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• Session 1: Opening Remarks and Keynotes
  • Opening remarks by Mr. Kamal Malhotra, UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative
  • Keynote remarks by H.E. Mr. Craig Chittick, Ambassador of Australia to Viet Nam
  • Keynote remarks by Dr. Nguyễn Duy Bắc, Vice President of the Ho Chi Minh National Academy of Politics
  • Keynote remarks by Dr. Phạm Văn Tân, Vice President and General Secretary of Viet Nam Union of Science and Technology Associations

• Session 2: 2017 PAPI National Trends and Provincial Performance
  • A Snapshot of PAPI, 2009-2017
    • Ms. Caitlin Wiesen, Country Director, UNDP Viet Nam
  • National Trends in Governance and Public Administration in 2017 and Issues of Greatest Concern in 2017
    • Dr. Paul Schuler, International Expert, PAPI Research Team
  • Key Findings at the Provincial Level in 2017 and Over Time
    • Dr. Dang Hoang Giang, CECODES Deputy Director, PAPI Research Team

• Session 3: Provincial Responses to PAPI Findings
  • Remarks by Representative from Ba Ria-Vung Tau
  • Remarks by Representative from Thai Binh

• Session 4: Questions and Answers
A Snapshot of PAPI from 2009-2017

Ms. Caitlin Wiesen
Country Director, UNDP Viet Nam

www.papi.org.vn
The Viet Nam Provincial Governance and Public Administration Performance Index

- 63 Provinces and municipalities
- 207 Districts
- 414 Communes
- 828 Villages

500 Questions

90 Indicators

22 Sub-dimensions

6 Dimensions
1. Participation at Local Levels
2. Transparency in Local Decision-Making
3. Vertical Accountability towards Citizens
4. Control of Corruption in the Public Sector
5. Public Administrative Procedures
6. Public Service Delivery

Citizens are at the heart of Viet Nam's development. As ‘end-users’ of public administration and public services they are fully capable of assessing the performance of the State and local authorities.
PAPI Timeline (2009-2017)

- 2009: Pilot in 3 provinces
- 2010: Expanding PAPI to 32 provinces
- 2011: 1st nationwide survey (5,568 interviews)
- 2012: 2nd nationwide survey (13,642 interviews)
- 2013: 3rd nationwide survey (13,747 interviews)
- 2014: 4th nationwide survey (13,892 interviews)
- 2015: 5th nationwide survey (13,955 interviews)
- 2016: 6th nationwide survey (14,063 interviews)
- 2017: 7th nationwide survey (14,097 interviews)
- 2018: 8th nationwide survey (103,059 interviews)

Total interviews: 543 + 5,568 + 13,642 + 13,747 + 13,892 + 13,955 + 14,063 + 14,097 + 103,059 = 186,003 interviews
PAPI’s Concrete Outputs

• **103,059 randomly selected citizens** from across 63 provinces interviewed face-to-face since 2009. In 2017 alone, **14,097 respondents** answered the 2017 PAPI questionnaire.

• **61 out of 63 provinces** have hosted and/or engaged in diagnostic workshops on PAPI findings to date, with an increasing number of provinces funding the workshops.

• **51 out of 63 provinces** have issued action plans, directives, resolutions and/or taken concrete actions on improving PAPI scores, or on actions needed to increase citizens’ satisfaction with local government performance (16 provinces issued new and/or renewed provincial policies to respond to PAPI findings in 2017 alone).
Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels
### PAPI and the Sustainable Development Goals

**Goal 16:** Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 16 – Targets relevant to PAPI</th>
<th>Goal 16 – Indicators relevant to PAPI</th>
<th>2017 PAPI Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels</td>
<td>16.6.2* Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services</td>
<td>D5 and D6 questions about public services provided by local governments (administrative services, health care, health insurance, primary education, water supply, solid waste collection, access to electricity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the 2017 PAPI Report, pp. 145-147 for concrete data and information with regard to measurable indicators in Goal 16 and other goals.
Implementation of 2017 PAPI

• 2017 PAPI survey was conducted from 12 July to 31 October with 14,097 citizens interviewed face-to-face

• 36 field controllers experienced with PAPI fieldwork quality control covered all 63 provinces (2 each province)

• 308 enumerators (28.5% male, 71.5% female) were selected from 1,238 applicants across Viet Nam

• 81 tablets were used consecutively during the data collection process

• 5 task-managers from UNDP, CECODES and VFF; 4 field support officers and 1 enumerator recruiter from CECODES; two 24/7 real-time technical support staff from RTA
National Trends in Governance and Public Administration and Issues of Greatest Concern in 2017

Dr. Paul Schuler, International Expert, PAPI Research Team

www.papi.org.vn
• Political will and support for external/independent monitoring tools (*the 6th Central Party Committee Plenum’s Conclusions*)

• Strong determination to curb corruption at the central level

• 10 years of the 2007 Ordinance on Grassroots Democracy and 20 years since the initiation of grassroots democracy in Viet Nam

• Discourse around industry revolution 4.0 and its implication for e-governance development

• Preparation for implementation of the 2016 Law on Access to Information from 1 July 2018

• 2\textsuperscript{nd} year of 2016-2021 government term

• 2\textsuperscript{nd} year of implementation of Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development
National Trends in Governance and Public Administration in 2017
Upward trends in performance in 5 out of 6 dimensions from 2016-2017

- Improvement in ‘Control of Corruption in the Public Sector’ most significant
- ‘Public Service Delivery’ dimension shows constant progress

BUT,
- Performance in governance-related aspects remain poorer than in public services
- ‘Participation at Local Levels’ and ‘Vertical Accountability’ remain poor
Dimensional Performance from Gender and Ethnicity Perspectives in 2017

- Men and the Kinh majority hold the most positive evaluations across nearly all dimensions

- ‘Public Service Delivery’: the only dimension where gender and ethnicity do not matter greatly
Improvement in Control of Corruption...

- Significant improvement in control of corruption in public agencies (diversion of state funds, bribery for land titles and construction permits) and in state employment (recruitment for public posts)

- Some improvement in control of corruption in public services (healthcare and primary education)

- Stable scores in willingness to fight against corruption at local government level
But are bribes still necessary for access to these public services?

• Perception of the need for bribes for state employment still high.

• Fewer reporting bribes for land titles and public officials diverting state funds for personal interest.
Remarkable improvement in corruption indicators

Possibility 1: News about anti-corruption efforts impacting perceptions

Possibility 2: Short-term after 5th Central Committee Plenum

Implication: Wait for next year to see if changes are stable
2017 Land Governance Issues

Overview

• Land concerns remain salient
• Conflicts over compensation persist
• Local governments constrained from land seizures by 2013 Land Law

Questions

• Have land seizures declined?
• Has compensation improved?
• Is there gender equity in land use registration?
Have you or a relative had land taken in the past year?

- A positive development?
- Smaller number of respondents reported land seizures
Was compensation for land seizure fair?

- Fewer of the citizens who faced land seizures were satisfied with the compensation offered.
Is your name on the Land Use Rights Certificate?

- While 18% fewer women in rural areas reported having their names on land use certificates in 2016, the difference dropped by half to 9% in 2017.
Overview of 2017 Land Governance Issues

Questions

- Have land seizures declined? **Yes**
- Has compensation improved? **No**
- Is there gender equity in land use registration? **More than in 2016**

Observations

- Local governments more constrained from seizure
- Land seizures less common
- Some improvement in gender equity in names on land use rights certificates
2017 Household Economic Situation

Questions

• How did citizens assess their 2017 household economic situation?

• How do citizens perceive their household economic situation in the next 5 years?
2017 Perception of Economic Situations

- Majority of Vietnamese citizens said their current economic situation (2017) was neither good nor bad.
- Future economic prospects:
  - Steady increase since 2014 in the number of citizens that think their economic situation will worsen in the next 5 years
  - The increase in pessimism is consistent across gender, ethnicity and the poorest income group compared to 2016
Economic situation improving in next five years (by income bracket)?

PAPI 2017
Summary

Positive trends in overall government performance in the second year of the 2016-2021 term

More optimism about government performance in control of corruption in the public sector

Mixed feelings about land seizure and compensation

Increased pessimism about household economic conditions in the future
Issues of Greatest Concern in 2017
What is the most important issue the government should address?

- Poverty/Hunger: 28.47
- Jobs/Employment: 7.78
- Environment: 7.35
- Corruption: 7.35
- Roads: 7.06
- Other Social Issues: 6.58
- Law and Order: 3.19
- East Sea Dispute: 2.97
- Other Econ Issues: 2.68
- Agriculture Policy: 2.46
- Income: 2.14
- National Defense: 2.03
- Education: 1.99
- Health: 1.94
- GDP Growth: 0.0
Poverty remains important: **Why?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Personal Poverty Concern</th>
<th>Family Poverty Concern</th>
<th>Government Duty to Reduce Poverty</th>
<th>Implication for Viet Nam’s Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>58.19%</td>
<td>61.98%</td>
<td>55.71%</td>
<td>82.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Middle</td>
<td>47.65%</td>
<td>54.07%</td>
<td>54.41%</td>
<td>88.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>47.51%</td>
<td>50.18%</td>
<td>55.24%</td>
<td>84.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>35.21%</td>
<td>45.67%</td>
<td>62.10%</td>
<td>87.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reason 1: Poor worried about slipping into poverty
- Reason 2: Majority think poverty impacts Viet Nam’s development
What induces citizens to pay for poverty reduction?

• Personal factors:
  • Men more willing
  • Party members more willing
  • Mass org members more willing

• Drivers for concern:
  • Concern about falling into poverty
  • Concern about health of workers
  • Concern about education of workers

Note: Baseline willingness to give is 70.9%
What makes citizens concerned about poverty?

- Provincial GDP status
  - Respondents in poorer provinces more concerned
  - Poor respondents in other provinces more concerned
Great Concern About Poverty

Citizens in low income group in poor provinces most concerned about falling into poverty

Majority see poverty reduction as important for Viet Nam’s development

Poverty reduction: “Well begun, not yet done”?  

PAPI 2017
Support environmental friendly or economically beneficial projects?

• Question: Choose polluting project vs. economically beneficial project

➢ Environment trumps employment
Support coal-fired power plant or clean air?

- Question: Varied emphasis on environmental, health and energy access effects

- Greenhouse gases effect significantly reduces support, especially among educated citizens

![Graph showing predicted percentage of supporters with and without mention of greenhouse gases.](www.papi.org.vn)
### Key Considerations

#### Governments face challenges entering middle-income trap

- Enhanced and more inclusive governance
- Greater demand for access to information and responsiveness
- Persistent demand for reduced poverty, BUT unwillingness to trade environmental degradation even if large economic benefits

#### What can be done?

- Governments willing to face challenges
- Most effective option: **improve performance** (enhanced efficiency, transparency, accountability, service quality)
- Improving economically while protecting environment: invest in education, lessen corruption
Provincial Performance in 2017

Highlights of provincial performance in 2017 and changes by dimension, 2016 to 2017

Dr. Dang Hoang Giang,
CECODES Deputy Director,
PAPI Research Team
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Average Provincial Performance in Participation at Local Levels in 2017

- **5 best performers**: Ha Tinh, Bac Ninh, Hai Duong, Thai Binh, Thai Nguyen *(from 6.0-6.4 points, on the scale from 1-10)*

- **5 poorest performers**: Binh Duong, Hau Giang, Ca Mau, HCMC, Soc Trang *(from 4.3-4.8 points, on the scale from 1-10)*

- Poorer performers mostly found in South Central, Central Highlands and Southern regions, similar to 2016 findings
+ 13 provinces made significant progress in ‘Participation at Local Levels’

- 14 provinces saw significant setbacks in ‘Participation at Local Levels’
### Progress and Setbacks in Local Government Performance in Participation at Local Levels (2016-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Setbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Having a second candidate to choose from in village head elections: 49% in 2017 vs. 42% in 2016</td>
<td>• Less civic knowledge of whether selected government posts are elected or appointed: 0.81 points in 2017 vs. 0.88 points in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having voluntarily (rather than by force) contributed to local projects: 43% in 2017 vs. 37% in 2016</td>
<td>• Lower rate of citizens reporting having their voluntary contributions recorded in local records: 72% in 2017 vs. 73% in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reporting local projects being monitored by Community Investment Supervision Boards: 34% in 2017 vs. 21% in 2016</td>
<td>• Fewer contributors to local projects having opportunities to provide their comments in local project designs: 33% in 2017 vs. 36% in 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average 2017 Provincial Performance in Transparency in Local Decision-Making

- **5 best performers**: Quang Binh, Hai Duong, Ha Tinh, Ba Ria-Vung Tau, Bac Lieu (*from 6.33-6.71 points, on the scale from 1-10*)

- **5 poorest performers**: Soc Trang, Kon Tum, Binh Thuan, Lai Chau, Dak Lak (*from 4.99-5.17 points, on the scale from 1-10*)

- Better performers mostly found in the Northeastern, North Central, and Mekong River Delta regions (different from 2016)

- Poorer performers mostly found in Central Highlands, South Central regions
+ **15** provinces made significant progress in ‘Transparency in Local Decision-making’

- **11** provinces saw significant setbacks in ‘Transparency in Local Decision-making’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Setbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Finding errors in poverty lists: 36% in 2017 reporting that poor households were missed in poverty lists vs. 39% in 2016</td>
<td>• Trust in accuracy of disclosed budgetary information: ~70% believed the information was accurate in both 2016 and 2017 (lower than in previous years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirming that commune budgets and expenditures were made publicly available: 36% in 2017 vs. 32% in 2016</td>
<td>• Having opportunities to comment on land use plans: ~4% in both 2016 and 2017 (lower than in previous years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being aware of local land plans: 15.2% in 2017 vs. 13.6% in 2016</td>
<td>• Renewed land use plans still exerting negative impact on affected populations: mean scores of around 2 points over time (scale: 1 = no impact, 2 = negative impact, 3 = positive impact)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Affects Access to Government Documents Online?

• Having Internet connection: an important determinant of accessing documents online

• Those with higher education levels tend to use government portals more often

• Male respondents use more often than female respondents
E-GOVERNMENT

A Few Aware of Law on Access to Information and Use E-government Portals

• 9.3% of 14,097 aware of Law on Access to Information

• 12% searched government information

Top 5 Source of Information on Government Documents

1. **40%** Meet a local official I know personally
2. **33%** Obtain information from personal contacts (family, friends)
3. **23%** Read from a local official notice board
4. **23%** Post a question on social media
5. **22%** Search government portals

Citizens’ use of online portals

- **16%** Construction Permits
- **8%** Certification Procedures
- **6%** Personal Procedures
- **8%** Land Use Rights Certification

www.papi.org.vn
Average 2017 Provincial Performance in Vertical Accountability

- **5 best performers:** Nam Dinh, Ha Nam, Thai Binh, Lao Cai, Vinh Long (from 5.56-6.25 points, on the scale from 1-10)

- **5 poorest performers:** Lai Chau, Gia Lai, Bac Kan, Dak Nong, Tra Vinh (from 4.10-4.43 points, on the scale from 1-10)

- Better performers more evenly distributed

- Poorer performers mostly found in Northwestern and Central Highlands regions
+ 27 provinces made significant progress in ‘Vertical Accountability’

- 18 provinces saw significant setbacks in ‘Vertical Accountability’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Progress</strong></th>
<th><strong>Setbacks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interacting with local authorities when facing problems: e.g., 17% met with commune government officials in 2017, up from 14% in 2016</td>
<td>• Those who interacted with local authorities found interactions successful: e.g., 81% of those who met with commune government officials were satisfied in 2017, down from 83% in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Those who submitted complaints satisfied with results of complaint resolution: 53% in 2017 vs. 45% in 2016</td>
<td>• Those who made denunciation satisfied with denunciation resolution by local authorities: 33% in 2017 vs. 68% in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reporting that there is People’s Inspection Board in localities: 39% in 2017 vs. 34% in 2016</td>
<td>• Low percentage of those satisfied with local governments addressing of joint petitions: 41% in both 2016 and 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017 Provincial Performance in Control of Corruption in the Public Sector: Large gaps between provinces

- **5 best performers**: Long An, Binh Dinh, Ben Tre, Can Tho, Quang Binh (*from* 7.15-7.23 *points, on the scale from* 1-10)

- **5 poorest performers**: Hai Phong, Binh Duong, Dak Nong, Hung Yen, Dak Lak (*from* 4.36-5.2 *points, on the scale from* 1-10)

- Better performers in the Central and the South – moving South trend!

- Poorer performers mostly found in Northern mountainous and Central Highlands regions
+ 33 provinces made significant progress in ‘Control of Corruption in the Public Sector’

- 6 provinces saw significant setbacks in ‘Control of Corruption in the Public Sector’
### Importance of Relationship for State Employment:

**Fewer prospective applicants in the South need personal relationship when applying for public sector jobs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zero</th>
<th>Lai Chau</th>
<th>Yen Bai</th>
<th>Dak Nong</th>
<th>Binh Duong</th>
<th>Lang Son</th>
<th>Tra Vinh</th>
<th>Soc Trang</th>
<th>Ha Giang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dak Lak</td>
<td>Cao Bang</td>
<td>Dien Bien</td>
<td>Ninh Thuan</td>
<td>Quang Ngai</td>
<td>Kon Tum</td>
<td>Ha Noi</td>
<td>Bac Ninh</td>
<td>Bac Kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khanh Hoa</td>
<td>Phu Yen</td>
<td>Son La</td>
<td>Hau Giang</td>
<td>Gia Lai</td>
<td>Hai Phong</td>
<td>Ninh Binh</td>
<td>Quang Ninh</td>
<td>Tien Giang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Nguyen</td>
<td>HCMC</td>
<td>Hoa Binh</td>
<td>Ca Mau</td>
<td>Vinh Long</td>
<td>TT-Hue</td>
<td>Bac Giang</td>
<td>Ha Nam</td>
<td>Lam Dong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quang Tri</td>
<td>Thai Binh</td>
<td>Hung Yen</td>
<td>Phu Tho</td>
<td>Vinh Phuc</td>
<td>Lao Cai</td>
<td>Binh Thuan</td>
<td>Da Nang</td>
<td>Ha Tinh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuyen Quang</td>
<td>Binh Phuoc</td>
<td>Tay Ninh</td>
<td>Quang Nam</td>
<td>Long An</td>
<td>Thanh Hoa</td>
<td>Kien Giang</td>
<td>Nghe An</td>
<td>Nam Dinh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRVT</td>
<td>Dong Thap</td>
<td>Ben Tre</td>
<td>Can Tho</td>
<td>Quang Binh</td>
<td>An Giang</td>
<td>Binh Dinh</td>
<td>Dong Nai</td>
<td>Hai Duong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac Lieu</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pervasive and persistent nepotism still largely seen in state employment**

**Application for government positions of:**

- Land Registry Staff
- Policeman
- Commune Justice Officer
- People’s Committee
- Teacher
Citizens’ Perception of Corruption in the Public Sector by Province: Top performers still in the South

- No Diverting of Public Funds
- No Bribes for Land Title
- No Bribes at Hospital
- No Bribes for Teachers’ Favors
- No Kickbacks on Construction
- No Bribes for State Employment

Poorest performers

Best performers
2017 Provincial Performance in Public Administrative Procedures

- **5 best performers:** Ben Tre, Dong Thap, Binh Phuoc, Hai Phong, Nam Dinh *(from 7.47-7.69 points, on the scale from 1-10)*

- **5 poorest performers:** Cao Bang, Ha Giang, Bac Kan, Lao Cai, Lam Dong *(from 6.78-6.81 points, on the scale from 1-10)*

- More better performers in the South than 2016

- Poorer performers mostly found in Northeastern, Northwestern and Central Highlands regions
+ 8 provinces made significant progress in ‘Public Administrative Procedures’
- 3 provinces saw significant setbacks in ‘Public Administrative Procedures’
Assessment of Quality of Administrative Service for Land Use Rights Certificates

Procedures and services for land use rights certificates (LURCs) remain the most troublesome among four services PAPI measures: government certification, construction permits, LURCs and commune one-stop shops.
2017 Provincial Performance in Public Service Delivery: From high average up, narrow gap

- **5 best performers**: Ba Ria-Vung Tau, Vinh Long, Bac Ninh, Ben Tre, An Giang (from 7.61-7.83 points, on the scale from 1-10)

- **5 poorest performers**: Ca Mau, Binh Duong, Tien Giang, Quang Ngai, Son La (from 6.28-6.67 points, on the scale from 1-10)

- More better performers found in Central and Mekong Delta region than 2016

- Poorer performers mostly found in Northwestern, Northeastern and Central Highlands regions
+ 8 provinces made significant progress in ‘Public Service Delivery’

- 3 provinces saw significant setbacks in ‘Public Service Delivery’
Assessment of Quality of Public District Hospitals by Province

- **No shared beds**
- **Electric fan**
- **Clean restroom**
- **Regular visits by staff**
- **Treated with respect**
- **Reasonable expenses**
- **Reasonable waiting period**
- **Disease/Injury cured**
- **Private Pharma**
- **Satisfaction with service**

**Ha Noi, HCMC and Can Tho among 10 poorest performers**
Assessment of Quality of Public Primary Schools by Province

Teachers’ favouritism of pupils attending their self-organised, after-school classes remains prevalent in many provinces, including in better performing provinces.
Aggregated 2017 PAPI:
Mountainous, Central Highlands provinces falling behind

- 5 best performers: Quang Binh, Ben Tre, Nam Dinh, Bac Ninh, Ba Ria-Vung Tau (from 38.91-39.53 points, on the scale from 10-60)

- 5 poorest performers: Lai Chau, Binh Duong, Ha Giang, Bac Kan, Yen Bai (from 33.10-34.37 points, on the scale from 10-60)

- Better performers mostly found in the Northeastern, Central and Mekong Delta regions

- Poorer performers mostly found in Northern mountainous, Central Highlands regions
None of 63 provinces excel in all six dimensions

- Quang Binh, Ben Tre and Bac Lieu in the best performing group in 5 out of 6 dimensions (still, Bac Lieu in low-average performing group in ‘Vertical Accountability’)

- Large gap between highest provincial score (39.52 points) and expected maximum score (60 points)
+ 7 provinces made significant progress in aggregated 2017 PAPI scores against 2016

- 0 provinces saw significant setbacks in aggregated 2017 PAPI Scores against 2016
Overall Provincial Progress: 2017 vs. 2012 Provincial PAPI Scores

+ **12 provinces** made significant progress in aggregated 2017 PAPI scores compared to 2012

- **6 provinces** saw significant setbacks in aggregated 2017 PAPI scores compared to 2012
Converging Trend in Provincial Performance in 2017

- **PAPI Aggregate Score Range (10-60 points)**

- **Year of Nationwide PAPI Surveys**

- **Highest**
- **75th Percentile**
- **Median**
- **25th Percentile**
- **Lowest**
RELATIVELY STRONG CORRELATION BETWEEN 2017 PCI AND 2017 PAPI

Better performance in public service delivery (i.e., education, healthcare and infrastructure) may yield better outcomes in economic governance (i.e., labour quality, infrastructure for economic development).
• 7 provinces saw large improvements; none of the 63 provinces had significant declines compared to 2016 PAPI scores

• Quang Binh, Ben Tre and Bac Lieu were in the best performing groups in five out of the six dimensions

• A trend of converging provincial performance, as seen from the lowest and highest aggregate provincial scores in 2017 compared to the previous years

• Some gap in 2017 between provinces receiving the highest (39.53 points) and the lowest scores (33.09 points)

• Significant disparity between the highest provincial score (39.52 points) and the potential maximum score of 60 points
Implications for Provinces

• Provinces can assess how they have progressed over time, and how they compare with other provinces of similar socio-economic and geographic characteristics.

• PAPI serves as a “first cut” of a province’s performance in a certain year in a comprehensive manner.

• Provincial leaders are advised to examine findings for each indicator of the PAPI dimensions and sub-dimensions provided in the respective provincial profiles.

• Detailed indicator results suggest areas where central and local governments should do more to improve their performance in governance and public administration.
For more information about PAPI, see:

www.papi.org.vn/eng

and follow PAPI at:

#PAPIvn

www.facebook.com/papivn

www.twitter.com/PAPI_Vietnam

www.youtube.com/user/PAPIVietNam
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