management:** making resources available to minimise or avoid risk and if the risk event does occur to then have a contingency plan to deal with the situation

**Likelihood:** what is the chance that the identified risk will occur? Eg likelihood of major floods in flood prone parts of Quang Ngai is annually.

**Consequences:** result or an effect of an event. Eg in a bad flood the results could be loss of life, crops and animals.

**Risk level:** what is the level of risk to the Program? What will the impact be immediately or in the longer term? Eg if the flood did not affect activities of RUDEP then the risk level is low.

**Contingency Plan:** Maintain a plan of actions to take if the risk does occur.

### **Schedule**

#### **8.15am Introduction**

**8.30 am to 9.30 am** Discuss concepts and scope and aim of workshop

How to identify different types of risks that may affect RUDEP eg

**External** (outside the control or resources of RUDEP):

**Natural** (weather typhoons, drought, flooding, land slides, pests and diseases)

**Political** (markets, free trade agreements, banking rules and regulations, decrees, rules affecting credit, private market development and enterprises, private investment, land tenure and compensation)

**Economics** (inflation, economic growth, centrally planned or market economy, exchange rate, proximity of large markets, quality of products, level of competition)

**Pollution** (water, air, land from eg big industrial developments)

**Social** (health eg malaria in highlands, road accidents, HIV Aids, migration of youth to the big cities)

**War** (too much experience in the recent past)

**Internal** (within the control and resources of RUDEP):

**Relationships** (between PMU and stakeholders (AusAID, Provincial, District and Commune officials) and beneficiaries (HHs, service providers))

**Attitude to change** (Do the Stakeholders and HHs have a desire to make changes in line with the objectives of RUDEP? Is it desirable to institutionalise participatory planning process?)

**Absorption capacity** (ability of beneficiaries to absorb and use new skills to increase income?)

**Access to and allocation of resources and budget** (adequate resources available at appropriate time to respond and to address issues. Eg how to obtain credit for activities)

**Sustainable development** (farming systems and other activities that can be maintained to be consistently productive over many years)

**Program management** (financial and administration support, operational procedures)

**Service Providers** (training, technical support etc)

### **9.30 to 10.30am: Meet in 4 Groups**

Answer the following question:

***What are the risks that you encounter in implementing RUDEP?***

Once you have agreed on the long list of likely relevant risks to prioritise them using the criteria **consequences, likelihood, and risks**

### **10.30 to 10.45am Coffee break**

### **10.45 to Midday Report back from the groups**

Comments and additions to the prioritised risks and look at differences and common ones.

Midday to 1.30pm Lunch

**1.30 to 3.00pm** Divide the priority risks amongst the **4 groups to develop contingency plans for priority risks.**

Fill in the form: for each risk assigned consider the indicators to monitor if the event is happening or going to happen. Identify and assign roles and responsibilities for actions to be taken to avoid or minimise the impact of the event on the Program. Identify and assign roles and responsibilities if the event does occur and the action to be taken to recover from the impact.

### **3.00pm to 3.15pm tea break**

### **3.15pm to 4.30pm report back and compare contingency plans**

agree on how these will be updated etc.

### **4.30pm closing remarks**

## **Annex 2**

---

# **Risk Identification and Priority Ranking**

## Annex 2: Risk Identification and Priority Ranking

Risk	Priority	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk Level
<b>GROUP 1</b>				
Marketing knowledge – hhs not getting a good price	1	5	5	4
Contradictory views between AMC staff and counterparts	1	5	5	4
Misunderstandings between officials at province/district/commune levels	2	5	3	5
Poor HHs being excluded from Program activities	2	4	5	4
Misappropriation of funds	2	5	4	4
Inadequate service providers/lack of service providers	2	5	4	4
PPP not accepted in Quang Ngai	3	3.5	4	4
Provision of GoV funds (10%)	3	4	4	4
Misunderstanding between AMC/Counterparts	3	4	4	4
AusAID closes the Program down	3	4	5	3
Seasonal migration	3	4	4	4
Demand for funds exceeds RUDEP's budget		3.5	3	3
Local officials don't allow HHs to participate		3	4	3
Lack of Program flexibility to address all issues in PDD		5	2	2
Price of products decreases		5	3	3
Natural disasters		3	3	3
Others donors not attracted to fund Program activities		4	3	3
Unwillingness of stakeholders to learn from other projects		3	3	3
Local officials don't permit or facilitate empowerment/participation		3	4	3
Delays in funding livelihood activities/Activity Gp plans/different procedures		5	3	3
New decrees or laws make it difficult to implement		2	5	3
Restrictions on RUDEP staff to interact		2	4	3
UXO encountered		2	4	3
Lack of knowledge of CPC staff		3	3	4
Slow implementation means HHs not willing to participate		3	4	3
RUDEP staff dying/leaving the Program		3	4	3
Terrorism		1	5	?

Risk	Priority	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk Level
<b>GROUP 2</b>				
Natural disaster – flood, typhoon	1	5	5	5
Farmers’ poor participation in RUDEP activities	1	3	5	2
Local staffs unenthusiastic contribution to DDO working condition	1	2	5	2
Bad relationships between stakeholders	2	2	4	2
Motorbike/traffic accidents	2	3	4	4
Unstable markets	2	4	4	4
DDO in upland communes catch malaria, tuberculosis easily	2	2	4	2
Property stolen (in field office) – no security	3	2	3	2
DDOs low level of facilitation skills	3	3	3	3
No allowance for hamlet/village leaders	3	4	3	2
Ability for technology adoption	3	3	4	4
Disease for livestock and crops	3	3	4	4
Fire	2	2	5	2
Food poisoning	2	2	4	2
Default in loan repayment	2	2	3	2
DDOs robbed while travelling in remote areas	2	2	4	2
Unmarried female DDO in upland communes – inexperienced. Also less chance to meet a future husband	2	2	2	2
Pregnant staff				
Safety of DDOs in remote areas				
<b>GROUP 3</b>				
PPP not accepted in Quang Ngai (or not adopted/not sustainable)	9	2	1	2
GoV not being able to contribute funds (10% of GoA funds)	4	4	2	2
Misunderstanding/lack of info between counterpart/AMC	5	2	2	2
Drop in prices	1	4	4	4
Difference perspective between AMC/counterparts	1	5	5	5
Procedures for implementing infrastructure projects cumbersome/difficult	2	4	4	4
Contractor being dishonest and supervisor not fulfilling role	3	2	3	3
District/commune officials lacking ability/not enthusiastic	2	3	2	2

Risk	Priority	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk Level
Lack of information/not properly evaluating service providers properly	6	1	3	3
Educational/intellectual level of beneficiaries (knowledge of market, accounting etc) affect access to Program	1	4	4	4
Ltd funding available for service providers (WU to provide support to VSCF)	10	3	3	3
Demonstration models not appropriate: not adopted		2	3	3
VSCF not being institutionalised, no regulations (other than our own). Not working through a community group/no govt regulations	7	1	5	5
Gender equality – males participating in the Program more at present	13	2	2	2
Natural disasters	8	1	5	5
People receiving money, but not using it for correct purpose (eg: infrastructure)	4	1	4	4
People selling products on market, but not at correct market price	5	3	4	4
Program has difficulty when collecting info province/district/communes	1	4	4	4
Problems with the computers	11	2	4	4
Misunderstanding about responsibilities (Quang is not the computer repair man)	12	1	2	2
Provincial/district/commune officials not able to participate in training	2	3	3	3
Different perspectives among stakeholders on objectives of study tours	2	3	3	3
<b>GROUP 4</b>				
Can't swim - drown in the flood	1	4	5	5
Misunderstanding between accountant and other Program staff	2	5	3	3
Photocopier stops working	5	2	2	1
Motorbike accident	1	3	5	5
Computer broke at any time – delay work	3	3	2	2
Burden of documents to be translated in a timely manner	2	2	3	2
Accident due to lack of understanding of traffic laws	4	5	5	5
Broken window in vehicle	4	4	3	3
Perdiems not advanced beforehand	5	3	2	1
Terrain is not good, always muddy – 2 cars no winch	5	3	2	2
Parked vehicle being hit by another vehicle	4	2	4	4
Cars off the road for extended periods – accident, lack of spare parts				
Theft				

## **Annex 3**

---

# **Risk Management and Contingency Plan**

### Annex 3: Risk Management and Contingency Plan

Risk	Indicator	Mitigation	Treatment
<b>GROUP 1</b>			
Marketing knowledge	Buying selling price different to market	Increase market knowledge through mass media & provide information to people about accessing this information (when is this information on the radio/television) Extra information on the prices of raw and processed prices	Diversify production Using one product for a number of purposes – eg. Instead of selling cassava to cassava mill, use it for livestock feed
Contradictory views AMC/counterparts	Long meetings causing delays in activities	All need to share information Frequent evaluation of Program results Frequent study tours to increase capacity and carry out demonstration models	Establish internal processes with criteria to judge issues being discussed Mediation from a third party – this party to be accepted by all those involved in the disagreement
Misunderstandings between officials at different levels & AMC	Activities not implemented in the way it was intended HHs ask for activities which are out of the Program's scope	Provide regular information about Program processes and approaches Provide information at meetings Develop guidelines for Program activities so people can access and follow these guidelines	Meet, discuss so everyone can understand the issue more clearly
Poor HHs being excluded from Program activities	Proportion of poor HHs participating in VSCF groups and AGs	Implement activities appropriate to poor HHs Provide smaller loans Increase knowledge of those who take out a loan Take more interest in poor HH proposals – prioritise	Provide increased support to the poor people Give poor HHs priority Frequent exchange of information between all members of a group

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
Misappropriation of funds	Activities are not implemented according to the Plan Eg: People in VSCFs not using funds for the intended purpose	Transparency for these activities – where is the activity, what is the budget, who is implementing	Who is using the money and what are the funds being used for
Inadequate/lack of service providers			
PPP not accepted in Quang Ngai			
Provision of GoV funds (10%)			
Misunderstanding between AMC/Counterparts			
AusAID closes the Program down			
Seasonal migration			
Demand for funds exceeds RUDEP's budget			
Local officials don't allow HHs to participate			
Lack of Program flexibility to address all issues in PDD			
Price of products decreases			
Natural disasters			
Others donors not attracted to fund Program activities			
Unwillingness of stakeholders to learn from other projects			
Local officials don't permit or facilitate empowerment/participation			
Delays in funding livelihood activities/Activity Gp plans/different procedures			

Risk	Indicator	Mitigation	Treatment
New decrees or laws make it difficult to implement			
Restrictions on RUDEP staff to interact			
UXO encountered			
Lack of knowledge of CPC staff			
Slow implementation means HHs not willing to participate			
RUDEP staff dying/leaving the Program			
Terrorism			
<b>GROUP 2</b>			
Natural disaster – flood, typhoon	Heavy rainfall Oct-Dec each year Damage crops, effect on domestic animals and damaged infrastructure	Avoid this season for implementing activities Early warning system – so people receive enough information, promptly Annual O&M Plan Need to have a training plan for disaster mitigation training for all communities	Mobilise people to work together to overcome effects of the disaster Work with the local Government to overcome disaster
Poor farmers participation in RUDEP activities	Decrease in proportion of people participating in activity groups, lack of awareness about participation in activities	Respect the role of the village/hamlet leaders as they have a high standing in the community Form of subsidy at village and hamlet level (lacking especially in upland areas) Promote the Program so people can understand it more clearly	Access to money for activities to be improved Give support to the establishment of a communications network, eg. A speaker system in the commune (to announce meetings etc)

Risk	Indicator	Mitigation	Treatment
Local staff's unenthusiastic contribution to DDO working conditions	Low participation rate of people	Good relationship with the participating staff Need to have appropriate policies for local staff Find out the root of the problem about participating in Program activities	Organise workshop to analyse the cause of the issues Attach responsibility to each of the activities
Bad relationships between stakeholders (Stakeholders meaning leaders higher than commune level in this case)	No agreement as to what activities are sustainable Participation of the counterparts (eg: DARD officials don't show up to monitor demonstration)	Strengthen the perceptions (increase awareness) on sustainability People need to have general agreement on the definitions of sustainability	Workshop for lessons learned
Motorbike/traffic accidents	Motorbike is not in good condition	Comprehensive check of means of transport before trip Helmets to be worn on motorbikes Travel at a sensible speed Traffic rules need to be understood	Go to nearest hospital Report to PMU, insurance companies and local police Use personal motorbike while Program m/bike is being fixed
Unstable markets	People not able to generate income People fall into a bad situation	Help the people to establish a record which would show the information on a monthly basis Need to know what to produce People to establish a market research group Encourage and consolidate the groups of the people so they can continue to operate in the future	Look for marketing information and report this to the people

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
DDO in upland communes catch malaria, tuberculosis easily	Health condition and working conditions	Equip medical kit at the DDO office Periodical health checks People to be careful – eating, drinking, sleeping	Go to the hospital Report to the PMU
Property stolen (in field office) – no security	Property is missing	Good locks on doors/windows People need to be responsible – final check before leaving	Report to local police Report to PMU
DDOs low level of facilitation skills	Lack of self confidence when DDOs are meeting with other people Poor ability to be able to transfer information	Take part in training Experience/practice in public speaking Prepare, in advance, the information they will be presenting	DDOs need to learn more, find out more – from more experienced DDOs and other experienced Program personnel
No allowance for hamlet/village leaders	Lack of enthusiasm when participating in the Program and negative attitudes Unhappy when carrying out their duties	DDOs to encourage leaders through working with them Acknowledging their active participation	Report them to the PMU
Ability for technology adoption	Low education level People not being able to grasp information	Classes for people to learn about technology Establish communities clubs Use more visual techniques in meetings	
Disease for livestock and crops	Number of domestic animals getting sick/dying Number of hectares where crop fails due to disease Low productivity/yield	Vaccinations for disease – animal health centres at District and Commune level Cleanliness in stys/sheds – responsibility of each HH Carry out IPM program (DARD, HHs)	Quarantine/isolate animals with disease Burn dead animals

Risk	Indicator	Mitigation	Treatment
Fire		No smoking Good electricity network Turning light off before leaving	
Food poisoning	How much have you eaten and what?	Hygiene Food needs to be cooked properly and stored properly	
Default in loan repayment	Number of HHs not paying back their loan	Before allocating loans, there needs to be an awareness workshop (FCO/DDO) Create conditions for peer pressure within the group to pay back	If people default, need to ask for CPC to intervene, or other VSCF group members
DDOs robbed while travelling in remote areas	Number of people who have been robbed How many times someone is robbed Property stolen	Karate training (self defence?) Mobile phones	Promptly advise the officials (commune police)
Youth damage. Unmarried female DDO in upland communes – inexperienced. Also less chance to meet a future husband	Poor work performance (Vu) mentally unstable	Limit amount of weekend work, so he has time for recreation (Vu) Implement appropriate time management	Move Program employees from one commune to another
Pregnant staff	Women being pregnant	Cut down on the number of births Staff should take it in turns to become pregnant	Recruit short term staff to cover while women are on maternity leave Other people to do that person's work
Safety of DDOs in remote areas			
<b>GROUP 3</b>			
PPP not accepted in Quang Ngai (or not adopted/not sustainable)			

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
GoV not being able to contribute funds (10% of GoA funds)			
Misunderstanding/lack of info between counterpart/AMC			
Drop in prices			Establish a system for market forecast
Difference perspective between AMC/counterparts		PMU	PMU then the PCC if not resolved
Procedures for implementing infrastructure projects cumbersome/difficult	Slow implementation process	Try to simplify the procedure Improve the quality of the reports	
Contractor being dishonest and supervisor not fulfilling role	Slow progress Low quality of the construction work Reduced confidence of the people	Choose contractor/supervisor carefully All relevant terms and conditions need to be included into the contract – clear and firm	Reconstruct with quality assurance
District/commune officials lacking ability/not enthusiastic			
Lack of information/not properly evaluating service providers properly			
Educational/knowledge level of beneficiaries (knowledge of market, accounting etc) affect access to Program	Illiteracy	Organise activities to directly train the people PDA/specialists Want PMU to work out an appropriate solution to this, as it is a very important issue	
Ltd funding available for service providers (WU to provide support to VSCF)			

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
Demonstration models not appropriate: not adopted	Low rate of adoption Practices not changed		
VSCF not institutionalised			
Gender equality			
Natural disasters			
People receiving money, but not using it for correct purpose			
People selling products on market, but not at market price			
Program has difficulty when collecting information	Not be able to gather sufficient information	Clearly explain what information we need to collect Try to raise participation and strengthen communication about the benefit of information collection (MEGO/DDOs)	Organise a study tour
Problems with the computers			
Misunderstanding about responsibilities			
Provincial/district/commune officials not able to arrange/participate in training	Low participation	Arrange suitable locations for training Give clear contents (handouts)	Arrange for further training events to allow for full participation
Different perspectives among stakeholders on objectives of study tours		State clearly and agree on the purpose of the study tour Provide favourable conditions for the participants to have suitable allowances Good organisation	Organise workshop
<b>GROUP 4</b>			
Can't swim - drown in the flood	Weather forecast Contact with local people	Wear life jacket Learn to swim	Arrange for staff replacement
Misunderstanding between accountant and other staff			

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
Photocopier stops working		Report to Ngoc Fix ASAP	Budget for repair
Motorbike accident		Wear Helmet Adhere to traffic rules	Claim insurance compensation Arrange hospital Treatment asap Arrange staff replacement
Computer broken – delay work		Back up (USB) weekly CD rewrite	Call service Report to admin
Burden of documents to be translated in a timely manner		Time management Translator	Translate as much as possible
Accident due to lack of understanding of traffic laws	Check safety index for vehicle	Drive carefully Be aware of situation	Decide on first aid
Broken window in vehicle		Be careful	Claim insurance Report to ATL/Admin
Perdiems not paid in advance			
Terrain is not good, always muddy – 2 cars no winch			
Parked vehicle being hit by another vehicle		Park in right place Be aware of situation (Driver responsible)	Report case to office Have car repaired asap
Cars off the road for extended periods		Report to Admin the car status	Report to ATL Repair to Toyota Hire car(s)
Theft		Lock things safely use security system in office	

**Annex 4**

---

**Workshop Participants**

### Annex 4: Workshop Participants

Ted A'Bear	Australian Program Director	APD
Trevor Ole	Australian Team Leader	ATL
Mark Hoey	Senior Participatory Development Adviser	SPDA
Bede Evans	Participatory Development Adviser	PDA
Phuoc	Vietnamese Participatory Development Adviser	VPDA
Stephen Collins	Communications Officer	CO
Dee Hartvigsen	Program Manager	PM
Trinh Cong Vu	District Development Officer	DDO
Tu Thanh Phong	District Development Officer	DDO
Huynh Thi Hong Thai	District Development Officer	DDO
Nguyen Thi Bich Thuy	District Development Officer	DDO
Nguyen Thi Bich Thu	District Development Officer	DDO
Dinh Kim Cuong	District Development Officer	DDO
Tran Thi Le Tuyen	Capacity Building Officer	CBO
Hoa	Vietnamese Capacity Building Officer	VCBO
Do Dong Teo	Finance and Credit Officer	FCO
Pham Van Quang	Monitoring, Evaluation and Geographic Information Systems Officer	MEGO
Huynh Le Truong Phu	Infrastructure and Environment Officer	I/EO
Nguyen Thanh Tu	AusAID	
Nguyen Le Nguyen Ngoc	Office Manager	OM
Nguyen Thuy Phuong	Office Assistant	OA
Nguyen Thi Hanh Duc	Secretary/Trainee MEGO	S/TMEGO
Nguyen Cong Sanh	Driver	
Nguyen Xuan Khanh	Driver	
Nguyen Hoang	Driver	