GLOBAL AID INSIGHTS Pty Ltd

Australia-Vietnam Energy Transition Platform (AVETP)

Mid-Term Review Report

Global Aid Insights
June 2026

Conflict of Interest Declaration

The mid-term review team confirms that there are no actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest that could compromise the independence, objectivity, or credibility of this review. Members of the team have not participated in the design, implementation, or management of the programme being reviewed, nor do they hold any financial, institutional, or personal interests in its outcomes.
Any prior professional engagement with implementing partners has been limited to independent research or evaluation roles and does not constitute a conflict of interest. Safeguards were applied throughout the evaluation to ensure impartial judgement, including independent analysis, transparent methodological decisions, and evidence-based reporting.

Authors and the review team: Dr Yaseen Ayobi, Dr Phí Minh Nguyệt and Nguyen Nhat Hoai

Contents

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full term
ADB	Asian Development Bank
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AVETP	Australia–Vietnam Energy Transition Platform
BFU	Blended Finance Unit
BPG	Binh Thuan Plastic Group
CAPEX	Capital Expenditure
CEF	Credit Enhancement Facility
C&I	Commercial and Industrial
CMC	Capital Markets for Climate Action Fund
COD	Commercial Operation Date
COP26	26th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
CRC	Climate Resilient Communities
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DPPA	Direct Power Purchase Agreement
DuD	Due Diligence
EAAIF	Emerging Africa & Asia Infrastructure Fund
EDGE	Excellence in Design for Greater Efficiencies
EOPO	End of Program Outcome
EPC	Engineering, Procurement, and Construction
ESAP	Environmental and Social Action Plan
ESG	Environmental, Social, and Governance
ESMS	Environmental and Social Management System
EV	Electric Vehicle
EVN	Electricity of Vietnam
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FTM	Front of the Meter
GCIF	GuarantCo Investment Fund
GEDSI	Gender Equality, Disability, and Social Inclusion
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GoV	Government of Vietnam
GWh	Gigawatt Hour
HCMC	Ho Chi Minh City
HR	Human Resources
HSES	Health, Safety, Environment, and Social
IFC	International Finance Corporation
InfraCo	InfraCo Asia
IO	Intermediate Outcome
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
JETP	Just Energy Transition Partnership
KII	Key Informant Interview
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
M&A	Mergers and Acquisitions
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MOIT	Ministry of Industry and Trade
MTR	Mid-Term Review
MW	Megawatt
MWp	Megawatt peak
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PDP VIII	Power Development Plan VIII
PIDG	Private Infrastructure Development Group
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
QAQC	Quality Assurance and Quality Control
RE100	Renewable Energy 100
SBV	State Bank of Vietnam
SECO	Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise

Abbreviation	Full term
SPO	Second Party Opinion
SSC	State Securities Commission
TA	Technical Assistance
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
USD	United States Dollar
VDB	Vietnam Development Bank
VND	Vietnamese Dong
WB	World Bank

List of Tables

1 Executive Summary

AVETP is delivering credible, high-quality transaction results in support of Vietnam's net zero transition, but stronger country arrangements are needed to convert those results into a more visible, coherent bilateral programme.

The Australia–Vietnam Energy Transition Platform (AVETP) is a bespoke partnership between the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and the Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG), established in 2023 to support Vietnam's net zero transition through catalytic blended finance and market development. It also includes $3 million allocated to Australian Development Investments (ADI), however this Mid-Term Review focused on the PIDG-managed component of AVETP and was undertaken to assess progress toward the platform's end-of-program outcomes; examine the adequacy of monitoring, evaluation and learning arrangements, DFAT's oversight and engagement arrangements, the fit of the current programme logic; and develop practical recommendations for the remainder of the investment period.

Each of the review focus areas, including effectiveness, MEL arrangements, DFAT oversight and engagement, programme logic, and implementation lessons learned, is addressed in more detail in the chapters that follow.

1.1 Effectiveness

AVETP has been very effective in catalysing relevant, good quality, and in several cases, market shaping transactions that support Vietnam's transition to net zero. Its strongest performance has been at the transaction level, where PIDG's combination of early-stage equity, longer tenor debt, guarantees, and technical assistance has helped fill financing gaps not well served by local banks or conventional MDB products. This has supported a diverse portfolio across e-mobility, rooftop solar, water infrastructure, recycling related green bonds, and emerging distributed energy platforms. As shown in Table 1, these transactions generated tangible results across multiple pathways, including renewable energy capacity and generation, emissions avoidance, clean mobility scale-up, water treatment capacity, recycling expansion, green bond finance, and private capital mobilisation. The evidence suggests that AVETP's most significant contribution has not been transaction volume, but the quality, structure, and catalytic character of financing, including first of kind transactions, stronger standards, improved investee readiness, longer tenors, local capital market development, and wider demonstration effects. Most stakeholders noted that there is the potential for PIDG to complete more transactions in Vietnam, given the strength and depth of the market opportunity.

Table 1: Consolidated AVETP Portfolio Results

Result area	Combined result
Renewable energy scale and output	AVETP-supported renewable energy pathways represent **313.68 MW of realised or planned renewable capacity**, with current or expected annual renewable electricity generation of **382,060 MWh/year**.
Estimated or projected emissions avoided	AVETP-supported pathways are associated with **260,777 tCO_2e/year** in estimated or projected emissions avoided.
VND-denominated finance and investment	AVETP-supported transactions account for **VND 869 billion** in VND-denominated finance and investment, comprising VND 391 billion in local debt mobilised, VND 260 billion in green bond finance, and VND 218 billion in InfraCo equity investment.

1.2 AVETP MEL Arrangements

The evidence suggests that AVETP's current MEL arrangements are partly functional but not yet fit for purpose as a DFAT bilateral programme. PIDG has credible corporate systems for impact management, safeguards, and transaction monitoring, and these support global transaction-level oversight. However, they have not been translated into a clear Vietnam specific MEL architecture capable of reporting against AVETP's agreed EOPOs, intermediate outcomes, and cross-cutting priorities.

As a result, useful transaction-level data exists but remains fragmented across client teams and has not yet been systematically collected and aggregated into a coherent AVETP-wide performance story. This gap is particularly important because several transactions remain early stage, under construction, or recently closed, making outcome and impact measurement somewhat premature. In addition, AVETP-supported work covers a broader climate finance portfolio than renewable energy generation alone, including e-mobility, water, and recycling. These areas are aligned with the objective of the program, but current reporting and MEL arrangements do not yet fully capture their contribution in a consolidated country-level narrative. Current arrangements therefore serve PIDG's transaction management needs rather than DFAT's requirements for country level reporting, learning, and performance management requirements.

The most practical way forward is to establish a light, transaction centred AVETP reporting architecture layered over PIDG's existing systems, with a small set of core transaction indicators, stage-based reporting, a minimum GEDSI and safeguard dataset aligned with the EOPOs and a clearer country-level reporting interface.

1.3 Oversight and Engagement

Overall, AVETP oversight and engagement arrangements have been active and strategically effective. They have worked well in maintaining AVETP's strategic relevance, keeping the platform aligned with Australia's development and foreign policy priorities, and identifying delivery weaknesses that required corrective action. DFAT has played an important role in ensuring that AVETP remains connected to Vietnam's transition agenda, particularly in relation to blended finance, private capital mobilisation, climate investment, and capital market development. Vietnamese counterparts, including the Ministry of Finance and the State Securities Commission, also confirmed Vietnam's priorities on low carbon investment, market development, and green finance. DFAT's engagement has also been effective in surfacing delivery weaknesses and pushing PIDG to respond, particularly in relation to reporting, local engagement, visibility, and programme management.

DFAT's oversight and engagement arrangements have been impacted by PIDG's limited local presence in Vietnam. In practice, DFAT's oversight has often had to compensate for gaps in PIDG's local presence, communications, reporting, and relationship management, placing a greater burden on Post than originally intended. This has reduced the extent to which technically strong transactions have translated into stronger bilateral influence and public visibility for Australia. The main limitation is therefore not weak strategic alignment, but the absence of sufficiently resourced country-facing arrangements capable of turning that alignment into visible, coordinated, and politically leveraged engagement.

The evidence also points to a structural tension in the oversight model itself: PIDG is a lean, transaction-oriented platform with a comparatively low overhead structure, which has supported efficient transactions delivery. At the same time, the AVETP design made clear commitments around local presence, post engagement, public diplomacy, communication, outreach, and country-level reporting. These functions sit partly outside PIDG's core transaction-management model and require greater resourcing and clearer role definition. As a result, AVETP has performed more strongly as a transaction platform than as a fully country-facing bilateral programme. The main issue is therefore not that the platform model is misplaced, but that stronger local engagement, clearer responsibilities, and better conversion of transaction-level progress into visible programme results are needed for the remainder of implementation.

1.4 Fit for Purpose Programme Logic

The current results structure is only partly fit for purpose. AVETP does not have a full programme logic as such, but it includes two EOPOs and a set of intermediate outcomes that provide a basic framework for assessing progress. These still capture important aspects of the investment, particularly renewable energy, sustainable bonds, and capital market development. However, they no longer reflect the actual shape of the portfolio, the diversity of PIDG's instruments, or the main pathways through which the programme is contributing to its intended outcomes. In practice, the logic was originally framed too narrowly around renewable energy generation and consequently dependent on direct output metrics such as MW installed, GWh generated, or numbers of bonds issued. The resulting mismatch between what the programme is doing and what the EOPOs are designed to track has also contributed to reporting difficulties and weakened the explanatory power of the current framework.

The current EOPOs/programme logic should therefore be refined and broadened rather than discarded. Most elements remain relevant, especially the capital market development strand, climate and safeguard related indicators, and the focus on mobilising private finance. However, these need to be repositioned within a broader transition finance and market development model better aligned to PIDG's delivery model and the realised portfolio. The revised logic should better capture AVETP's contribution not only to transaction delivery, but also to market shaping, institutional strengthening, improved investment standards, and longer-term system change in support of sustained private investment in Vietnam's energy transition. A revised structure could be tested with PIDG and DFAT: mobilising more and better private investment into Vietnam's net zero transition; improving the quality and investability of climate resilience projects and financing structures focused on mitigation and adaptation; supporting more inclusive and equitable transition investments.

1.5 Lessons from AVETP Implementation to Date

Several clear lessons emerge from AVETP implementation to date. The overarching lesson is that the programme's core model is working, but its delivery model needs strengthening if strong individual transactions are to translate into a stronger country programme over the remainder of implementation. AVETP has performed best where it has supported high quality, additional, market shaping transactions that fill genuine financing gaps, improve the structure or tenor of finance, and demonstrate new sector or instrument pathways. This confirms that AVETP's comparative advantage lies in quality, additionality, and demonstration effects, rather than transaction volume alone.

A second major lesson is that PIDG's value goes beyond finance. Due diligence, HSES requirements, ESG processes, governance expectations, and technical assistance have helped strengthen investee systems, improve readiness for future finance, and raise market standards. Technical assistance has been most effective when tightly linked to live transaction bottlenecks, such as early feasibility, unusually high transaction costs, or support to help firms meet international standards.

The main lessons for the remainder of AVETP concern delivery constraints, pipeline development and risk management. A stronger mechanism is needed to support earlier stage pipeline development, especially where opportunities are promising but not yet bankable. Primary data suggests that "bankability" constraints are not only about project quality, but also about specific gaps in early-stage capital, equity depth, regulatory readiness, due diligence preparedness, financial modelling, E&S/HSES systems, governance standards, and familiarity with international financier requirements. PIDG could therefore strengthen its pipeline by providing more targeted pre-transaction support, including early-stage risk-sharing capital for smaller or higher-risk local companies, technical assistance for financial models and E&S systems, support to meet international due diligence standards, local market and regulatory advisory support, and closer in-country origination to identify promising but not yet bankable opportunities.

Local presence has emerged as a particularly important lesson, affecting transaction speed, policy engagement, visibility, reporting, and coordination with owners and DFAT. The evidence also suggests that a broader climate resilience relevant portfolio is a practical form of risk management in Vietnam's policy environment rather than mission drift away from energy transition. In this context, the CEF shows that system level market building is feasible and relevant, but slower, more political, and more dependent on sustained local engagement than ordinary transactions. The central lesson is therefore not that AVETP requires wholesale redesign, but that it needs stronger country delivery arrangements, more deliberate use of TA, continued focus on additional and market shaping deals, and better conversion of transaction progress into visible, reportable programme level results.

2 Recommendations

The review makes six core recommendations for the remainder of AVETP. These focus on the highest-priority changes needed to strengthen delivery, improve country-level management, sharpen reporting, and support stronger transaction conversion. More detailed operational suggestions are included under each recommendation rather than presented as separate recommendations, to avoid duplication and maintain focus.

RECOMMENDATION 1. ESTABLISH A STRONGER COUNTRY-FACING FUNCTION IN VIETNAM

PIDG should establish a clearer and more reliable country-facing function for Vietnam, whether through a dedicated local focal point, or a small in country team with clear responsibility for coordination, reporting, stakeholder engagement, public diplomacy support and pipeline development. The evidence highlights that weak local presence has reduced responsiveness, slowed policy and regulatory engagement, weakened visibility of Australia's contribution, and shifted too much burden onto DFAT Post.

Stronger in country capacity is likely to improve transaction origination and conversion, support more regular engagement with government and market actors, strengthen preparation for events and announcement, improve reporting quality, and provide DFAT with a clearer and more consistent country-level interface. This function should also help coordinate owner engagement and ensure that DFAT is informed early about transaction milestones, market developments, and public diplomacy opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION 2. STRENGTHEN VISIBILITY OF AUSTRALIA'S CONTRIBUTION THROUGH A PRACTICAL COUNTRY-LEVEL COMMUNICATIONS APPROACH

DFAT and PIDG should agree a practical communications and visibility approach for Vietnam that makes Australia's contribution more consistently visible across transactions, events, reporting, and stakeholder engagement. The review found that Australia's substantive contribution is stronger than its public visibility, and that stronger transaction performance has not translated sufficiently into bilateral profile and influence.

This approach should include clearer branding and messaging, earlier coordination around public diplomacy opportunities, more regular market and stakeholder updates, and explicit recognition of Australia's role in AVETP backed transactions where appropriate. It should also clarify roles between PIDG, DFAT Post and DFAT Canberra so that communications are planned earlier and not left to ad hoc arrangements around individual events.

RECOMMENDATION 3. REFINE THE PROGRAMME LOGIC AND ESTABLISH A LIGHT AVETP-LEVEL MEL AND REPORTING FRAMEWORK

DFAT and PIDG should agree on a refined AVETP programme logic and a concise AVETP-specific MEL framework for the remainder of the programme. This should not replace PIDG's corporate impact systems. Rather, it should sit above those systems and translate existing PIDG data into a practical Vietnam-facing reporting architecture aligned with AVETP's EOPOs, intermediate outcomes, and DFAT's country-level accountability requirements.

The current programme logic remains too narrowly anchored in renewable energy generation and direct output metrics, while the actual portfolio now spans e-mobility, water infrastructure, recycling, and the CEF. A revised logic could organise AVETP around three broader areas: mobilising more local and private investment into Vietnam's net zero transition; improving the quality and investability of sustainable infrastructure and green finance opportunities, including financing structures that support climate resilience, mitigation, and where relevant, adaptation outcomes to combat the effects of climate change; and supporting more inclusive and equitable transition investments. This would improve both alignment and feasibility and would make it easier to link PIDG's activities to the EOPOs.

The MEL framework should distinguish clearly between transaction performance and programme performance. Transaction performance should cover areas such as financial assistance provided (debt, guarantees, project development support and other PIDG instruments), renewable energy capacity installed, emissions avoided, standards strengthened, and private capital mobilised. Programme performance should cover Australia's visibility, country-level engagement, policy traction, pipeline development, reporting quality, and the extent to which AVETP is contributing to wider market development.

Reporting should be structured at three practical levels:

- **Transaction level:** a short scorecard for each AVETP-relevant transaction, covering transaction status, MW or MWp produced, climate data, finance mobilised, core climate indicators, HSES actions, GEDSI indicators, implementation issues, and expected versus realised results.
- **Portfolio level:** a small set of aggregated indicators across transactions, such as renewable capacity supported, generation where relevant, emissions avoided where measurable, capital mobilised, number and value of green or sustainable bonds supported, local currency solutions, and core GEDSI metrics.
- **System level:** short contribution-based case studies on catalytic and market-shaping outcomes, such as demonstration effects, improved investee systems, green bond market development, and progress on the CEF.

This would make AVETP reporting more useful for DFAT, PIDG and stakeholders, while avoiding a heavy or duplicative MEL system.

RECOMMENDATION 4. INTRODUCE A MINIMUM CROSSCUTTING AND CLIMATE DATASET FOR ALL AVETP TRANSACTIONS

PIDG and DFAT should require a minimum dataset across all AVETP relevant transactions covering climate, gender equality, disability inclusion, safeguards, and HSES. The current evidence shows that some data exists at transaction level, but it is uneven, fragmented, and poorly surfaced. Disability inclusion is especially weak, while climate figures are sometimes projected, modelled, or calculated using different assumptions.

The minimum dataset should include women's participation in the workforce, management and senior leadership; any gender-related workforce or market initiatives; whether persons with disabilities are employed or intentionally reached; whether a disability inclusion policy or practice exists; major HSES incidents, complaints, or safeguard issues; and the assumptions used to estimate emissions avoided or other climate results. This would create a practical reporting floor without imposing a heavy additional MEL burden.

RECOMMENDATION 5. PRIORITISE HIGH QUALITY, ADDITIONAL, AND MARKET SHAPING TRANSACTIONS OVER SIMPLE VOLUME TARGETS

AVETP should continue to prioritise transactions based on quality, additionality, demonstration effect and market-shaping potential. While several stakeholders noted that the number and volume of transactions remain limited, the strongest evidence of effectiveness comes from transactions that filled financing gaps, improved tenor, strengthened investee systems, raised standards, and demonstrated new pathways for climate-aligned investment in Vietnam.

Future prioritisation should therefore favour transactions that:

- address clear financing gaps not well served by local banks or commercial investors;
- demonstrate new or underdeveloped financing structures, such as longer-tenor bonds, local currency guarantees, mezzanine finance, or early-stage risk-sharing capital;
- support first-of-kind or harder-to-finance sectors;
- improve investee readiness, governance, HSES and ESG systems; and
- create credible demonstration effects for other investors or market actors.

To support this, AVETP should continue use technical assistance more strategically as a transaction-enabling tool at the front end of the pipeline. Primary data suggests that “bankability” constraints vary by transaction and may relate to early-stage capital, sponsor equity depth, regulatory readiness, due diligence preparedness, financial modelling, E&S/HSES systems, governance standards, pricing, and local market conditions. AVETP should continue provide more targeted pre-transaction support, including early-stage feasibility work, financial modelling, E&S and HSES strengthening, due diligence readiness support, local regulatory advice, and support to meet international financier requirements.

RECOMMENDATION 6. MANAGE THE CREDIT ENHANCEMENT FACILITY AS A LONGER HORIZON MARKET BUILDING INITIATIVE

The CEF should continue to be pursued with realistic expectations and a delivery model suited to institution and longer-term market building. The evidence shows that the CEF remains highly relevant to Vietnam’s capital market and net zero financing needs, but progress has been slowed by regulatory, political, and institutional factors. Engagement to date has been supported through local consultancy and Owner engagement; however, the process is now largely with government. For the remainder of AVETPthe CEF should be viewed as a longer-horizon market-building initiative requiring sustained advocacy, government engagement, market education, and technical support.

Progress should be tracked through market-building, institutional engagement, and capacity development milestones rather than through short term transaction style indicators alone. Until the legal framework is approved, realistic indicators could include progress on draft regulations or guidelines; technical inputs provided by PIDG; progress on governance structure, product design, operating model, and risk management arrangements; identification of capitalisation requirements; and capacity-building support for relevant counterparts.

3 Introduction

3.1 The Australia–Vietnam Energy Transition Platform (AVETP)

The AVETP is a DFAT funded investment designed to support Vietnam's transition to a low carbon and climate resilient economy by mobilising private sector investment in renewable energy, sustainable infrastructure, and capital market development. It commenced in 2023 and was originally scheduled to run to June 2025, but was extended to June 2028 to allow continued implementation, including work on the proposed CEF, which had been delayed by regulatory constraints. The Platform comprises two investments, with AUD 17 million allocated to the PIDG and AUD 3 million to Australian Development Investments, although the PIDG component is the primary focus of this review.

The Mid-Term Review was commissioned by DFAT to assess progress towards the AVETP's end of program outcomes, examine whether its current program logic and MEL arrangements remain fit for purpose, and generate practical recommendations to strengthen delivery, sustainability, and alignment over the remainder of the investment. Building on Australia's broader partnership with PIDG, the AVETP aims to expand the pipeline of bankable clean energy and sustainable infrastructure transactions in Vietnam, unlock private capital through blended finance and capital market instruments, and support more inclusive, equitable, and higher quality investments that contribute to Vietnam's net zero transition.

The AVETP responds to a core structural challenge in Vietnam's energy transition. Although investment needs for energy generation, transmission, and supporting infrastructure are substantial, private capital mobilisation has been constrained by regulatory uncertainty, elevated risk perceptions, and a limited pipeline of bankable projects. These constraints have affected both domestic and international investors and have shaped the pace and composition of AVETP implementation to date. The platform therefore operates in a context where electricity demand is rising rapidly, coal remains embedded in the short to medium term energy mix, and the urgency of transition is increasing under pressure from Vietnam's net zero commitments, fiscal constraints, uneven regulatory reform, and wider global decarbonisation trends.

The starting point for this Mid-Term Review is an examination of AVETP's programme logic, delivery architecture, and progress toward its two EOPOs:

- Australia will play a visible and influential role in increasing and improving the quality of private investment in Vietnam's transition to net zero, including in renewable energy and small and medium enterprises supporting climate action; and
- Increased investments in Vietnam's net zero transition will be inclusive and equitable, including by supporting and augmenting Vietnam's own policies in these areas.

The review also considers the Intermediate Outcomes (IOs) intended to contribute to these EOPOs. These cover two broad domains. The first is **energy transition**, including renewable energy generation, installed capacity, emissions reduction, improved standards, and mobilisation of finance for renewable energy growth. The second is **capital market development**, including sustainable bond issuance, expansion of the investor base, local currency solutions, mobilisation of domestic investors and entrepreneurs, and progress toward an enabling environment for sustainable capital market issuances. Together, these IOs reflect AVETP's dual ambition to support both transaction level delivery and wider market development.

The Table-2 illustrates PIDG's integrated lifecycle approach, showing how technical assistance and concessional capital support projects from upstream incubation through development and construction to operation. Across this lifecycle, PIDG deploys project development through InfraCo Asia and credit solutions including EAAIF and GuarantCo to mobilise private capital and strengthen local capital markets in support of Vietnam's energy transition under AVETP.

Table 2: *PIDG approach and Solutions*

Stage	PIDG solution area	Instrument or activity/Partners	Description	Examples or notes
Incubation	Technical assistance	Upstream early-stage support	Early support to identify, prepare, structure, and strengthen potential climate finance and infrastructure opportunities before they are ready for investment.	Supports project preparation, feasibility, market development, and early-stage advisory work.
Development and construction	PIDG project development	InfraCo	Project origination, structuring, and management. Equity and other forms of investment into operational businesses.	Supports project development and investment readiness before projects move into operation.
Operation	Debt solutions	EAIF	Long-term debt fund.	Provides long-term debt finance for eligible infrastructure and climate-related projects.
Operation	Guarantee solutions	GuarantCo	Primarily local currency guarantees that unlock loans and bonds.	Helps mobilise domestic finance and reduce perceived risk for lenders and investors.
Operation	Credit enhancement facilities	Credit Enhancement Facilities	Mobilise local capital into projects and businesses.	Examples include InfraCredit, InfraZamin, Dhamana, and other credit enhancement facilities. Some are already active, while others are in set-up mode.
Cross-cutting support	PIDG solutions	Concessional capital, grants, debt and equity	Concessional capital and blended finance are used across PIDG solutions to improve project viability and unlock investment.	Includes viability gap funding and impact-enhancing activities.

AVETP cannot be assessed at mid-term solely through transaction counts or disbursement volumes. Its core value lies in catalytic additionality: the extent to which DFAT's investment through PIDG helps de risk transactions, improve the quality of investment, mobilise private capital, strengthen market confidence, and demonstrate financing models that can be replicated or scaled over time. This is particularly important in a context such as Vietnam, where infrastructure transactions, regulatory reform, and capital market development often move unevenly and over long-time horizons. The review therefore adopts an assessment approach that is systems aware, adaptive, and attentive not only to transaction volume, but also to market shaping effects, institutional strengthening, and the longer gestation periods that characterise blended finance, infrastructure development, and capital market reform.

Consistent with the Terms of Reference, the Mid-Term Review is framed around five broad evaluative dimensions: progress toward the EOPOs, the effectiveness of AVETP's MEL arrangements, DFAT oversight, lessons learned, and the integration of gender equality, disability, and social inclusion. Given the absence of a dedicated AVETP-specific MEL framework, the review places particular emphasis on the adequacy and practicality of current monitoring and reporting arrangements. It also recognises limitations in the robustness and granularity of available data and therefore draws on targeted primary evidence, including stakeholder interviews, document triangulation, and selected deep-dive case studies outlined in the annex to this report.

3.2 AVETP Log frame

The AVETP logframe Table-3 sets out the relationship between the programme's two main investment components, their intended activities, expected outputs, and end-of-program outcomes. It shows how the Renewable Energy Access Fund is expected to support clean energy generation, renewable energy capacity, improved access, emissions avoidance, and gender-responsive investment, while the Capital Markets for Climate Action Fund is expected to deepen Vietnam's climate finance market through green bonds, local currency finance, institutional investor participation, and sustainable infrastructure investment.

Table 3: AVETP logframe reviewed and tested as part of the Mid-Term Review

Component	Programme activities	Outputs	End-of-program outcome
Component 1: Renewable Energy Access Fund	The Renewable Energy Access Fund is designed to expand PIDG's investment footprint in Vietnam, accelerating the deployment of clean energy solutions and broadening access to renewable power sources. Catalytic capital, including technical assistance and capital grants, is provided as soft capital to support Vietnam's progress, unlock investments facing delays, and reduce additional costs caused by long development times.	• New renewable energy generation. • Increased renewable energy installed capacity, measured in megawatts (MW), and renewable energy generation. • Increase in the share of renewables. • Increased number of people with new and improved access. • Displacement of fossil-fuel-generated power and amount of greenhouse gas emissions avoided. • Number of projects classified as empowering women and girls. • Number of green or sustainable bonds issued or supported. • Value of green or sustainable bonds issued or supported.	EOPO-1: Australia will play a visible and influential role in increasing and improving the quality of private investment in Vietnam's transition to net zero. This includes both the renewable energy sector and SMEs supporting climate action.
Component 2: Capital Markets for Climate Action Fund	The Capital Markets for Climate Action Fund focuses on developing Vietnam's financial markets by supporting green bonds, local currency investment mechanisms, and sustainable financing instruments that attract institutional investors. The provision of investment capital to PIDG subsidiaries, including InfraCo Asia, GuarantCo, and the Emerging Africa and Asia Infrastructure Fund (EAIF), enables investment in new deals in Vietnam.	• Increased number of people with new and improved access to sustainable infrastructure in line with a country investment approach. • Increased number of green or sustainable bonds issued or supported. • Increased value of green or sustainable bonds issued or supported. • Increased number of participating institutional investors. • Increased number of first-time green bond issuers. • Renewable energy and energy-transition projects financed or advanced. • Green and climate finance transactions supported, including green or sustainability-linked bond issuances.	EOPO-2: Increased investments in Vietnam's net zero transition will be inclusive and equitable, including by supporting and augmenting Vietnam's own policies in these areas.

3.3 Methodology

The methodology adopted a mixed method, theory informed approach designed for a complex, catalytic investment platform rather than a conventional service delivery programme. It combined document and portfolio review, key informant interviews, case-based analysis, and comparative trend analysis to assess how AVETP is contributing to change across Vietnam's market, institutions, and investor behaviour. At its core, the approach was contribution focused and systems aware, examining not only what has changed, but how and under what conditions AVETP is helping to mobilise private capital, strengthen market confidence, and support Vietnam's energy transition. The methodology was also guided by principles of inclusion, responsible investment, ethics, independence, and learning, so that the review supports both accountability and practical course correction for the remainder of the programme.

Table 4: Overview of the AVETP Review Design and Methodology

Main component	Description
Evaluation design	The review applied a mixed-methods, theory-informed and systems-thinking approach, with contribution analysis at its core. It integrated qualitative and quantitative evidence to understand how AVETP contributes to market development, investment behaviour, and Vietnam's net zero transition.
Evidence sources	The review drew on AVETP programme documents, transaction records, portfolio data, reporting products, and stakeholder perspectives gathered through key informant interviews with DFAT, PIDG, partners, investees, and other relevant stakeholders.
Analytical methods	The review used contribution-focused analysis, case-based analysis, and comparative and trend analysis to examine plausible contribution, identify patterns across transactions, and assess emerging results, barriers, enablers, and learning across the portfolio.
Cross-cutting lens	The review applied an inclusive and responsible investment lens, considering gender equality, disability inclusion, safeguards, transparency, accountability, and responsible climate finance practice.
Ethics and credibility	The review was grounded in independence, transparency, evidence quality, and ethical practice to support credible findings, accountability, learning, and practical course correction.

3.4 Review Purpose and Approach

This Mid-Term Review was designed as an independent, mixed-methods, utilisation-focused assessment of the AVETP. Its purpose was not only to assess progress to date, but also to generate practical findings and recommendations that can improve programme delivery, reporting, and strategic alignment over the remainder of implementation. This approach was appropriate because AVETP is not a conventional bilateral development programme. It is a blended-finance platform operating through multiple instruments and business lines, with a portfolio that has evolved across renewable energy, e-mobility, water, recycling, green bonds, guarantees, and credit enhancement.

The review was informed by a theory-based and contribution-oriented logic. It did not seek to establish attribution through counterfactual analysis. Rather, it assessed how and to what extent AVETP has plausibly contributed to progress toward the EOPOs, intermediate outcomes, and wider strategic objectives, drawing on available evidence from documents, interviews, transaction case material, and stakeholder reflections. This was consistent with a utilisation-focused evaluation logic in which evidence is aligned to real-world decision needs, programme timing, and practical management questions rather than only to ex post summative judgement.

3.5 Review Design

The review used a convergent mixed-methods design that combined document review, key informant interviews, field-based consultation, transaction case study analysis, and iterative triangulation. Quantitative and qualitative evidence were considered together, with quantitative information used where available to examine transaction scale, mobilisation, climate results, workforce composition, and other measurable indicators, and qualitative evidence used to interpret relevance, additionality, catalytic effects, policy engagement, oversight, implementation constraints, and programme learning.

Given the structure of AVETP, the methodology combined two linked lenses. The first was a **transaction lens**, examining what had been financed, what had changed, and what evidence existed at investee or instrument level. The second was a **programme lens**, examining how those transactions were being translated into a coherent country programme, including reporting, visibility, policy relevance, oversight, country interface, and progress toward the EOPOs.

3.6 Data Collection Methods

The review drew on four main sources of evidence.

Desk review
A structured desk review was undertaken of programme documents, reporting materials, transaction summaries, interview notes, and stakeholder submissions. This included review of DFAT and PIDG documentation, transaction-level materials, stakeholder interview notes, and records related to programme logic, MEL, oversight, and implementation progress. The desk review was used to map the original programme framing, identify evidence gaps, and test the fit between reported results and the actual shape of the portfolio.

Key informant interviews and consultations
The review team conducted semi-structured interviews and consultations with DFAT, PIDG, Vietnamese government counterparts, investees, intermediaries, and other relevant stakeholders. These interviews were designed to explore not only what had happened, but how and why it had happened, what constraints had emerged, and where perceptions converged or diverged across stakeholder groups. Interviews were especially important for understanding catalytic and market-shaping effects, transaction additionality, policy and regulatory dynamics, and the practical functioning of oversight, reporting, and country-level coordination. The PIDG core team interview, for example, provided detail on PIDG's impact systems, reporting processes, gender integration, and organisational model, while DFAT and Vietnamese stakeholders provided perspective on country relevance, visibility, policy alignment, and interface challenges.

Field-based inquiry and case study work
The review used transaction case studies as a central method for assessing effectiveness, additionality, implementation experience, and emerging results. Case material was developed from site visits, interviews, transaction documents, and stakeholder reflections across investments such as Dat Bike, CME, Aqua-One, BPG, and August Energy. These case studies allowed the review to examine the diversity of AVETP's portfolio, including different instruments, sectors, maturities, and result pathways. They were particularly useful for identifying demonstration effects, systems strengthening, inclusion outcomes, standards upgrading, and the limits of the original programme logic. The case-based approach also helped surface practical lessons for the remainder of the programme.

Review of existing monitoring and impact data
The evaluation also drew on PIDG's own impact and monitoring systems, including published impact data, annual updates, transaction-level metrics, and internal descriptions of how project data is collected and checked. PIDG reported that it uses an online database across its investments, standardised indicators where possible, annual updates from projects, and internal quality checks by impact staff.

3.7 Sampling Strategy

Sampling was purposive rather than statistical. Stakeholders were selected to ensure coverage across the main functions and perspectives relevant to the review questions. This included DFAT Canberra and Post, PIDG corporate and business-line representatives, investees, financial and market intermediaries, Vietnamese government agencies, owners and partners, and selected actors involved in enabling environment or market-building work such as the Fiingroup.

The case study sample was also purposive. It was designed to capture diversity across sectors, financing instruments, maturity of transactions, and intended result pathways. This was important because AVETP's value proposition does not rest on one homogeneous investment type. The review therefore intentionally included cases from e-mobility, rooftop solar, water, recycling, and early-stage distributed energy in order to test how well the programme logic and monitoring arrangements fitted the portfolio as actually implemented.

Table 5: List of participant organisations and stakeholders interviewed

Stakeholder group interviewed	Organisations	Total	Male	Female
Five core case studies Private sector / investee companies	CME Solar; Dat Bike; Binh Thuan Plastic Group (BPG); Aqua-One; August Energy	**11**	**9**	**2**

Stakeholder group interviewed	Organisations	Total	Male	Female
Government / regulators Policy and finance counterparts	Ministry of Finance (MoF); State Securities Commission (SSC)	**3**	**2**	**1**
DFAT / Australian Government Australian government stakeholders	Australian Consulate General; Australian Embassy Hanoi	**5**	**2**	**3**
Development partners Other owners and development partners	Swiss Embassy (SECO) and UK Embassy	**3**	**1**	**2**
Private intermediaries Market actors and financial advisory	Fiingroup / FiinRatings; Fast Capital	**2**	**1**	**1**
PIDG core team and partners GuarantCo, InfraCo, EAAIF, TA and MEL	PIDG Core Team and Partners	**7**	**5**	**2**

3.8 Quality Assurance, Ethics, and Limitations

The review applied standard qualitative and mixed-methods quality safeguards, including triangulation, source comparison, transparent distinction between observed and projected results, and cautious treatment of causal claims. Where outcome evidence was estimated rather than fully realised, this was treated explicitly as emerging evidence rather than confirmed impact. The review also paid attention to the political and institutional context in which different stakeholders were speaking, particularly where issues of visibility, oversight, regulation, or owner expectations were involved.

Several limitations should be noted. First, the portfolio is still at a mid-term stage, and several investments remain early stage, under construction, or recently closed. This means that many intended development outcomes are not yet fully observable. Second, AVETP does not yet have a sufficiently clear Vietnam-specific MEL framework, which limited the availability of directly comparable programme-level data across transactions. Third, transaction-level information was uneven and limited across sectors and investees: some could provide stronger climate and financial data, while others had better workforce or HSES evidence, and some areas such as disability inclusion were weakly tracked. Fourth, PIDG's corporate systems are stronger than AVETP's country-level reporting architecture, which meant the team often had to reconstruct programme-level findings from transaction and stakeholder evidence retrospectively. These limitations were mitigated through triangulation, use of multiple case studies, cautious interpretation, and explicit distinction between realised, emerging, and projected results.

3.9 Analytical Framework

Analysis was organised around the evaluation questions and informed by OECD DAC style evaluative reasoning, while remaining sensitive to the distinctive features of a blended-finance platform. The review placed particular emphasis on effectiveness, emerging impact, programme logic, MEL fitness for purpose, oversight and engagement arrangements, and lessons for the remainder of implementation.

Three analytical principles guided interpretation.

First, the review distinguished between **direct outputs**, **emerging outcomes**, and **catalytic or enabling effects**. This was important because AVETP includes both immediate, measurable results such as financing closed or MW installed, and slower or indirect results such as market confidence, improved standards, local capital market development, and institutional progress on the CEF.

Second, the review distinguished between **transaction-level performance** and **programme-level (platform) performance**. This was necessary because the evidence repeatedly showed that AVETP has often performed more strongly at the level of individual transactions than at the level of DFAT-facing (platform/programme) reporting, visibility, and country programme management.

Third, the review used **triangulation** as a core method of validation. Findings were not based on single-source claims where stronger corroboration was possible. Instead, evidence from documents, interviews, case studies, and transaction data was compared and tested across sources. Where stakeholder accounts diverged, the review treated this as analytically meaningful rather than as an error to be eliminated. Differences in perspective often revealed important tensions between corporate systems and country needs, between transaction logic and bilateral programme expectations, or between strategic alignment and operational delivery.

4 Findings and Analysis

This section presents findings on the AVETP's effectiveness, with a focus on the two EOPOs, the CEF, MEL arrangements, DFAT oversight and engagement, programme logic, and implementation lessons for the remainder of the investment period.

4.1 Effectiveness

Overall, AVETP has been very effective in catalysing relevant, good-quality transactions and in demonstrating the value of PIDG's blended-finance model in Vietnam, but less effective as a DFAT-facing bilateral programme. At transaction level, the platform has shown clear strengths: PIDG's mix of early-stage equity, longer-tenor debt, guarantees, and technical assistance has helped fill financing gaps not well served by local banks or conventional MDB products. This has translated into a diverse portfolio across e-mobility, rooftop solar, water infrastructure, and recycling-related green bonds, and early-stage renewable energy platforms. The strongest evidence of effectiveness lies in the quality and catalytic character of the transactions supported. AVETP has helped bring forward first-of-kind or harder-to-finance transactions, improved the tenor and structure of finance, strengthened investee systems, and supported local capital market development. At the same time, stakeholders offered a balanced view on transaction volume. Some noted the potential for PIDG to close more transactions, given the size and depth of the Vietnamese market opportunity. Others emphasised that the transactions completed to date were high quality, additional, and market-shaping, demonstrating strong progress through first-of-kind financing structures, improved standards, and catalytic examples across sectors such as e-mobility, rooftop solar, water, and circular manufacturing.

AVETP has also shown transaction-level adaptability. While the original programme logic was strongly oriented toward renewable energy generation, the realised portfolio has expanded into climate-relevant sectors where market and regulatory conditions allowed progress, including e-mobility, water infrastructure, circular manufacturing. This reflects a pragmatic response to Vietnam's regulatory and market conditions, particularly during a period when new renewable generation projects faced approval, licensing, and PPA-related delays.

However, programme-level effectiveness has been noticeably weaker. Stakeholders consistently reported weaker stakeholder engagement, delayed and insufficient reporting, weak alignment between PIDG's corporate systems and AVETP's country-level reporting needs, and inadequate local presence in Vietnam. This has reduced visibility of Australia's contribution, placed additional pressure on DFAT Post for coordination and communication, and limited PIDG's responsiveness in government engagement, upstream transaction development, and support for initiatives such as the CEF. The result is a clear aggregation and country-interface gap. While useful transaction-level data exists, and PIDG has credible corporate monitoring capacity, relevant data is not consistently assembled, translated and reported through an AVETP-level framework that meet DFAT's country-level management, reporting and visibility needs.

The remainder of this effectiveness section assesses progress against the two end-of-programme outcomes and the Credit Enhancement Facility (CEF). It also draws on relevant case studies to illustrate how AVETP-supported transactions have contributed to results in practice across different sectors and financing instruments.

4.2 Finding by the End of Programme Outcomes (EOPOs)

EOPO-1: Australia will play a visible and influential role in increasing and improving the quality of private investment in Vietnam's transition to net zero. This includes both the renewable energy sector and small and medium enterprises (SMEs) supporting climate action.

Evidence suggests that AVETP has made a credible and influential contribution to increasing and improving the quality of private investment in Vietnam's net zero transition. Through PIDG, the platform

has helped bring forward investments across renewable energy, e-mobility, water infrastructure, circular manufacturing, and early-stage distributed energy platforms. These transactions show that DFAT funding PIDG's support has helped unlock or accelerate private investment where capital was constrained, risk was perceived as high, or financing structures were not readily available through local markets.
The strongest evidence lies not only in increased investment volumes, but in the quality, structure, and catalytic value of the investment. As summarised in Table 6 -7, AVETP-supported transactions are associated with an estimated or projected 260,777 tCO_2e/year in avoided emissions, 313.68 MW of realised or planned renewable capacity, 382,060 MWh/year of current or projected renewable electricity generation, at least VND 478bn in green bond-related finance, and USD 129.8m in additional or projected private capital mobilisation.

A further strength is the way AVETP has improved the quality and credibility of investees and projects. Across the case studies, PIDG support strengthened ESG, HSES, governance, documentation, and risk management systems and investor readiness. This has helped prepare firms for later rounds of finance, improve investor confidence, and demonstrate more robust standards in emerging sectors. In this sense, AVETP's influence is strongest in transaction quality, additionality, and demonstration effect rather than in headline volume alone.

The capital market contribution is also important. Aqua-One and BPG demonstrate how guarantees and blended structures can help make long-tenor, climate-aligned finance more feasible in sectors where local bank finance may be shorter-term or less suitable. CME's mobilisation of both local debt and foreign debt also shows that AVETP-supported transactions can help combine domestic and international finance. As shown in the Table-6, the finance results include at least VND 478bn in green bond-related finance, USD 40.9m and VND 391bn in foreign and local debt mobilised, and USD 129.8m in additional or projected private capital mobilisation. These examples indicate a contribution to market development through guarantees, local currency solutions, first-time issuers, and financing structures that may be replicated in other sectors.

PIDG, investees, and some government and market stakeholders recognise Australia's contribution, particularly at the transaction level. PIDG is also gaining increased visibility in Vietnam's private sector through recent transactions and its practice of issuing media releases when transactions close. However, the broader AVETP public-facing identity is less visible across the wider market engagement. This limits the extent to which Australia's role is understood as a coherent contribution to Vietnam's sustainable infrastructure and green finance agenda, beyond its association with specific PIDG-supported transactions.

Table 6: Portfolio reach and results at a glance

Results area	Result	Value	What this means
Climate impact	Estimated or projected emissions avoided	260,777 tCO_2e/year	Combined estimated and projected emissions avoided across clean mobility, rooftop solar, water-related solar, recycling, and distributed energy pipeline results.
Renewable capacity	Installed or planned renewable capacity	313.68 MW	Combined realised and planned renewable capacity supported across relevant AVETP transactions.
Clean generation	Current or projected renewable electricity generation	382,060 MWh/year	Combined current and projected annual renewable electricity generation from supported renewable energy transactions.
Green bond finance	Green bond-related finance	At least VND 478 billion	Green bond-related finance supported through AVETP-relevant transactions, including guarantee-backed structures.
VND-denominated finance and investment	All finance and investment	VND 869 billion in VND	AVETP-supported transactions account for VND 869 billion in VND-denominated finance and investment, comprising VND 391 billion in local debt mobilised, VND 260 billion in green bond finance, and VND 218 billion in InfraCo equity investment.
Private capital	Additional or projected private capital mobilisation	USD 129.8 million	Additional or projected private capital mobilised through supported transactions and platforms.

Table 7: Aggregated evidence by results area

Results area	Evidence summary
Climate and energy results	AVETP-supported transactions are associated with 260,777 tCO_2e/year in combined estimated or projected emissions avoided, 313.68 MW in realised or planned renewable capacity, and 382,060 MWh/year in current or projected renewable electricity generation.
Finance mobilised and de-risked	The portfolio includes USD 4 million plus USD 30 million in debt financing and platform capital supporting clean transport and distributed energy; USD 40.9 million and VND 391 billion in foreign and local debt mobilised through renewable energy investment; and a USD 20 million guarantee plus 40% CAPEX cover through credit enhancement and guarantee support for green industry and infrastructure.
Market reach and service benefits	The portfolio includes 150,000 m^3/day in clean water treatment capacity, potential access to improved water infrastructure for 1.5 million people, and expansion of Dat Bike's market footprint from 6 to more than 40 outlets, representing at least a 6.7-fold increase.

EOPO-2: Increased investments in Vietnam's net zero transition will be inclusive and equitable, including by supporting and augmenting Vietnam's own policies in these areas.

The evidence suggests that AVETP is making a meaningful but mixed contribution to ensuring that increased investment is inclusive and equitable. The strongest evidence is concentrated in access, participation, local employment, affordability, and stronger safeguards. As summarised in the Table-8, the clearest inclusion-related results include potential access to clean water for 1.5 million people, broader access to e-mobility beyond higher-income customers and expected future local employment in the water treatment project, with 70% of jobs expected to be recruited from surrounding communities. The evidence also shows 50%–60% women's representation among office staff in the recycling and circular economy project, alongside strengthened standards across HSES, ESG, ESMS, training, contractor standards, and governance systems. At project level, Dat Bike appears to have broadened access beyond premium adopters by expanding into lower-priced models and reaching more price-sensitive users. Aqua-One links climate-aligned infrastructure to local employment, women's participation, ethnic minority inclusion, and improved access to an essential service. BPG and CME also show evidence of female workforce participation in sectors that are often male dominated, alongside improved labour and safeguard standards.

At the same time, the evidence suggests that AVETP has made more progress in increasing women's participation than in achieving deeper changes in gender equality and disability. Women are present in the workforce and, in some cases, in leadership, technical, office, design, and monitoring roles. This represents positive progress in sectors where female participation is often lower, especially in site-based and operational positions. However, there is more limited evidence of deeper shifts in workplace culture, disability inclusion, organisational policy, leadership pathways, or decision-making structures. Disability inclusion is the weakest GEDSI dimension across the portfolio, with little evidence that it is systematically integrated into investee policies, workforce practices, or monitoring systems. Most investees reported having no employees with disabilities and no specific disability inclusion policy.

The policy dimension of EOPO-2 remains the least evidenced area. There are positive signs that AVETP is contributing to a policy-relevant market direction: CME's growth reflects demand from firms pursuing RE100 and net-zero commitments; Aqua-One and BPG have helped deepen Vietnam's sustainable finance market through green bonds; and PIDG's guarantee and credit-enhancement work is widely regarded as relevant to Vietnam's financing gaps. However, the more explicit contribution to supporting and augmenting Vietnam's own policies remains limited. The clearest example of AVETP's contribution to policy and market-shaping engagement is the CEF, which is widely viewed as highly relevant to Vietnam's capital-market development and sustainable finance agenda. However, progress has been delayed due to regulatory constraints and limited local follow-through. While progress through the CEF and individual transactions is acknowledged, there is limited evidence in relation to the EOPO's focus on supporting and augmenting Vietnam's own equitable and inclusive policies.

Table 8: Inclusion, Access, and Safeguards Results

Results area	Indicator	Reported result	What this means
Service access	People potentially served through clean water infrastructure	1.5 million people	The water infrastructure investment is expected to improve access to clean water for a large population.
Affordability	Lower-priced e-mobility model customers who appear lower-income or price-sensitive	More than 40%	Lower-priced electric motorbike models appear to be broadening access beyond higher-income customers.
Local employment	Future workforce expected from local communities	70%	The water treatment project expects a substantial share of future jobs to be recruited from surrounding communities.
Women in workforce	Women represented among office staff in one recycling and circular economy transaction	50%–60%	One transaction shows relatively strong women's representation among office-based staff.
Standards upgrade	Areas where standards were strengthened	5 areas	HSES, ESG, ESMS, training, contractor management, and governance systems were strengthened across transactions.

4.3 Credit Enhancement Facility

The Credit Enhancement Facility (CEF) remains one of the most ambitious and potentially transformative elements of AVETP, but it is also one of the slowest moving. Stakeholders across DFAT, PIDG, SSC, MoF and the market consistently described the CEF as highly relevant to Vietnam's capital market development and net zero financing needs. PIDG sees it as a long-term contribution to transforming infrastructure finance in Vietnam by establishing a locally based, onshore guarantor able to provide local currency guarantees and mobilise domestic institutional investors.

Progress to date has been real, but slower than originally expected. The evidence suggests that the first major step was a feasibility study completed in 2023, which concluded that the CEF was commercially viable as a non-subsidised commercial structure rather than a grant-based vehicle. Since then, the focus has shifted to the enabling environment. Multiple sources confirm that the central bottleneck has been the absence of a legal and regulatory framework for such an institution in Vietnam. The SSC has started drafting the regulations and guidelines needed to establish the facility, with the Ministry of Finance playing a central role and the World Bank providing regulatory support.

Stakeholders repeatedly emphasised that this is the first attempt to create such a facility in Vietnam and that it is effectively being built from a blank sheet of paper. The CEF should therefore be understood differently from ordinary transactions. Unlike a guarantee for a specific bond or loan, it is an institution-building and market-shaping initiative with a much longer horizon. Operationalisation remains pending, and the facility has not yet begun delivering guarantees, mobilising domestic institutional investors, or generating transaction-level outcomes. Its effectiveness should therefore be judged against its stage of development: meaningful policy traction and market-building value have emerged, but realised results remain at an early stage.

4.4 AVETP MEL Arrangements

The evidence suggests that AVETP's current MEL arrangements are partly functional but not yet fit for purpose as a DFAT bilateral programme. PIDG has credible global corporate systems for impact management, safeguards, and transaction monitoring, and these appear to perform strongly at the corporate level. Transactions are screened for impact and safeguard risks, reporting requirements are built into transaction processes, and investees are often able to provide data on operational, HSES, climate, and in some cases gender related results. However, these corporate systems have not been translated into a sufficiently clear and practical Vietnam specific MEL architecture that supports reporting against AVETP's agreed end of program outcomes, intermediate results, and cross cutting priorities. As a result, there remains a gap between what PIDG can monitor internally and what DFAT needs to report, manage, and learn at the country level. Gender, disability, and inclusion are present in PIDG systems, but are weakly and inconsistently reflected in AVETP-level reporting, with disability data especially limited.

This gap is further compounded by the nature of the portfolio and the way the platform has evolved. Several transactions are still early stage, under construction, or recently closed, meaning that many intended development outcomes are not yet fully observable. At the same time, the scope of the programme is appropriate and relevant, including renewable energy generation, e-mobility, water, green bonds, recycling, guarantees, and credit enhancement. However, this breadth needs to be more clearly reflected in the programme logic and MEL framework so that AVETP's full contribution can be captured and reported coherently. Useful transaction level data exists, but it is uneven, fragmented, and not assembled into a consistent AVETP reporting structure. Current arrangements therefore meet PIDG's transaction management and corporate reporting needs better than DFAT's requirements for country level performance tracking, narrative reporting against EOPOs, and systematic analysis of gender, disability, inclusion, and climate results. The burden of bridging this gap has also fallen too heavily on DFAT Post, reflecting not only a technical MEL weakness but also a broader challenge of local coordination, program interface, and reporting support.

Key Findings

1. PIDG has credible internal impact and reporting systems at the corporate level

PIDG has a rigorous global internal impact management and reporting system. At the corporate level, this appears to perform strongly, particularly in relation to cross country portfolio management, safeguards, impact screening, and ongoing monitoring and evaluation. The system tracks impact across transactions in different countries and is supported by an internal impact team and annual monitoring updates throughout the investment cycle. However, these globally oriented corporate arrangements have not yet been sufficiently translated into a clear, bespoke AVETP level MEL and reporting framework.

2. The main weakness is the absence of a dedicated AVETP level MEL framework and programme logic

Multiple sources point to a mismatch between PIDG's corporate systems and DFAT's AVETP reporting needs. The desk review found little or no clear data reported against the two EOPOs and the Intermediate Outcomes. There is also no agreed programme logic or dedicated MEL plan for the AVETP platform. In practice, evidence is not being systematically reported against the agreed Vietnam level outcomes. This gap appears to arise because PIDG understandably relies on its existing global corporate systems, which are designed to track and aggregate results across countries, while DFAT requires reporting against the specific outcomes agreed for the platform.

3. Current reporting is not fully meeting DFAT's country level needs

PIDG has made some efforts to provide AVETP specific progress updates. While these efforts are appreciated, they do not provide DFAT with a sufficiently clear view of progress against the EOPOs, Intermediate Outcomes, and cross cutting commitments. Stakeholders described the reporting function as weak, with limited usable information on outcomes for accountability to both the Australian and Vietnamese governments. Quarterly reporting has also not provided sufficiently systematic information on gender, inclusion, or disability.

4. Transaction level data exists, but it is fragmented and not yet standardised at platform level

Field evidence confirms that transaction level data is available across several investments, including Dat Bike, CME, BPG, Aqua-One, and August Energy. These data include information on investment volumes, installed capacity, emissions, staffing, gender participation, and operational changes. However, the data is limited in quality and scope and is not yet brought together in a single AVETP reporting format that allows systematic portfolio level assessment. The issue is therefore less one of total data absence than fragmentation, lack of standardisation, and unclear minimum reporting expectations.

5. Gender, disability, and inclusion are present in PIDG systems, but weakly reflected in AVETP reporting

PIDG reports that gender and inclusion, including disability inclusion, are embedded in screening and investment processes. Transaction level evidence shows that some GEDSI related data exists, including women's workforce participation, leadership roles, and in some cases ethnic minority participation. However, this information is not consistently aggregated or surfaced in AVETP reporting. Disability remains especially weak, inconsistent, or absent.

6. The MEL challenge is not only technical, but also managerial and relational

Current MEL weaknesses are not only about indicators or reporting templates. They are also about local presence, coordination, follow up, and the practical use of information. PIDG's limited local interface in Vietnam has meant that aspects of reporting, coordination, visibility, and transaction follow up have been pushed back onto DFAT Post. In a platform of this kind, MEL is not only a compliance function. It is also the mechanism through which DFAT and PIDG maintain a shared understanding of what the platform is doing, where it is progressing, and where course correction is needed.

What MEL approaches are most practical and effective for the remainder of the programme?

For the remainder of AVETP, the most practical approach is **not** to build a heavy new MEL system from scratch. That would be unrealistic, duplicative, and poorly matched to the remaining timeframe. Instead, the most effective approach is to establish a **light, transaction-centred MEL architecture** that sits on top of PIDG's existing systems and translates them into a manageable Vietnam-facing reporting framework.

This system should address five elements.

First, AVETP should adopt a small set of core indicators and intermediate results within transaction reporting through a single, standardised template. This would enable transaction teams to report consistently on capital mobilised; PIDG and AVETP financing committed; transaction status; renewable capacity installed or under construction where relevant; annual renewable generation where relevant; estimated GHG emissions avoided using transparent assumptions; the number and type of projects reaching financial close; and one or two indicators of market shaping effects, such as first of kind transactions, longer tenor, use of guarantees, or subsequent financing crowded in. This is feasible because much of this data is already available or can be estimated across the existing case studies.

Second, AVETP should use a **tiered reporting model** that distinguishes between early-stage, under-construction, and operational transactions. This is important because different transactions can credibly report different things. For early-stage projects such as August Energy, the focus should be on pipeline, approvals, capital mobilised, and projected climate outcomes. For under-construction projects such as Aqua-One, reporting should focus on financing closed, construction progress, safeguards, workforce composition, and projected service/climate outcomes. For operational projects such as CME and Dat Bike, reporting should include actual installed capacity, production/generation, realised staffing, and updated on climate estimates and development outcomes.

Third, AVETP should introduce a **minimum cross-cutting data set** on gender equality, disability inclusion, and safeguards for all investees. A practical minimum set would include: proportion of women in total workforce, management, and board/senior leadership; evidence of any gender-related workforce or market initiatives; whether the investee has a disability inclusion policy or practice; whether any persons with disability are employed or intentionally reached; and any major HSES incidents, complaints, or safeguard issues during the reporting period.

Fourth, AVETP should supplement transaction metrics with a **short annual qualitative portfolio review** focused on additionality, demonstration effect, and policy relevance. This matters because some of AVETP's most important results, such as longer-tenor bonds, improved ESG or HSES system, strengthened investor credibility, catalytic follow-on finance and progress towards the CEF, are not well captured by quantitative indicators alone.

Fifth, there needs to be a **clearer country-level reporting interface**. The most practical solution would be to nominate one accountable country manager to coordinate inputs across relevant PIDG teams and consolidate them into a single AVETP country-level update. This should be supported by a simple reporting calendar agreed with DFAT, including semi-annual progress updates and an annual portfolio review.

4.5 AVETP Programme Logic

The current EOPOs, intermediate outcomes, and programme logic are only partly fit for purpose. They still capture some important elements of AVETP, particularly around renewable energy, sustainable bonds, and capital market development, safeguards, and private finance mobilisation. This remains important because PIDG is expected to continue supporting solar and commercial and industrial renewable energy projects, including through emerging pipelines such as August Energy, which are strongly aligned with the original objectives of the programme. However, the results structure does not fully reflect the actual shape of the portfolio, the diversity of PIDG's transactions and instruments, or the main ways in which the programme is contributing to the EOPOs. PIDG's activities in Vietnam are opportunity-led and depend on the availability of bankable, mandate-aligned transactions, rather than being driven only by the AVETP programme logic. Additionally, the logic was originally framed too narrowly around renewable energy generation and highly dependent on direct output metrics such as MW installed, GWh generated, or numbers of bonds issued. This was appropriate at the time of design, when Vietnam was emerging from a major solar and wind investment boom. However, the subsequent slowdown in renewable energy approvals and the tightening of the feed-in tariff regime reduced the availability of bankable renewable generation projects during implementation.

As a result, AVETP-supported transactions also included e-mobility, water infrastructure, recycling, green bonds, guarantees, blended finance, and the CEF. These should not be interpreted as a departure from scope, but as part of a broader climate finance and transition-related portfolio that reflects available opportunities and DFAT's flexible support to PIDG in Vietnam. At the same time, the programme logic does not yet clearly explain how these diverse transactions contribute to the EOPOs, particularly where the climate contribution is indirect, enabling, or linked to market development rather than direct renewable energy generation. It is therefore essential that the current logic be refined rather than replaced entirely. Most parts remain useful, especially the capital market development strand, climate and safeguard related indicators, and the focus on mobilising private finance. However, these need to be repositioned within a broader but still disciplined climate transition model. A more practical structure would organise the programme around three to three areas: mobilising more and better private investment into Vietnam's net zero transition; improving the quality and investability of climate mitigation, adaptation, and resilience projects; and supporting more inclusive and equitable transition investments.

Key Findings

1. **The current programme scope** was originally framed **too narrowly in renewable energy generation and does not adequately reflect the broader range of climate relevant investments.**

Evidence suggests that AVETP **should retain its strong renewable energy and energy transition focus**, while applying a broader but disciplined climate finance lens where opportunities are bankable, mandate-aligned, additional, and relevant to Vietnam's transition needs. This is important because PIDG's activities in Vietnam are not driven by the programme logic alone, but by the availability of opportunities it can realistically support or finance. A more appropriate direction is to retain a **clear climate transition focus**, while allowing greater flexibility to support **climate mitigation, adaptation, and resilience-related investments** where these are relevant, additional and aligned with PIDG's comparative advantage. This would be more consistent with the realised portfolio and with implementation lessons showing that a broader climate-relevant portfolio is a form of risk management rather than mission drift.

2. The IOs overemphasises direct output metrics and underplays catalytic and quality effects

The current programme logic gives too much weight to immediate output style indicators, such as MW installed, GWh generated, people reached, or policy changes. It does not sufficiently capture the ways AVETP is actually generating value, including improving the quality of finance, supporting first-of-kind transactions, extending tenor, strengthening standards, enabling local currency structures, and helping firms attract follow-on capital.

3. Most elements of the current EOPOs and IOs remain useful and should be retained

The capital market development strand remains strongly relevant, especially given the evidence from guarantee backed green bonds, local currency solutions, first time issuers, and the proposed CEF. The logic is also right to include HSES, gender, and climate related considerations, because the case studies consistently show that PIDG improves standards and strengthens firm level systems. The issue is not that these areas are irrelevant, but that they are currently too thin, too disconnected, or too narrowly framed relative to the EOPOs.

4. Australia's visibility and influence are not adequately captured in the current logic

EOPO 1 explicitly refers to Australia's visible and influential role, yet the current IOs do not meaningfully track how transactions translate into Australian visibility, owner influence, bilateral strategic engagement, or public diplomacy value. This is a significant gap because multiple stakeholders observed that Australia's substantive contribution is stronger than its public visibility.

5. Inclusion and equity pathways are underdeveloped

EOPO 2 focuses on investments being inclusive and equitable, including support to Vietnam's own policies in these areas. The current logic includes a few gender and climate related indicators, but this is not enough to capture the inclusion evidence that is emerging from the portfolio. More coherent pathways are needed for women's employment, local jobs, minority participation, affordability effects, workforce practices, safeguards and disability inclusion.

6. Policy and enabling environment pathways are treated too simplistically

The current logic includes ambitions around regulatory change, market knowledge, and sustainable finance development, but it underestimates how long term, politically contingent, and non-linear this work is, particularly in relation to the CEF. The CEF experience shows that progress depends on political timing, institutional ownership, legal drafting, and sustained engagement rather than on short term linear delivery.

4.6 Oversight and Engagement

Overall, DFAT's oversight and engagement arrangements have been active **and strategically effective**. DFAT has remained closely engaged with AVETP, including participating in PIDG events, supporting senior-level engagement, maintaining alignment with Australia's development and foreign policy priorities, and using opportunities to clarify expectations for managing a bilateral programme. DFAT's engagement has helped keep AVETP connected to Vietnam's transition agenda, particularly around blended finance, private capital mobilisation, climate investment, and capital market development.

The main limitation has not been DFAT's level of oversights or strategic engagement. Rather the challenge has been that DFAT's oversights has been affected by the quality and consistency of reporting, while broader programme engagement and visibility have been constrained by limited local presence and country arrangements within the AVETP/PDIG delivery arrangements. These factors sit largely outside DFAT's direct control but have increased the burden on post to support coordination, relationship management, communication and visibility.

Key Findings

1. DFAT's oversight has been strongest on strategic alignment and direction

A major strength of DFAT's engagement has been its role in keeping AVETP aligned with both Australia's international development policy and Vietnam's transition priorities. DFAT viewed the platform as a bespoke mechanism through which Australian priorities on climate, gender, blended finance, and locally led development could be applied in Vietnam. Vietnamese government stakeholders also stressed the relevance of concessional and blended finance to Vietnam's needs as a middle-income country and welcomed international support for low carbon and private sector investment.

2. DFAT has been effective in identifying weaknesses and pushing PIDG to respond

The evidence indicates that DFAT has played an important corrective role. BFU, Post, and other DFAT stakeholders were explicit that AVETP had not initially been set up in a way that matched DFAT's expectations for bilateral oversight, visibility, reporting, and local interface. DFAT used its oversight role to surface weaknesses in reporting, communication, local engagement, and early underutilisation of funding, and to press PIDG for stronger in country presence and better programme level management.

3. The weakest area has been visibility of Australia's contribution

One of the clearest findings is that Australia's role has not been sufficiently visible. PIDG itself is becoming better known in Vietnam and is increasingly referenced in capital market conferences and commercial circles. However, stakeholders have limited awareness that Australia is a part-owner and funder of PIDG-supported transactions. DFAT and other stakeholders reported that many actors do not clearly understand that transactions are being supported through Australian funding, and that public diplomacy has too often depended on DFAT taking extra initiative rather than being built systematically into AVETP's operating arrangements. This challenge should be understood in the context of PIDG's multi-owner structure. Australia is one of six PIDG owners, different owners promote different PIDG-supported transactions, and PIDG cannot preference AVETP over other owner programmes or funding arrangements. The issue is therefore not only a lack of visibility effort, but the absence of clearer and agreed visibility protocols that allow Australia's contribution to be recognised where appropriate, while remaining consistent with PIDG's broader platform model.

4. Weak country level interface has reduced the effectiveness of oversight arrangements

A major reason for these weaknesses is the absence of a sufficiently strong PIDG presence in Vietnam. Stakeholders from DFAT, other owners, private sector intermediaries, and Vietnamese counterparts repeatedly emphasised the need for stronger local resourcing. The lack of a well-developed in country interface has constrained relationship management, upstream transaction origination, follow up with government and market actors, and practical support for event preparation, communications, and responsiveness.

5. Oversight has helped maintain policy relevance, but has been less effective in leveraging policy engagement

Stakeholders across DFAT, owners, FiinRatings, and Vietnamese institutions regarded the CEF as highly relevant to Vietnam's capital market and net zero financing agenda. DFAT has helped keep the issue on the agenda by leveraging other DFAT programs with SSC, including Joint Capital Market Program (J-CAP) and Government-to-Government (G2G) engagement, and stakeholders noted that regulatory progress has advanced. Some stakeholders felt that if PIDG had been active on the ground, the initial process might have progressed more quickly.

6. The design of the oversight model has contributed to the observed limitations

The evidence suggests that the limitations are not only about execution. They are also partly structural. PIDG is a lean, transaction-oriented platform operating on a lower cost base than a typical bilateral managing contractor. In practice, DFAT has expected PIDG not only to originate and manage deals, but also to perform country-facing coordination, communications, reporting, and public diplomacy functions that sit outside the comparative strengths of transaction teams. This helps explain why DFAT's oversight has had to work harder than intended and why some burdens have shifted back onto Post.

7. Reporting, coordination, and follow up burdens have fallen too heavily on DFAT Post

As a consequence of the weak local interface, aspects of reporting, coordination, and visibility have been pushed back onto DFAT Post. This has contributed to inefficiency and frustrations. The evidence suggests that the programme was costed on the basis of two in-country positions, but for much of the implementation period, these roles were not based in country and therefore did not provide the level of country-facing support that DFAT would normally expect from a bilateral mechanism.

4.7 Lessons from AVETP implementation to date for delivery improvements and risk management

Several clear lessons emerge from AVETP implementation to date. Overall, the evidence suggests that the programme's core model is working, but that its delivery model needs strengthening if a strong set of individual transactions is to translate into a stronger country programme over the remainder of the investment period. The clearest positive lesson is that AVETP performs best when it supports **high quality, additional, market shaping transactions** that fill genuine financing gaps, improve the structure or tenor of finance, and demonstrate new sector or instrument pathways. PIDG's value also goes beyond finance: due diligence, HSES requirements, ESG processes, and governance expectations have helped strengthen investee systems, improve readiness for future finance, and raise market standards. Technical assistance has been most useful where it has been targeted at specific transaction bottlenecks, such as early-stage feasibility, unusually high transaction costs, or helping firms meet international standards.

At the same time, the main lessons for the remainder of AVETP concern **delivery constraints and risk management**. A stronger mechanism is needed to support earlier stage pipeline development, especially where opportunities are promising but not yet bankable. Local presence has emerged as a critical lesson, affecting not only transaction speed and responsiveness, but also visibility, policy engagement, reporting, and coordination with DFAT. The CEF shows that system level market building is feasible and relevant, but slower, more political, and more dependent on sustained local engagement than ordinary transactions.

Key Findings

1. AVETP's strongest results have come from high quality, flagship, and market shaping transactions

AVETP has been most effective where it has supported transactions that fill real market gaps, use an appropriate financing instrument, and demonstrate new financing models or sector pathways. This suggests that additionality and demonstration effect should remain more important than transaction numbers alone.

2. PIDG's transaction support adds value when finance is combined with systems strengthening

A repeated lesson across the transactions is that PIDG's value is not only financial. Due diligence, HSES expectations, ESG processes, governance standards, and technical clarification helped strengthened internal companies' systems and prepare them for future transactions. PIDG's standards can function as a productive form of capacity building when supported in practice.

3. Technical assistance is most effective when used as a transaction enabling tool

TA works best when it addresses concrete constraints that would otherwise delay, weaken, or prevent live transactions. This includes support for unusually high transaction costs in first of kind deals, upstream feasibility and early-stage development work, and helping companies meet international standards where willingness exists but capacity or liquidity is limited.

4. AVETP needs stronger support for earlier stage pipeline development

Vietnam has strong demand and promising opportunities, but conversion into closed transactions is constrained by early-stage risks, high transaction preparation costs, limited country presence, and policy uncertainty. This does not mean that PIDG is only focused on near-bankable transactions. The evidence shows that PIDG is already supporting earlier-stage and higher-risk opportunities through InfraCo, technical assistance and concessional capital. However, AVETP could make this support more deliberate and visible by targeting the specific bottlenecks that prevent promising opportunities from becoming investable. The programme should strengthen support at the front end of the pipeline where modest assistance could materially improve the chances of later close.

Based on the primary data, the most useful support would include pre-feasibility and feasibility studies, transaction-specific due diligence, financial modelling, risk assessment, support to meet international lender standards, ESG and HSES system strengthening, and cost-sharing for unusually high transaction costs in first-of-kind or complex deals. For smaller or earlier-stage projects, such as distributed energy, cooling, water, circular economy or newer climate technologies, support may also need to include early equity or risk-sharing where local developers have limited liquidity or where commercial lenders are not yet willing to enter. Stronger local presence and market engagement would also help identify promising opportunities earlier, work with sponsors to improve readiness, and maintain momentum through Vietnam’ s regulatory and approval processes.

5. Local presence is critical for both effectiveness and risk management

The absence of a strong local PIDG interface has reduced delivery efficiency and increased programme risks. Stakeholders linked weak local presence to slower transaction development, weaker government engagement, lower visibility, slower communications, and a higher coordination burden on DFAT Post. The practical lesson is that local presence is not an optional add on. A clearer and more reliable country-facing function is needed for the remainder of AVETP.

6. A broader climate relevant portfolio is a practical form of risk management

Implementation experience suggests that a narrowly renewable energy framing does not match market reality in Vietnam. Renewable transactions have faced regulatory, grid, and approval bottlenecks, while other climate relevant sectors such as water, EV infrastructure, recycling, cooling, and distributed energy have offered more practical opportunities. The lesson is that AVETP should remain anchored in energy transition, mitigation, adaptation, and resilience while avoiding an overly narrow focus on energy alone.

7. CEF type initiatives require a different delivery model from ordinary transactions

The early work on the CEF highlights that system level market building is slower, more political, and more institutionally complex than standard transactions. Progress depends on regulatory drafting, government processes, technical capacity building, and political timing, not only on financing structure. CEF type work requires patience, sustained advocacy, local engagement, and realistic expectations about timelines.

8. The main risk for the remainder of the programme is the conversion of opportunity into visible country level results

Many stakeholders acknowledged that the opportunity set is large, the pipeline is healthy or improving, and the transactions completed so far are high quality. The more persistent risk is that AVETP’s transaction strengths may not be fully translated into visible, coordinated, and reportable programme results unless local interface, reporting, and owner engagement are not strengthened.

9. Transaction success and programme success need to be distinguished more clearly

Strong transactions do not automatically translate into a strong bilateral programme. AVETP should be managed through two connected lenses: one focused on transaction quality and delivery, and another focused-on programme level coordination, visibility, reporting, and bilateral value.

5 Annexes: Illustrative Case Studies of AVETP-Supported Transactions

This section presents illustrative case studies of AVETP-supported transactions to complement the assessment of the two end-of-programme outcomes. Together, the case studies show how AVETP has contributed through different financing instruments and sectors, including e-mobility, rooftop solar, water infrastructure, circular manufacturing, and early-stage renewable energy platforms, while also highlighting differences in maturity, evidence strength, and expected pathways to impact.

Table 9: Core Case Studies

Case study	Short summary	Key outcomes
Dat Bike	Support to a domestic electric mobility company through InfraCo debt financing helped address working capital constraints and strengthen internal systems.	Major production and sales growth, expanded retail footprint, broader access to lower-priced models, improved investment readiness, and estimated annual avoided emissions of **13,140 tCO2**.
Aqua-One	Blended finance through a green bond guarantee, InfraCo equity, and technical strengthening supported a large water infrastructure project with climate co-benefits.	More favourable financing terms, faster project progression, **150,000 m³/day** water treatment capacity, potential service access for **1.5 million people**, stronger HSES systems, and estimated rooftop solar emissions savings of **800–1,000 tCO2/year**.
BPG Plastic	GuarantCo-supported green bond finance helped expand recycling operations and new factory development while strengthening internal systems.	First green bond in Vietnam's plastics sector, stronger recycling capacity, increased use of recycled inputs, reduced virgin plastic demand, stronger HSES processes, and wider market signalling for circular manufacturing finance.
August Energy	InfraCo-backed platform finance supported earlier entry into Vietnam, a local delivery partnership, and pipeline development for solar and cooling projects.	Established local origination platform, first cooling project approved, projected pathway to **200 MW** installed capacity by Year 3, and a pipeline capable of mobilising larger volumes of private capital over time.

6 Case Study: Dat Bike – E-mobility

6.1 Context

Dat Bike is a Vietnamese electric motorbike company operating in a market where two-wheelers are central to daily mobility and urban economic activity. This makes the company relevant to Vietnam's transition to cleaner transport. Before PIDG's investment, Dat Bike had already established itself as a promising domestic player, but its growth was constrained by limited access to finance, relatively small production capacity, and a narrow retail footprint. Dat Bike reported that local bank lending was difficult to access because of collateral requirements. At the same time, the company needed working capital to strengthen operations, expand manufacturing, and improve performance. PIDG's support therefore came at an important stage in the company's growth.

6.2 PIDG support

Dat Bike received USD 4 million in debt financing from InfraCo Asia. According to the company, this support helped it manage working capital pressure, invest in manufacturing, expand plant capacity, and improve cost-to-performance. Dat Bike also reported that PIDG support went beyond finance. The company highlighted the value of due diligence, HSES guidance, monthly exchanges on safety incidents and good practice, and support to strengthen internal systems. While Dat Bike noted that PIDG's due diligence process was longer than that of some other funders, it also stated that the process helped improve its internal standards and credibility.

6.3 What changed

PIDG support contributed to a significant shift in Dat Bike's scale, market reach and commercial maturity. Following the transaction, production capacity increased more than tenfold, while the retail footprint expanded from 6 stores to more than 40, with a target of 100 stores by the end of 2026. The company's geographic footprint also widened significantly over time. While Dat Bike initially focused its retail presence in the Ho Chi Minh City, it later expanded into Hanoi and gradually extended its reach across central Vietnam, the Mekong Delta, and southeast provinces. Business growth was accompanied by stronger organisational capacity, with total headcount increasing approximately twofold to more than 400 employees across office and manufacturing functions. The company also broadened its product range from a mainly premium segment to lower-priced models, helping reach more price-sensitive customers and beginning to serve business users such as ride-hailing drivers. The case also shows wider market development effects, including a user community of around 50,000 people, regular test-ride events, and a partnership with Grab and Grab Finance to support uptake among drivers. Based on current sales and assuming the bikes remain in active use, Dat Bike could be avoiding around 13,140 tCO_2 annually.

Table 10: Data snapshot: Dat Bike before and after PIDG support

Indicator	Before PIDG deal, August 2024	After PIDG deal or current status, March 2026	Change or interpretation
Stores	6 stores	More than 40 stores, with a target of 100 by end-2026	Store footprint is now at least 6.7 times the baseline, equivalent to a minimum 567% increase.
Growth trajectory	Not applicable	14 stores by end-2024 and 37 stores by end-2025	The company has expanded rapidly since the PIDG investment.
Sales demographic	Product segment at USD 1,800 and above, mainly personal users	Product segment expanded to approximately USD 1,200–1,800;	Lower-priced models appear to be broadening access to e-mobility beyond higher-income customers.
Estimated emissions avoided per bike	Not fully stated	730 kg CO_2 per electric motorbike per year	This figure is used to estimate total potential emissions avoided.

Indicator	Before PIDG deal, August 2024	After PIDG deal or current status, March 2026	Change or interpretation
Estimated total CO_2 avoided per year	Not applicable	13,140,000 kg CO_2 per year, or 13,140 tCO_2 per year	Estimated emissions avoided are based on bikes sold.
Daily kilometres travelled	Not applicable	Approximately 30 km per day on average; 150–200 km per day for business users	Business users travel substantially longer distances than average users.
Battery performance	Not applicable	Battery degrades to 80% after 350.000km, 25 years	Battery durability supports longer-term use and consumer confidence.
Geographic spread	Limited	More than 40 stores, mainly in Ho Chi Minh City and Hanoi, with wider presence in central, Mekong Delta and southeast areas	Dat Bike has expanded beyond its initial market footprint.
Low-income or price-sensitive reach	Not tracked	More than 40% of lower-priced model customers appear to be lower-income or price-sensitive	Lower-priced models may be helping broaden access to e-mobility.
Partnerships	Not specified	Partnership with Grab and Grab Finance	Partnerships may support customer finance and access for drivers with limited credit history.
Consumer confidence and awareness	Not specified	Approximately 50,000-user community, regular test rides, and stronger awareness and trust in electric vehicles	The company is contributing to consumer awareness and confidence in e-mobility.
Contribution to e-mobility market	Not specified	Leading domestic electric motorcycle player contributing to local manufacturing and supply chain development	Dat Bike is supporting the development of Vietnam's domestic e-mobility market.

6.4 Cross-cutting issues

Dat Bike reported that women make up around 20% of the total workforce, 35% of office staff, and around one-third of leadership positions. The company also stated that it considers gender in market research and product design. At the same time, it noted that women are harder to recruit into factory roles because of labour market preferences and perceptions about manufacturing work. According to Dat Bike, most gender-related HR policies were already in place before PIDG support, while the more visible changes after the investment related to HSES. On disability inclusion, Dat Bike reported that it currently has no employees with disabilities and no specific policy in place, although it indicated openness to exploring this in future. On health and safety, the company reported no physical accidents in manufacturing during 2024–2025, worker insurance coverage, and regular safety meetings and reporting. It also stated that PIDG helped strengthen its safety systems. Some evidence gaps remain. Several consumer-impact indicators, including electricity consumption, fuel savings, petrol displaced, and monthly cost savings, are referenced but not yet quantified in the available dataset. Battery durability is described, but battery recycling or end-of-life arrangements are not yet clearly evidenced. Some inclusion and climate claims are therefore promising but not yet fully substantiated.

7 Case Study: Water Infrastructure

7.1 Context

AquaOne's Hoa Binh–Xuan Mai water treatment project provides an important example of how AVETP support can contribute to sustainable infrastructure beyond energy generation alone. The project is establishing a new water treatment plant and transmission system designed to supply clean water to populations whose baseline access has depended heavily on bottled water and groundwater extraction, with associated cost, environmental, and ecosystem implications. According to AquaOne, the new plant is expected to produce up to **150,000 m³ of clean water per day**, which the company estimates could serve around **1.5 million people** based on average daily water use. At the time the project was being developed, AquaOne had arranged around 20% of the project's capital expenditure from its own equity and needed to raise the remaining 80% externally. The company first explored local bank lending but reported that bank loans offered less favourable interest rates, stricter conditions, and slower disbursement than the project timeline required. Since the project licence was time-bound and construction speed was critical, the company needed financing that was faster, more flexible, and better matched to the project's long-term infrastructure profile.

7.2 PIDG support

AquaOne reported receiving three forms of support through PIDG. First, GuarantCo provided a **green bond guarantee** that enabled AquaOne to raise bond financing for around **40% of capital expenditure**. AquaOne stated that this financing was more attractive than bank lending because the bond terms provided more favourable interest rates, a longer tenor of up to 20 years, and a grace period on principal repayment for first few years, which helped reduce the project's interest rate risk. It should also be noted that this was the first time in Vietnam that a 20-year bond was issued by a corporate entity. The company indicated that this bond allowed construction to move faster and helped it meet project deadlines. Second, InfraCo provided an **equity investment of VND 218 billion**, resulting in InfraCo holding **24.8% of the total equity share** in the Hoa Binh–Xuan Mai company, making it the largest owner after AquaOne itself. Third, AquaOne described a technical and institutional strengthening dimension to the support. The company reported that PIDG's requirements led it to adopt IFC-aligned HSES standards, strengthen documentation and contract review processes, and engage external support to build systems that could meet the required standards. AquaOne emphasised that these processes were demanding, but also useful in strengthening the company's internal capability and preparing it for future transactions.

7.3 What changed

PIDG support contributed to four main outcomes for AquaOne. First, it improved the project's financing by combining a green bond guarantee, equity investment and technical assistance, helping the 150,000 m³/day water treatment plant move forward. Second, it strengthened project delivery standards. AquaOne reported improved HSES systems, safer construction practices, stronger contractor management and better environmental controls. Third, it improved the project's climate and resource efficiency through 1.57–1.7 MW of rooftop solar, expected to meet 15%–17% of the plant's energy needs and avoid around 800–1,000 tCO_2 per year. Fourth, it is expected to support local employment and inclusion, with around 150 operational jobs planned, including 70% from local communities, 30%–34% women and 25%–29% from ethnic minority communities.

Table 11: Aqua-one data matrix for water treatment project

Indicator or measure	Baseline or before PIDG support	Current or expected with PIDG support
Financing structure	Aqua-One had 20% equity available, with the remaining 80% needed from external sources. Bank loans offered strict conditions, slower disbursement, and shorter tenors.	GuarantCo provided a green bond guarantee for around 40% of capital expenditure. InfraCo made an equity investment of VND 218 billion and holds a 24.8% equity share.

Indicator or measure	Baseline or before PIDG support	Current or expected with PIDG support
Green bond tenor	Local bank loans typically offered tenors of 10–15 years.	Green bond financing provides a tenor of up to 20 years, with interest payment waived for the first two years.
Water treatment capacity	No new plant in the project area.	The project is expected to produce 150,000 m³ of clean water per day.
Estimated people served	Baseline reliance on bottled water and groundwater extraction.	Approximately 1.5 million people could potentially be served.
Construction timeline	The project was under pressure to meet a time-bound construction licence.	Construction started about one year earlier and is expected to be completed by the end of April 2026.
HSES standards	The company had prior project experience, but not at this level of external standards.	IFC-aligned HSES standards are being applied across the project and contractors, with six-monthly PIDG reporting.
Energy efficiency of plant	Standard equipment approach.	Higher-cost, energy-efficient European equipment has been purchased, and a water recycling system has been installed.
Rooftop solar installed or planned	Not available.	A 1.57–1.7 MW rooftop solar system is planned for the plant.
Share of plant energy supplied by rooftop solar	Not applicable.	Rooftop solar is expected to supply approximately 15%–17% of the plant's energy use.
Estimated GHG emissions avoided from rooftop solar	Not applicable.	Rooftop solar is expected to avoid approximately 800–1,000 tCO_2 per year.
Local workforce participation	Not applicable.	70% of future staff are expected to be recruited from local communities.
Women in workforce	Not applicable.	Women are expected to represent 30%–34% of the total workforce.
Ethnic minority participation	Not applicable.	Ethnic minority staff are expected to represent 25%–29% of the total workforce.

The case also shows that PIDG's contribution is not limited to capital. AquaOne repeatedly linked PIDG's support to stricter operational, legal, commercial, and HSES discipline. The due diligence process was described as demanding, but also valuable in strengthening the company's internal systems and helping it learn how to work with international partners and requirements. This suggests that PIDG's role extended beyond financing the transaction to strengthening the company's capability for future deals. The project also appears to generate both infrastructure and climate benefits. Its core development contribution lies in providing large-scale access to treated water, while climate-related co-benefits arise through rooftop solar generation, more energy-efficient equipment, and improved resource use.

7.4 Cross-cutting issues

Aqua-One reported a strong local workforce orientation, with most future staff expected to be recruited from surrounding communities, including ethnic minority groups. The project is also expected to supply clean water to Muong communities in Phu Tho province, where households currently rely on untreated groundwater, rainwater, or river water for domestic use. Women are expected to make up roughly one-third of the total workforce. The company also described active workforce training and a no-accident construction record at the time of the interview. These are positive signals, though most of the workforce and inclusion data remain forward-looking rather than verified through post-construction evidence. AquaOne is a strong example of how AVETP support can help deliver sustainable infrastructure through a blended package of equity, guarantee support, and technical strengthening. The case is particularly important because it broadens the platform's relevance beyond energy generation into water infrastructure with clear public service benefits.

8 Case Study: Circular Economy

8.1 Context

Binh Thuan Plastic Group (BPG) provides an important example of how AVETP support can contribute to Vietnam's green industrial transition through circular manufacturing. The company planned to expand its recycled plastic manufacturing business by developing two new factories, one in Hung Yen province and another in Ho Chi Minh City. To support this expansion, BPG explored different financing options, including bank loans and bond issuance. According to the company, bond finance offered more favourable pricing than bank lending at the time, which led BPG to seek support for a green bond transaction. Through a banking intermediary, BPG connected with GuarantCo and developed the transaction from there. In December 2025, BPG successfully issued a VND 260 billion green bond for its EDGE-certified Hung Yen factory and recycled plastic pallet rental business, backed by a USD 20 million guarantee from GuarantCo. The company reported that USD 10 million was allocated to the Hung Yen factory and rental business, and USD 10 million to the Ho Chi Minh City factory, with the first tranche already disbursed.

8.2 PIDG support

BPG described PIDG's support as having three main elements. First, GuarantCo's guarantee enabled the company to issue a green bond on more favourable terms than the available bank loan options. Second, PIDG support helped BPG strengthen and systematise its internal environmental, social, health, safety and governance processes. Third, the company stated that the transaction improved its market standing and enhanced its profile as the first plastic group in Vietnam to successfully issue a green bond. BPG repeatedly emphasised that the GuarantCo structure was commercially favourable and aligned with the type of financing it was seeking. BPG noted that it already had E&S processes and regular ESG reporting before the transaction, and that key labour standards, including commitments relating to child labour, forced labour and other core labour requirements, were already being implemented in practice in line with Vietnamese regulations. However, these systems and commitments were not yet fully structured, standardised or formally documented. The due diligence process helped BPG organise and formalise these systems more systematically. Following PIDG support, BPG strengthened HSES documentation for upcoming projects in line with international standards, formalised labour and safeguard commitments, and standardised procedures and mechanisms, including grievance mechanisms, to strengthen compliance, governance and contractor management.

8.3 What changed

BPG's key changes can be understood across finance, business scale, circular production and systems strengthening. With GuarantCo's support, BPG diversified its financing sources by raising capital through a green bond rather than relying only on bank finance. The transaction did not solve a pre-existing bankability problem, as BPG already had access to bank loans, but it helped the company broaden its financing portfolio, reduce dependence on traditional bank lending, and access a more suitable capital market instrument to support expansion into recycling and new factory development. This financing supported a broader business trajectory in which recycling is becoming more central to BPG's operations. By 2024, BPG had reached a substantial level of plastic waste collection and recycling across its factories, and the upcoming Hung Yen factory is expected to add recycled plastic use equivalent to around 17%–18% of BPG's current annual recycling activity. BPG also reported that recycled plastic now accounts for around 60% of total production input, while virgin plastic use fell from 50% in 2022 to 30% in 2024, indicating a shift toward a more circular production model and reduced reliance on fossil-based raw materials.

Recycling capacity also increased by around 3.5 times between 2022 and 2024, equivalent to an approximate 246% increase, driven by market expansion, factory investment, supply-chain optimisation, and improved raw-material technology. In addition, BPG stated that health and safety were already high priorities before the transaction, but PIDG support helped formalise and systematise internal processes, strengthen environmental requirements for contractors and suppliers, and make alignment with international standards more visible.

Table 12: KPI and data matrix for BPG Plastic

Indicator or measure	Baseline or before PIDG support	Current or expected with PIDG support
Financing instrument	Bank loans and other fundraising options considered; bond market seen as more favourable than bank loans	Green bond of **VND 260bn** issued in Dec 2025 with **USD 20m GuarantCo guarantee**
Use of proceeds	Expansion plans for manufacturing recycled plastic business and two new factories	**USD 10m** allocated to Hung Yen factory and **USD 10m** to Ho Chi Minh City factory; first USD 10m disbursed
Factory expansion	Existing operations, with plans to expand into recycled plastic	Hung Yen plant under construction, expected operation from **1 July 2026**; Ho Chi Minh City plant planned for 2026
Annual plastic waste collected and recycled	Not stated pre-transaction	The upcoming Hung Yen factory is expected to add recycled plastic capacity equal to around 17%–18% of BPG's current annual recycling activity.
Share of recycled material in production	Lower historically	Approx. **60%** recycled plastic used in production
Virgin plastic demand	**50%** virgin plastic used in 2022	**30%** virgin plastic used in 2024
Recycling capacity growth	Nil	Recycling capacity increased by around 3.5 times, or by approximately 246% between 2022 and 2024.
Gender inclusion	Women were already present in the company and in leadership.	Women represent 50%–60% of office staff, 30%–35% of the total workforce, and 30%–35% of the board.

8.4 Cross-cutting issues

BPG reported positive gender participation across the company, with women representing between **50% and 60% of office staff**, **30% to 35% of the total workforce**, and **30% to 35% of the board of directors**. The company stated that there is no gender discrimination in recruitment and that women are regularly appointed to leadership and appropriate operational roles. On health and safety, BPG described safety as a top leadership priority and reported no physical accidents over the past five years. Fire prevention and firefighting drills are regularly organised, and contractor oversight has been strengthened. On environmental management, BPG highlighted efforts to minimise water use, recycle process water, collect used pallets and plastic waste, and encourage customers to switch from wooden to plastic pallets, which the company frames as contributing indirectly to forest protection. BPG Plastic is a strong example of how AVETP support can help advance green industrial transition through circular manufacturing and green capital-market instruments. The strongest evidence lies in the successful green bond issuance, expansion of recycling capacity, high and rising use of recycled material in production, and the company's growing role in plastic waste recovery. The case also suggests that PIDG support helped strengthen internal systems and raise BPG's profile in the market. While the transaction did not fundamentally solve a bankability constraint, it did provide a more favourable financing route and helped position the company as a visible early mover in green finance for the plastics sector in Vietnam.

9 Case Study: August Energy – Early-stage platform support for Energy as a Service Generation

9.1 Context

August Energy is a regional energy-as-a-service infrastructure platform with operations in India and Southeast Asia. Through its Southeast Asia vehicle, the company has partnered with InfraCo Asia to develop generation and integrated utilities projects, with Vietnam identified as one of its priority markets alongside the Philippines. The platform focuses primarily on solar-plus-storage and cooling-as-a-service projects, with an interest in building a scaled portfolio of distributed energy assets in Vietnam.

August Energy is still at an early stage in Vietnam. Before closing the InfraCo transaction, its main focus had been the Philippines and Thailand. The company stated that the availability of capital and support from InfraCo accelerated its entry into Vietnam by around 12 months, allowing it to move earlier than would otherwise have been possible to build an on-the-ground team.

9.2 PIDG support

August Energy reported that InfraCo committed USD 15 million, matched by USD 15 million from August Energy, creating a USD 30 million platform in Southeast Asia, with the ability for both parties to increase their commitments as the platform scales. Within this structure, August Energy retains 51% ownership and InfraCo holds 49%. The capital is intended mainly for projects in the Philippines and Vietnam, with a smaller allocation to Thailand. The company stated that the InfraCo transaction was signed in December 2025 and completed in February 2026.

The company highlighted three main forms of support from InfraCo. First, the capital commitment allows August Energy to allocate equity funding earlier in project development, especially in markets where debt finance is limited at the early stage. Second, InfraCo's willingness to share upfront project risk makes smaller and earlier-stage projects more feasible, including August Energy's first cooling-as-a-service project in Vietnam. Third, August Energy reported receiving support on ESG systems, templates, policies, gender initiatives, and a technical assistance facility to cover certain upfront development costs.

9.3 What changed

The most immediate change is that August Energy was able to establish a concrete entry pathway into Vietnam. The company stated that, without InfraCo's backing, Vietnam would likely have remained a later-stage market after the Philippines and Thailand. With InfraCo support, August Energy moved forward with a local partnership, began structuring its Vietnam business plan, built an initial team, and started developing a project pipeline.

A second important change is the establishment of a local origination and delivery model. August Energy announced a partnership with Mega Energy, led by a developer with prior experience in Vietnam's solar sector. According to the company, this arrangement provides on-the-ground presence, local market knowledge, and origination capability, while August Energy provides institutional development capability. August Energy and InfraCo remain the owners and investors of the projects.

A third area of change is that the Vietnam business now has a quantified growth pathway. The KPI matrix indicates a cumulative target of at least 30 MW installed in Year 1, rising to more than 100 MW in Year 2 and more than 200 MW in Year 3 across behind-the-meter and front-of-the-meter projects. Annual renewable electricity generation is projected at 37,213 MWh in Year 1, 150,252 MWh in Year 2, and 263,290 MWh in Year 3. Using Vietnam's latest publicly available grid emissions factor of 0.6592 tCO_2/MWh, this would translate into estimated avoided emissions of 24,531 tCO_2 in Year 1, 99,046 tCO_2 in Year 2, and 173,561 tCO_2 in Year 3. On this basis, the platform has the potential to generate material climate benefits if delivery proceeds as planned.

A fourth area of change is the scale of project mobilisation now envisaged. The platform is intended not only to deliver individual projects, but also to build a portfolio capable of mobilising progressively larger volumes of capital over time. August Energy has also secured internal approval for its first cooling project in Vietnam, linked to a light industrial manufacturing facility. The company stated that construction was being targeted for April or May 2026, subject to final structuring and local setup. It noted that InfraCo's participation made it easier to proceed with this smaller project because risk and equity funding could be shared upfront.

Table 13: Data and KPI matrix for August Energy

Indicator or measure	Baseline before PIDG	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Renewable energy capacity installed	Not available	30 MW	100 MW	200 MW
Annual renewable electricity generated	Not available	37,213 MWh	150,252 MWh	263,290 MWh
Greenhouse gas emissions avoided	Not available	24,531 tCO_2	99,046 tCO_2	173,561 tCO_2

The August Energy case differs from the other case studies because it remains in a platform-building phase. The main results are not yet large-scale installed assets, but the creation of a capital base, local market entry, an initial team, a delivery partnership, a live project pipeline, and a quantified pathway for growth. The results matrix should therefore be understood as a forward-looking business and impact plan, rather than verified performance to date.

The case also provides a useful example of early-stage additionality. August Energy stated that InfraCo's value lies in entering earlier than most commercial capital providers would. Because distributed energy infrastructure requires substantial upfront equity before debt can usually be arranged, early risk-sharing and capital support are important. In this sense, PIDG support appears to have helped August Energy establish a foothold in Vietnam sooner and with greater confidence than would otherwise have been possible.

If the Year 3 targets are achieved, August Energy's Vietnam portfolio would reach 200 MW of installed capacity, generate more than 263,000 MWh annually, and avoid more than 173,000 tCO_2 per year. This suggests that the platform could become a significant contributor to Vietnam's distributed renewable energy growth, particularly if it converts its early-stage pipeline into operating projects.

9.4 Cross-cutting issues

August Energy reported that its institutional shareholders, including InfraCo, have stringent environmental, social, health and safety requirements. The company stated that it already had an ESAP in place and that InfraCo's ESG team provided templates and policy support to help strengthen its systems further. It also noted that it is working on gender diversity targets, with discussions underway on initiatives such as internships, early-career opportunities for women, and support from diversity-focused HR consultants.

August Energy is a useful example of how AVETP support can enable an early-stage renewable energy platform to enter Vietnam faster, establish a local development model, and begin building a portfolio of distributed solar and cooling projects. The strongest evidence currently lies in accelerated market entry, shared-risk capital, a local partnership, and a quantified results pathway for project delivery, capital mobilisation, and emissions reduction. While the Vietnam platform is still at an early stage and most KPI figures remain projected rather than achieved, the case suggests that PIDG's contribution is strongest at the front end: enabling earlier positioning, faster origination, and greater willingness to pursue projects that might otherwise have been delayed.

10 Review Terms of Reference

Climate Resilient Communities

Climate Resilient Communities (CRC) supports implementation of the Australian Government's climate change commitments under Australia's International Development Policy, in line with partner government priorities.

CRC supports the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) to increase climate investments, drive climate integration, and better address climate change and disaster risk across Australia's development portfolio.

CRC incentivises funding towards gender-responsive, inclusive climate and disaster resilience programming, particularly in the water, food, nature-based solutions, and energy sectors.

DFAT has engaged DT Global to support the implementation of CRC through a Support Unit.

For further information about CRC, visit the DFAT website.

Background – Australia – Vietnam Energy Transition Platform (AVETP)
AVETP aims to increase access to clean energy, enhance climate resilience, and support Vietnam in achieving its net-zero emissions target by 2050. It is designed to support Vietnam's transition to a low-carbon economy by mobilising private sector investment in renewable energy and sustainable infrastructure. It is comprised of two investments:

- $17 million allocated to the Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG) managed by the Australian Embassy in Hanoi; and
- $3 million allocated to Australian Development Investments (ADI) managed by the Blended Finance Section (BFU).

The midterm review focuses on the PIDG investment component of this program, as the ADI investment is clustered with the ADI global program reporting.
Australia is one of six owners of PIDG including Canada, the UK, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland. PIDG is an impact investor that facilitates private investment in infrastructure projects in emerging markets by reducing financial and regulatory barriers.
The design of the AVETP program was led by PIDG and specifies that the program will achieve two end-of-program outcomes (EOPOs) as follows:

- Australia will play a visible and influential role in increasing and improving the quality of private investment in Vietnam's transition to net zero. This includes both the renewable energy sector and small and medium enterprises (SMEs) supporting climate action.
- Increased investments in Vietnam's net zero transition will be inclusive and equitable, including by supporting and augmenting Vietnam's own policies in these areas.

Implementation of the AVETP is structured through three key components:

1. The Renewable Energy Access Fund designed to expand PIDG's investment footprint in Vietnam, accelerating the deployment of clean energy solutions and broadening access to renewable power sources. Catalytic capital (TA and capital grant) is "softly earmarked" to Vietnam to progress / unlock investments that face delays and additional costs due to long development times.
2. The Capital Markets for Climate Action Fund focuses on developing Vietnam's financial markets by supporting green bonds, local currency investment mechanisms, and sustainable financing instruments that attract institutional investors. Catalytic capital (TA and capital grant) is "softly earmarked" to Vietnam to cover:
    - selected costs of (green) bond issuances
    - targeted capital market studies and dissemination
    - detailed feasibility study to establish a local credit enhancement facility (CEF)
    - set up costs for a new CEF
    - initial equity investment in the new CEF
    - focused feasibility studies to explore integration of nature-based solutions in energy transition investments

- contribution to the implementation of nature-based solutions in specific investments for learning and demonstration.

3. The provision of investment capital to PIDG subsidiaries InfraCo Asia, GuarantCo, and the Emerging Africa & Asia Infrastructure Fund (EAAIF) to invest in new deals in Vietnam.

DFAT provides strategic oversight of the AVETP through the teams in Hanoi and Canberra, ensuring alignment with Australia's foreign policy and development objectives. PIDG's independent investment committees are responsible for selecting and managing projects, ensuring that investments are commercially viable while delivering significant development impact. The AVETP does not have a specific Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) framework. PIDG use their own global MEL framework to feed into reporting for the program. PIDG is required to provide quarterly reporting on its activities in Vietnam.

The investment originally spanned a two-year period from 30 June 2023 to 30 June 2025 and was recently extended for an additional three years to 30 June 2028 to continue the implementation of program activities, including the establishment of a CEF in Vietnam which was not implemented during the original phase because of regulatory issues.

PIDG experienced challenges in achieving the IPOs and EOPOs during the original term of the program because a lack of bankable renewable energy projects in Vietnam, regulatory and policy uncertainty for renewable energy investment, and a lack of regulation to support the establishment of a CEF. Despite these challenges, PIDG was able to finance significant projects for Vietnam's energy transition namely a loan for a company to develop a pipeline of rooftop solar projects, and a convertible loan for Vietnam's fastest-growing electric motorbike producer. Further, PIDG financed a number projects that were complimentary to the AVETP including providing green bond guarantees for aquaculture and water treatment projects.

Purpose

The AVETP is approaching its midway point and an independent Midterm Review (MTR) is being commissioned to:

- assess the program logic and progress towards the EOPOs including the need to expand the program to climate resilience projects (if necessary);
- assess MEL framework arrangements for the program and provide recommendations on what framework is most practical and effective for the AVETP in the final phase of the program;
- provide recommendations to strengthen delivery, and sustainability for remainder phase of the program.

The **objectives** of the evaluation are:

- Review the program logic and evaluate progress towards achieving the EOPOs, including an assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the program and potential need to expand the scope of AVETP to include climate resilience projects (if required):
- Assess and provide recommendations to potentially improve the MEL framework and practical measures for tracking results and adaptive management: and
- Provide recommendations for refinement of the EOPOs and/or IOs, to ensure feasibility and alignment with the EOPOs.

The **primary audience** for the MTR is the DFAT team in Hanoi and PIDG. Its secondary audience will be BFU who is the focal point for the PIDG core arrangement in DFAT. The MTR will be made available on DFAT's website and needs to be clear, concise and easy to read.

The review will answer the following questions, which PIDG, DFAT and the MTR Review Team will refine and prioritise further during the inception period.

- Is the program making the expected progress towards achieving its EOPOs?
- To what extent has the AVETP investment contributed to mobilising quality private capital for Vietnam's net zero transition, and what evidence is there that these investments are delivering sustainable, inclusive and equitable development outcomes (e.g. clean energy access, climate resilience, inclusive growth)?
- Are the current IOs and program logic fit for purpose in linking PIDG's activities to the EOPOs? If not, what refinements are recommended to improve alignment and feasibility?

- Assess current MEL arrangements (including current reporting arrangements), and the extent to which they are meeting PIDG's and DFAT's needs. Having regard to this, what MEL approaches are most practical and effective for the AVETP to track results—including gender equality, disability inclusion, and climate outcomes—over the remainder time of the program?
- How effective are DFAT's oversight and engagement arrangements of PIDG in ensuring visibility of Australia's contribution, and alignment with Vietnam's priorities and Australia's foreign policy objectives?
- What lessons from AVETP implementation to date—including transaction support, technical assistance, and early work on the Credit Enhancement Facility—can inform delivery improvements and risk management for the remainder time of the program?

Reporting and Schedule

The methodology for the review will be refined in consultation with the MTR Review Team but will likely include:

An initial verbal briefing to discuss the background, issues and priorities for the evaluation by DFAT Hanoi team.

A desk review of relevant documentations

A draft and final Review Plan

Interviews with key stakeholders including PIDG, other PIDG owners in Hanoi, one or two projects invested and supported by PIDG in Vietnam. The interviews will be conducted online or in person. The MTR Review Team will propose a list of stakeholders for interview in consultation with DFAT Hanoi and PIDG.

Presentation of findings after interviews.

Draft Report to DFAT Hanoi, BFU and PIDG.

Draft and final report submitted to and accepted by the DFAT Hanoi in writing followed by a final presentation of the findings.

The review shall commence in January 2026 and will be completed by the end of March 2026, as per the indicative schedule below.

Table 14: Planned MTR Activities

No.	Tasks	Indicative timeline
1	Undertake a verbal briefing with DFAT Hanoi to clarify scope and inform the Evaluation Plan, including consultation plan	12 January 2026
2	Conduct a desk review of relevant documentation provided by DFAT Hanoi	16 January 2026
3	Submit a draft review plan to Post, including methodology, instruments, identification of key respondents, requirements for further documentation.	23 January 2026
4	Following feedback from Post and PIDG (10 working days) submit a final review plan	6 February 2026
5	Stakeholder interviews / field mission	9 – 13 February 2026
6	Presentation of findings for comments	23 February 2026
7	Draft report and draft executive summary for comments	9 March 2026
8	DFAT review of draft report in consultation with PIDG, and provision of feedback (up to 10 days)	23 March 2026
9	Final report and final executive summary (within 5 working days of receiving DFAT and PIDG feedback).	30 March 2026
10	Presentation of final report to DFAT and PIDG	30-31 March 2026

Deliverables

- **Review Plan**: Following the briefing, the MTR Review Team will prepare a Review Plan in accordance with *DFAT's Design and Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Standards* (Standard 9) outlining the review methodology, the final evaluation questions, data collection methods and tools, and list of stakeholders for interviews.

- **Stakeholder interviews/ Field Mission:** The MTR Review Team will be required to conduct a field mission to Vietnam to meet AVETP, PIDG representatives, beneficiaries and other stakeholders.
- The MTR Review Team will need to complete a schedule for stakeholder interviews and field missions at least 15 workdays prior to their commencement so that DFAT can make necessary arrangements. The schedule will include all interviews, a summary including purpose, key questions/areas, data requested, expected duration, interviewees. It will be essential for PIDG to arrange meetings with beneficiaries. An interpreter may be engaged to support meetings during the field mission (if required). Meeting with some stakeholders including PIDG may be conducted virtually noting PIDG representatives are geographically dispersed.
- At the conclusion of the mission, there will be a debrief session with DFAT to discuss emerging findings and test assumptions.
- **Draft MTR and Executive Summary:** A draft Review Report and Executive Summary should be shared with DFAT by December 2025. The Review Report will include an executive summary (up to two pages), evaluation objectives, theory of change, methodology, findings/recommendations for each of the evaluation questions, and lessons learnt. Annexes should include the TOR, an evaluation matrix, and a list of interviews and sources of evidence.
- **Final MTR and Executive Summary:** The Final Report should meet the DFAT's *Design and Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Standards (Standard 10)* and requirements for publishing including accessibility. The report should be a useful, clear and concise summary of the review findings, implications and recommendations. The report should:
- include a succinct and clear executive summary;
- be written in plain English that can be read as a stand-alone document;
- clearly present key achievements and challenges;
- be evidence-based; and
- present a limited number of feasible recommendations.
- The final report will be published on the DFAT website and is required to meet accessibility requirements (Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0). The MTR Review Team is required to work closely with DFAT to frame any sensitivities and meet DFAT's requirements for documents to meet website accessibility guidelines.
- The MTR Review Team must submit the draft report to DFAT Hanoi team with at least 10 working days for providing comments and feedback. PIDG will be provided with an opportunity to comment on the draft report. The MTR Review Team will be provided with at least five working days to incorporate feedback on the draft.
- The allocation of days for review team members will be determined in consultation with the Team Leader during contract negotiations.

Roles and Responsibilities

- An AVETP MTR team will be contracted by CRCSU from the CRC technical panels. These positions include:
- Team Leader
- Climate Change Specialist
- GEDSI Adviser.

Note: Best endeavours will be made to contract a national consultant, supporting DFAT Locally Led Development Guidelines.

Team Leader

The Team Leader will be primarily responsible for the:

- Development and drafting of the review plan, draft report, and finalisation of the report (lead author).
- Co-ordination and facilitation of the MTR field mission.
- Focal point for communication with DFAT Hanoi on issues related to the development and finalisation of the deliverables.

- Quality assurance of all deliverables in line with the scope of services (including governance and management issues), ensuring application of DFAT policies and guidance as appropriate, and the utilisation of best practice principles in aid management.
- Ensure updates made based on feedback and review from the CRCSU and Post.
- Engage with the CRCSU, DFAT Climate Integration and Programming and Post for initial briefing, task oversight and direction at key points and debrief at task conclusion.

Experience required:

- Demonstrated experience in leading evaluation teams.
- Experience delivering and/or evaluating Australian-funded development programs.
- Excellent writing, liaison, analytical skills.
- Sound understanding and expertise in development effectiveness.
- Bachelor's degree or higher in social sciences, development or related fields.
- At least 10 years demonstrated experience in evaluating development programs using mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative).
- Familiarity with the socio-political and economic context of Vietnam.
- Experience in assessing development programs in Southeast Asia (ideally in Vietnam).
- Experience using and reporting to donor MEL systems and standards.
- Demonstrated skills and experience in applying Program logic/theory of change in a practical way that is appropriate, relevant and easily understood by stakeholders.
- High level communication (written and verbal) skills.
- Ability and self-initiative to carry out assigned tasks in a team under minimal supervision as well as an individual on a specific assignment.
- Proficiency with MS Programs and/or collaboration software.

Climate Change Specialist

The Climate Change Specialist will undertake the following duties:

- Assist in the development and drafting of the Deliverables
- Provide specialist support and inputs to the consultations, plan workshops/meetings, for the Deliverables with specific regard to Climate and Disaster risk and resilience including climate adaptation, climate mitigation and disaster risk reduction.
- Engage in the Australian and in-country consultations in Vietnam
- Engage with the CRCSU, DFAT Climate Integration and Programming and Post for initial briefing, task oversight and direction at key points and debrief at task conclusion.
- Follow the directions of the team leader in support of the Deliverables and address feedback provided by CRCSU and Post.

Experience required:

- Bachelor's degree or higher in social sciences, development or related fields.
- At least 10 years demonstrated experience in climate change (adaptation and mitigation) and building climate and disaster resilience including sectoral experience in the financial sector, private sector investment, renewable energy, sustainable infrastructure.
- Strong knowledge, understanding of blended finance mechanisms including sectoral experience in the financial sector, private sector investment, renewable energy, sustainable infrastructure.
- Demonstrated experience in contributing to evaluating development programs using mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative).
- Familiarity with the socio-political and economic context of Vietnam.
- Experience using and reporting to donor MEL systems and standards.
- Demonstrated skills and experience in applying Program logic/theory of change in a practical way that is appropriate, relevant and easily understood by stakeholders.
- High level communication (written and verbal) skills.
- Ability and self-initiative to carry out assigned tasks in a team under minimal supervision as well as an individual on a specific assignment.
- Proficiency with MS Programs and/or collaboration software.

GEDSI Specialist

The GEDSI Specialist will undertake the following duties:

- Assist in the development and drafting of the Deliverables.

- Provide specialist support and inputs to the consultations, plan workshops/meetings, for the Deliverables with specific regard to ensuring that the needs of women, men, youth and people with a disability are addressed in the report.
- Engage in the Australian and in-country consultations in Vietnam.
- Lead on the development of the GEDSI situational analysis and strategy.
- Ensure integration of GEDSI is aligned with Australian aid and the Vietnam Government's GEDSI priorities and commitments, as well as priorities drawn out through further consultations.
- Engage with the CRCSU, DFAT Climate Integration and Programming and Post for initial briefing, task oversight and direction at key points and debrief at task conclusion.
- Follow the directions of the team leader in support of the Deliverables and address feedback provided by CRCSU and Post.

Experience required:

- Bachelor's degree or higher in social sciences, development or related fields.
- Recognised technical capacity and relevant professional experience in the Indo-Pacific, with previous experience in Vietnam highly beneficial.
- Familiarity with the socio-political and economic context of Vietnam.
- Experience using and reporting to donor MEL systems and standards.
- Experience in reviewing the design and formulation of GEDSI analysis and strategies for DFAT programs/investments.
- Experience in gender lens investing and/or leveraging investments to advance disability equity and social inclusion.
- High level communication (written and verbal) skills.
- Ability and self-initiative to carry out assigned tasks in a team under minimal supervision as well as an individual on a specific assignment.
- Proficiency with MS Programs and/or collaboration software.

Reporting Lines and Performance Management

The AVETP MTR team will:

- Report to the CRCSU Panel Manager for administrative management; and
- Report to DFAT team at Hanoi Post for program management.