



AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH AWARDS 2008 FUNDING ROUND

Final Report

1. ADRA Application Number	ADRA0800080
2. Project Title Please restate the project title as named in your original application.	Crafting Sustainability: addressing water pollution in Vietnam's craft villages
3. Administering Organisation Please restate the name of the organisation administering this research project.	Australian National University
4. Principal Investigator Please restate the name of the Principal Investigator	Dr Sango Mahanty
5. Total amount received (AUD\$) from ADRA	\$294,000
6. What were your research objectives? (as stated in the original application). <i>Limit 300 words.</i>	
<p>The research aimed to assess the drivers of water pollution in Vietnam's Craft villages and options for addressing these drivers, particularly the role of community-based approaches. The specific questions addressed were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) What are the key drivers leading to water pollution from craft villages?b) How effectively are current regulations and policies addressing these drivers and why?c) What combination of community-based and other measures could improve water pollution and social outcomes, and how might these be facilitated?	

7. Did the final year of your research progress as planned? If not, why not? *Limit 300 words.*

The research initially aimed to examine the potential for using community based approaches to improve the management of water pollution in craft villages. On commencing the research, however, we found that it was important to expand its scope to look more broadly at the drivers of pollution. This enabled the project to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the causes and effects of water pollution in craft villages, possible policy responses and the place of community-based approaches within these.

A decision was made to cover four case studies after our scoping visit in July 2009, in order to get a good representation of different locations, types and scales of craft production. As the original fieldwork and staff time budget was framed with 3 case studies in mind, this had implications for the project budget, which are discussed with the financial report.

In terms of implementation, the cross-institutional collaboration between ANU and IPSARD has remained in place for the duration of the grant. The original project envisaged a 'writeshop' for ANU and IPSARD staff in Year 3, to analyse and write up the data,. However staff movements within IPSARD meant that such an approach was unviable. Instead, although IPSARD staff were closely involved in data collection and contributed to policy outputs and outcomes, much of the data analysis and writing was carried out by ANU. Adjustments were made to the budget in the last year to enable the ANU Research Associate employed under the grant (Dr Trung Dinh Dang) to shoulder some of this additional workload. To do this, funds were diverted from the planned 'writeshop' in the final year.

8. What was achieved during the research period? *Limit 1000 words*

Please focus on the outcomes and innovations of the project, and detail how it filled research gaps and identified new areas for research.

Waste water management in Vietnam's craft villages has up to now been treated as 'market externality', to be solved with improved technologies, regulation and and pollution fees. Current policies and regulations treat craft enterprises as mini-industries, capable of preparing highly technical environmental management plans, of shouldering fees per unit of pollution, and of relocating (without support) to new industrial zones in villages and communes.

This research has generated new knowledge on the causes of water pollution from craft villages. In particular, it has highlighted the role of capital, land shortages and livelihood imperatives in craft producers' decision-making. It has uncovered the diversity, interconnectedness and predominantly small to medium scale of operations in craft villages. The project not only achieved its objective of understanding the drivers of water pollution in craft villages, but also contributed more broadly to the understanding of the social and environmental implications of rural industrialisation in Vietnam. By framing water pollution as a commons dilemma, the research has highlighted the limitations of current policies, while creating scope for improved institutional design and collaboration between producers and government. It has also highlighted important gaps in data about water pollution levels and health in craft villages. The research uncovered anecdotal evidence of serious health impacts in polluted craft villages which, once verified, can motivate urgent and effective action on water pollution by government and communities.

A major objective of the project was building capacity in the partner organisation, IPSARD. Staff involved in the project, initially unfamiliar with qualitative research, commented that the detailed training on qualitative methods that they received showed them the value of using rich in-depth data to understand environmental governance problems. Thus, the project has broadened the methodological repertoire of approximately five Vietnamese

researchers who are taking this new knowledge with them to their ongoing applied research roles in Vietnam.

The research has been well received by peers at international conferences and journals. One review of a forthcoming paper in *Society and Natural Resources* (an A-ranked international journal) commended the research for its "highly synthetic analysis of environmental governance that combines a variety of traditions of institutional analysis". Policy impact has been achieved through IPSARD's direct inputs to a major paper on water pollution that was considered in 2011 by the National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. A workshop with key policy-makers and researchers was also held in December 2011 to review and discuss policy implications arising from the research.

9. What academic or research communication outputs (e.g. journal articles, conference papers) have resulted from the project so far? *Limit 300 words.*

Please provide AusAID with copies of these outputs with this report if applicable

Three conference papers were delivered to international peers, of which two are in the pipeline as journal articles/book chapters:

1. Dang, T.D., Mahanty, S, and Mackay, S. 2011. Pollution, Risk Perception and Responses in Vietnam's Craft Villages, Vietnam Update Conference, November 17-18 2011, ANU, Canberra. (book chapter)
2. Mahanty, S and Dang, T.D. 2011. Sustaining Commons, Sustaining our Future 2011, International Association for the Study of the Commons, January 10-14, Hyderabad, India.
<http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/handle/10535/7342> (reworked for publication in *Society and Natural Resources*)
3. Dang, T.D. and Mahanty, S. 2010. The Complexity of Addressing Water Quality in Vietnam's Craft Villages. North American International Association for the Study of the Commons Conference 2010, September 30-October 2 2010, Arizona USA.
4. Mahanty, S., Dang, T.D and Hai, P.G. 2012. Crafting Sustainability: addressing water pollution in Vietnam's craft villages. Project Completion Report, ANU and IPSARD, Canberra

10. Are there any other academic or research communication outputs (e.g. journal articles) in the pipeline that will be produced in the near future? *Limit 300 words.*

Conference paper (1) above is in the pipeline as a book chapter of collected papers from the 2011 Vietnam Update.

Conference paper (2) above is going through final revisions for publication in *Society and Natural Resources*.

A book manuscript is under preparation for publication in the ANU E-Press Environment Monographs series in 2013. This is an open access e-publication system, which will enable easy access by policy and research audiences in Vietnam and elsewhere. The book proposal is provided with this report.

A further academic paper is under preparation on state-society relations and environmental governance in Vietnam.

11. How do you intend to communicate the research outcomes? *Limit 300 words.*

The Written outputs (as outlined above) have been or will be widely disseminated. ANU E-Press was specifically selected for it's easy availability at no cost to Vietnamese and other audiences, including donor agencies.

A policy workshop was held in December 2011, where the key research findings were presented to staff of key national and provincial agencies as well as researchers. This workshop discussed draft policy recommendations and provided feedback, which has been incorporated in the final project report.

The final project report, provided with this report, will be disseminated as a 'Crawford School Research Paper', which is easily accessed via the internet.

12. Financial Report

Please attach a detailed financial report that includes details of expenditure of grant monies during the entire research period (as per attachment below).

13. Certification

I certify that all the details contained in this progress report are true and that all research partners and co-investigators agree that this report is an accurate representation of the projects progress so far.

Signed, Principal Investigator



Date

29 March 2012

ADRA 2008 Final Financial Report/Financial Acquittal

Budget Allocations (A\$) – As per proposal.

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Researcher/s Salary	63000	73000	68000	204000
Field Work Costs	3000	15000	3000	21000
Travel & Related Costs	10000	12000	12000	34000
Insurances	-	-	-	-
Knowledge Transfer Activities	-	5000	10000	15000
Capacity Development Activities (if applicable)	5000	5000	10000	20000
Total AusAID Funds Requested	81000	110000	103000	294000

Final Financial Acquittal (A\$)

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Researcher/s Salary	43020.07	94704.22	83152.14	220876.43
Field Work Costs	6544.20	15515.53	5429.11	27488.84
Travel & Related Costs	13474.02	19290.51	4910.93	37675.46
Insurances				
Knowledge Transfer Activities			3814.36	3814.36
Capacity Development Activities (if applicable)	4518.96	518.11		5037.07
Actual expenditure	67557.25	130028.37	97306.54	294892.16

Financial Report

Please provide a detailed explanation on the above that includes expenditure of grant monies during the entire research period.

Over the life of the project, **a higher than anticipated proportion of the budget was spent on salary costs, fieldwork and travel.** As noted under Item 7 above, the inclusion of four rather than three case study sites in the research called for more fieldwork as well as additional time for analysis and to write up the case material. This required more staff time and fieldwork, leading to higher salary and fieldwork costs both for ANU and IPSARD.

In relation to **knowledge transfer**, the project originally planned to take a small number of officials on study tour of selected craft villages and to document the project through a video. In consultation with IPSARD a decision was taken to instead host a national workshop in Hanoi, where a broader range of researchers, relevant agency representatives, including senior officials, and commune staff could participate. This was a well attended and useful event in terms of discussion of policy options.

In terms of **capacity development**, Year 2 saw less spent on capacity development than originally anticipated, as much of the staff training occurred on-the-job while doing fieldwork and in writing up field notes. As explained in point 7 above, funds were redirected in year 3 from 'writeshop' to support additional staff time for the Research Associate to assist with data analysis and case study preparation. As none of the original staff that participated in fieldwork were available to participate in a writeshop, the research associate at ANU and the principal investigator carried the bulk of the case study preparation workload and the funds were diverted for this purpose.