

## **Monitoring SDG Implementation in Viet Nam through the Viet Nam Provincial Governance and Public Administration Performance Index (PAPI)—a Citizen-centric measuring tool**

The Viet Nam Provincial Governance and Public Administration Performance Index (PAPI) is Viet Nam's largest annual time-series, citizen-centric, nationwide policy monitoring tool. Over the nine years of its operation, PAPI has collected the views of 103,059 randomly selected citizens about the country's performance in governance and public administration, based on their direct interactions with local governments at different levels. PAPI generates information about the actual performance of local authorities in meeting citizen needs. By doing so, it has created constructive competition and promoted learning among local authorities, while enabling citizens to benchmark their local government's performance and advocate for improvements.

Ultimately, it helps Viet Nam to identify areas that need greater attention as the country rolls out its national agenda for sustainable development towards 2030. In the same spirit as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that Viet Nam has committed to, PAPI puts citizens at the heart of Viet Nam's development. As 'end users' of public administration and public services, citizens are fully capable of assessing the performance of the central and local authorities and of supporting the country in building a State "of the people, by the people and for the people."

PAPI is a quantitative measurement tool that offers a comprehensive picture of how central and provincial governments have performed on an annual basis. PAPI provides data and evidence that reflect six dimensions of government performance: (i) participation in elections and policymaking at the local level, (ii) transparency in decision-making, (iii) vertical accountability, (iv) control of corruption in the public sector, (v) public administrative procedures, and (vi) public service delivery. PAPI has helped different national stakeholders to understand how governance and public administration in Viet Nam has changed over time and has suggested ways to address governance bottlenecks.

PAPI reports are results of fruitful multi-stakeholder partnership between the Centre for Community Support and Development Studies (CECODES, a local non-government organisation), the Centre for Research and Training of the Viet Nam Fatherland Front (VFF-CRT, an organisation under the largest umbrella political mass organisation—the Vietnam Fatherland Front, in Viet Nam), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In addition, since 2015 Real-Time Analytics, a private company, has provided technological support to digitize PAPI's data collection processes.

The below tables provide data on how Viet Nam has done in terms of implementation of the 2030 Agenda for the Sustainable Development Goals through indicators that PAPI measures in 2016 and 2017.

**Citizens' Perspective of Progress in Sustainable Development Goals in Viet Nam, 2016-2017**

**Table 1. 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 16   | Indicators relevant to PAPI  | PAPI Questions  | Findings from 2016 PAPI  | Findings from 2017 PAPI   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <b>16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere</b> | 16.1.3 Percentage of the population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months  | D511d: question about whether or not citizens were physically attacked by any stranger or thief                           | <b>1%</b> of 14,063 respondents said they were <b>subjected to physical violence</b> by thieves or strangers.  | <b>0.7%</b> of 14,097 respondents said they were subjected to physical violence by thieves or strangers.  |
|   | 16.1.4* Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live  | D510 c & d: questions about how citizens feel walking alone around the area they live during the day and during the night | <b>97%</b> of 14,063 respondents said they <b>felt safe walking alone</b> around the area they live <b>during the day</b> .<br><br><b>72%</b> of the respondents said they <b>felt safe walking alone</b> around the area they live <b>during the night</b> .  | <b>96%</b> of 14,097 respondents said they <b>felt safe walking alone</b> around the area they live <b>during the day</b> .<br><br><b>75%</b> of the respondents said they <b>felt safe walking alone</b> around the area they live <b>during the night</b> .   |
| <b>16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms</b>                | 16.5.1* Percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official, who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, in the previous 12 months, disaggregated by age group, sex, region and population group | D405a: question about if respondents or their family members were asked for bribes in the past 12 months                  | <b>5%</b> of 14,063 respondents admitted they were asked for bribes by a public official in the previous 12 months.  | <b>4.5%</b> of 14,097 respondents admitted they were asked for bribes by a public official in the previous 12 months.   |
|   |  | D5: questions about paying bribes for public certification services, construction permits, LURCs, and personal papers     | - <b>10%</b> of those who used the service nationwide admitted they paid a bribe for <b>public certification services</b> .<br><br>- <b>14.3%</b> paid a bribe for <b>construction permits</b> , <b>23%</b> paid a bribe for <b>LURCs</b> , and <b>9.6%</b> paid a bribe for <b>personal papers</b> at the | - <b>8.4%</b> of those who used the service nationwide admitted they paid a bribe for <b>public certification services</b> .<br><br>- <b>11.4%</b> paid a bribe for <b>construction permits</b> , <b>17%</b> paid a bribe for <b>LURCs</b> , and <b>10.4%</b> paid a bribe for <b>personal papers</b> at the commune level. |

| Goal 16   | Indicators relevant to PAPI  | PAPI Questions  | Findings from 2016 PAPI  | Findings from 2017 PAPI  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
|   |  | D6: questions about paying bribes for health care services and primary education  | <p>commune level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>11%</b> had to pay a bribe for their children to be better attended at <b>public primary schools</b>;</li> <li>- <b>17%</b> had to pay a bribe to obtain better service at <b>public district hospitals</b>.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>9.9%</b> had to pay a bribe for their children to be better attended at <b>public primary schools</b>;</li> <li>- <b>9%</b> had to pay a bribe to obtain better service at <b>public district hospitals</b>.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels</b> | 16.6.2* Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services | D5 and D6: questions about public services provided by local governments (administrative services, health care, health insurance, primary education, water supply, solid waste collection, access to electricity) | <p>The rating of user satisfaction is presented by types of public services under PAPI 2016 survey:</p> <p><b>a. Public Administrative Services</b> (by percentage of users satisfied with the services):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Public certification services: <b>81%</b></li> <li>- Public service for construction permits: <b>71%</b></li> <li>- Public service for LURCs: <b>61%</b></li> <li>- Public service for personal papers: <b>81%</b></li> </ul> <p><b>b. Public Services</b> (by total quality rating):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Health care service at district public hospitals: <b>5.22</b> points on the 10-point scale</li> <li>- Public primary schools: <b>4.99</b> points on the 9-point scale</li> </ul> | <p>The rating of user satisfaction is presented by types of public services under PAPI 2017 survey:</p> <p><b>a. Public Administrative Services</b> (by percentage of users satisfied with the services):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Public certification services: <b>80%</b></li> <li>- Public service for construction permits: <b>75.5%</b></li> <li>- Public service for LURCs: <b>67.6%</b></li> <li>- Public service for personal papers: <b>79%</b></li> </ul> <p><b>b. Public Services</b> (by total quality rating):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Health care service at district public hospitals: <b>5.12</b> points on the 10-point scale</li> <li>- Public primary schools: <b>5.26</b> points on the 9-point scale</li> </ul> |
| <b>16.7 Ensure responsive,</b>  | 16.7.2 Proportion of population who believe  | D1 questions about citizen participation in local   | - <b>71%</b> of contributors to projects (34.5% male; 36.5% female) said   | - <b>72%</b> of contributors to projects (37.5% male; 34.5% female) said   |

| Goal 16  | Indicators relevant to PAPI   | PAPI Questions   | Findings from 2016 PAPI  | Findings from 2017 PAPI  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <b>inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels</b> | decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group | project implementation   | <p>they <b>participated in making decision on whether the infrastructure project would be done</b></p> <p>- <b>44%</b> of those (<b>22.6%</b> male; <b>21.3%</b> female) participating in discussions on project implementation said they <b>provided comments in project discussions</b></p>  | <p>they <b>participated in making decision on whether the infrastructure project would be done</b></p> <p>- <b>40.3%</b> of those (<b>21.6%</b> male; <b>18.6%</b> female) participating in discussions on project implementation said they <b>provided comments in project discussions</b></p>  |
|  |   | D2: questions about citizen participation in local land planning | <p>- <b>18%</b> of the respondents (<b>10%</b> male, <b>8%</b> female) said they <b>were informed about local land planning</b></p> <p>- <b>35%</b> (<b>22%</b> male, <b>13%</b> female) of those who were informed said they <b>had an opportunity to comment on the land plans</b>, among whom <b>91%</b> (<b>59%</b> male, <b>32%</b> female) said their comments were taken into account</p> | <p>- <b>19%</b> of the respondents (<b>10%</b> male, <b>9%</b> female) said they <b>were informed about local land planning</b></p> <p>- <b>30%</b> (<b>20%</b> male, <b>10%</b> female) of those who were informed said they <b>had an opportunity to comment on the land plans</b>, among whom <b>89%</b> (<b>57%</b> male, <b>32%</b> female) said their comments were taken into account</p> |

**Table 2. Other Goals Relevant to PAPI in Perspective**

| Goals and Targets  | Indicators relevant to PAPI  | PAPI Questions  | Findings from PAPI 2016   | Findings from PAPI 2017   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere</b></p> <p>1.4 By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance</p> | 1.4.2 Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure | D207: battery of questions on land loss   | On land ownership (which is state ownership in Viet Nam), about <b>83%</b> of the respondents said they <b>did not lose land</b> as a result of local land plans in 2016.                                       | On land ownership (which is state ownership in Viet Nam), about <b>86%</b> of the respondents said they <b>did not lose land</b> as a result of local land plans in 2017.   |
| <p><b>Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all</b></p> <p>6.1 By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all</p>  | 6.1.1 Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services  | D610: battery of questions about access to clean water for drinking and cooking | <p>About <b>49%</b> of the respondents said they had <b>tap water</b> for cooking and drinking.</p> <p>Still, more than <b>6%</b> still said they had to <b>use unclean water</b> for cooking and drinking.</p> | <p>About <b>54.6%</b> of the respondents said they had <b>tap water</b> for cooking and drinking.</p> <p>Still, more than <b>6%</b> still said they had to <b>use unclean water</b> for cooking and drinking.</p> |
| <p><b>Goal 7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all</b></p> <p>7.1 By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services</p>  | 7.1.1 Percentage of population with access to electricity  | D607: questions on access to electricity  | About <b>98.5%</b> of the population had <b>access to electricity</b> through the national grid.  | About <b>98.4%</b> of the population had <b>access to electricity</b> through the national grid.  |