

The Rufford Small Grants Foundation

Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Small Grants Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. The Final Report must be sent in **word format** and not PDF format or any other format. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. Please note that the information may be edited for clarity. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to jane@rufford.org.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details

Your name	Bernard KERVYN
Project title	Pilot Tánh Linh waste recycling program -Vietnam
RSG reference	Reference RSG 59.07.09
Reporting period	12/2009-4/2011
Amount of grant	6300 GBP
Your email address	Bernard.kervyn@gmail.com
Date of this report	20/4/11

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
set up a <u>model waste recycling unit</u> (technically sound, good for agriculture, sustainable financially).		Financially it almost covers its running expenses	Technically the program is successful+ excellent for agriculture	We consider this as a superb achievement. Around the cities waste management plants are heavily subsidized. We operate in a rural area with incomes about 3 times lower, no subsidy

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).

- The difficulty to find labourers as shame to work on the plant is an issue
- The low rate of organic waste, as (successfully) we have also trained the farmers to make their own compost at home
- The low rate of valuable waste, as waste collectors sort the waste even before the truck arrives at the waste recycling plant.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

- We could demonstrate waste recycling is possible, even in poor areas, even when organic waste is less than 50% total waste.
- The resulting low quality but affordable compost is a success with the planters, they want more.
- The local authorities rate the program very high and have contributed to its expansion.
- Experts from the university advised the program was not realistic, considering the low organic waste percentage and the high sorting efforts needed. We believe we were right to pursue with the locals, as the problem is theirs and they do not get support from higher levels.

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project (if relevant).

- The farmers have joined numerous training sessions and visited the plant. They have tested the compost on their fields and contribute to its promotion
- The local district authorities have contributed financially to the program and are actively promoting it at higher levels.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

- Our regret is that local authorities of Đức Linh district are not more responsive. They requested we fund a dumping ground 8 years ago, but have not provided a piece of land for the waste recycling plant; Tân Linh district could, for 2 plants. Hàm Thuận Nam district proposes 2 sites as well, which we will consider when we will be able to raise the funds for the investment.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

- The program has been promoted in seminars in Vietnam, on our website and through our newsletter. We will continue to do so.

7. Timescale: Over what period was the RSG used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

- 16 months compared to the initial 12 months plan. We had hoped the local electricity company would fulfil its commitment to connect the plants to the grid, which would then allow a substantial reduction in operating costs. While we waited for this to happen, some investments had to be postponed.

8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.

Items		In GBP: 1/30.000		
		Budget		Spent
		RSG	Mekong Plus	
1	Improve all-weather access to the waste recycling units	1.500		2460
2	Improve equipment for workers' safety & reducing costs	1.500	1.000	1100
3	Testing of compost & decide for optimal mix	800		456
4	Promotion among 1000 farmers in farmers' groups: training & subsidized sales	1.700	1.000	2083 365
5	Promotion among 600 extremely poor farmers: training & subsidized sales	800	1.200	2517 513
Total		6.300	3.200	9.494

(2) Lower than planned because of delays to have electricity at the plant: the purchase of equipment was postponed.

(1) Higher than planned, as a replacement investment for the lower expenses in (2).

(5) idem

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

- We must continue to improve productivity at the 2 plants, to ensure the farmers get compost at a reasonable cost.
- We will expand the program.

10. Did you use the RSGF logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

- We confess we did not use it much. RSGF was regularly mentioned to our partners as a key supporter all along the program. RSGF is also on our website. We will now put a signboard on both plants as a sign of gratitude to RSGF as this phase of the project has been completed.
- All Mekong Plus programs are funded by a variety of small or large funders (18 for the moment) and most important by the local people themselves.

11. Any other comments?

- Thank you for your support. We were surprised by your initial reaction when we asked to adjust the way the funds could be spent. We understand you could be annoyed, however this program relies heavily on the local institutions (in this case the electric company) and we have limited capacity to impose our rhythm. We are grateful you could accept this change.

12. I agree to this report being published on the Rufford Small Grants website

Signed (or print name)



Bernard KERVYN