

# Project Completion Review of the Southeast Asia Community Access Programme (SEACAP)

## Narrative Report

30 June 2009

### Report prepared by:

Jelle van Gijn,  
Transport Specialist

and

Xochitl Benjamin,  
Social Development Specialist

for

The TI-UP Resource Centre



**DFID** Department for  
International  
Development

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table of contents	i
List of tables	ii
List of appendices	iii
Main abbreviations used	iv
<b>1 Background and Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose of this Report	1
1.2 Background to SEACAP	1
1.3 Structure of this report	1
<b>2 Management and Procurement</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Overview	2
2.2 Governance by DFID	2
2.3 Management by contractor	3
2.4 Government participation: Steering Committees	4
2.5 SEACAP Partners	5
2.6 Procurement	5
<b>3 Projects and Research</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Overview	6
3.2 Viet Nam	6
3.3 Cambodia	6
3.4 Lao PDR	7
<b>4 Communication and Dissemination</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1 Principles of SEACAP communication	8
4.2 Dissemination under SEACAP	8
<b>5 Socio-economic impact</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1 SEACAP goal and purpose	11
5.2 Socio-economic activities	12
5.3 Assessment of socio-economic impact	13
<b>6 Sustainability of project results</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1 SEACAP impact and gaps	15
6.2 Necessary conditions for sustainability	16
<b>7 Recommendations and Conclusions</b>	<b>17</b>
7.1 Learning from SEACAP's achievements	17
7.2 Components of a new programme	17
7.3 Concluding statement	18
7.4 Considerations for DFID involvement	20

## **List of tables**

Table 2.1	Composition of SEACAP Steering Committees	4
Table 5.1	SEACAP Socio-Economic Outputs	12
Table 7.1	Levels of involvement for SEACAP continuation	19
Table 7.2	Linkages between DFID's Research Strategy and rural transport	20

## Appendices

Appendix A: Terms of reference for SEACAP Project Completion Review

Appendix B: SEACAP Logical Framework (from 2003 Project Memorandum)

Appendix C: SEACAP contracts SC 01 – SC 31

Appendix D: People interviewed for SEACAP PCR

Appendix E: Documents consulted for SEACAP PCR

Appendix F: Comments on Recommendations of December 2006 Progress Review

*Disclaimer: This Project Completion Review of SEACAP has been conducted at the request of DFID by staff employed by WSP International Management Consulting (WSPimc) as part of the TI-UP framework contract between DFID and WSPimc.*

*Other staff of WSP – not part of this PCR team – were involved in the formulation of some TORs for training in Viet Nam under SEACAP, whilst engaged on a DFID assignment in Viet Nam during 2003-05. WSP has had no other material involvement during the implementation of SEACAP, other than a small sub-contract to a local organisation TDSI under SC 16, executed by one of WSP's independent consultants.*

*Following consultation with DFID and a joint review of circumstances, WSP management was therefore in a position to state that there was no conflict of interest arising from accepting this assignment.*

*The opinions and views recorded in this and other reports resulting from this PCR are those of the WSP review team. They do not necessarily coincide with those of DFID or SEACAP consultants or SEACAP stakeholders.*

---

## Main abbreviations used

ACAP	Asia Community Access Programme
ADB	Asian Development Bank
ADP	Annual Development Programme
AIT	Asian Institute of Technology
AFCAP	Africa Community Access Programme
CNCTP	Cambodian National Community of Transport Professionals
CRD	Central Research Department (DFID)
DF	Dissemination and Facilitation: category of activities under SEACAP
DFID	Department for International Development
DoR	Department of Roads (Lao PDR)
GMSARN	Greater Mekong Sub-regional Academic and Research Network
gTKP	Global Transport Knowledge Partnership
IFG	International Focus Group
IFRTD	International Forum for Rural Transport Development
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ITC	Institute of Technology Cambodia
ITST	Institute of Transport Science and Technology (Vietnam)
KAR	Knowledge and Research (DFID research programme up to 2003)
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
LCSP	Low Cost Surfacing Project (DFID KAR R7782)
LVRR	Low Volume Rural Roads
MARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (Vietnam)
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MPWT	Ministry of Public Works and Transport (Lao PDR)
MRD	Ministry of Rural Development (Cambodia)
NCDD	National Committee for sub-national Democratic Development (Cambodia; earlier: National Committee for Decentralisation and De-concentration)
NRDP	Northwest Rural Development Programme (Cambodia, ADB funded)
PCR	Project Completion Review
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RRSR	Rural Road Surfacing Programme (Viet Nam)
RTP	Rural Transport Project (Viet Nam, World Bank funded)
SC	(a) Steering Committee; (b) SEACAP (as used in codes for research contracts)
SEACAP	Southeast Asia Community Access Programme
TDSI	Transport Development and Strategic Institute (Viet Nam)
TRIP	Tertiary Road Improvement Project (Cambodia, KfW funded)
VRA	Viet Nam Road Authority
WB	World Bank

---

# 1 Background and Overview

## 1.1 Purpose of this Report

1. This Report has been prepared as part of the Project Completion Review (PCR) of the “South East Asia Community Access Programme”, known as SEACAP. The review was conducted through the TI-UP Resource Centre by Jelle van Gijn, Team Leader and Transport Specialist and Xochitl Benjamin, Social Development and Communications Specialist, with further assistance from Rob Taylor in Viet Nam. The team was engaged to carry out the Review primarily as a desk exercise, complemented by a field visit to Cambodia, some personal interviews in Vietnam and telephone interviews with stakeholders where possible, or emailed responses where not.

2. The purpose of this report is to provide a narrative background to the PCR template that forms the core of DFID’s evaluation reporting. This completed PCR form, including the PRISM/ARIES summary, is presented as a separate report.

3. This report has been prepared by the team of WSP consultants, for the sole purpose of providing further background to the SEACAP Project Completion Review. At the request of DFID, this report makes recommendations for potential follow-up work, assessing opportunities for continued dissemination. It represents the views and opinions of the WSP consultants, and does not necessarily reflect the views of DFID.

## 1.2 Background to SEACAP

4. *History.* SEACAP evolved from a combination of applied research initiatives in Viet Nam and Cambodia related to rural roads and transport. These included the KAR’s<sup>1</sup> “Low Cost Surfacing Project”; the support by DFID Viet Nam to the World Bank Rural Transport programme and the ILO Upstream project in Cambodia. The SEACAP Project Document, prepared during 2003, included the TORs for eight initial research projects, some of which had already been commissioned. Most of these initiatives provided the core of the initial years of the programme. Activities expanded into Lao PDR late in 2004.

5. *Objectives.* The objective of SEACAP is defined in its LogFrame as “Livelihoods of poor and vulnerable peoples in SE Asia improved sustainably”. The Project Goal (or Programme Purpose) is phrased as “Sustainable access (to health, education and trade) for rural communities, creating pro-poor growth”. Most of the Outputs are formulated in terms of road technology, guidelines, policies, best practices, etc, and the dissemination thereof.

6. *Timeline.* SEACAP started in April 2004, with the programme set for five years. The initial contract with the programme management consultants was up to December 2007. Three successive contract extensions stretched the duration of the management contract until June 2009.

## 1.3 Structure of this report

7. The structure of this report is guided by the terms of reference for this review. This PCR narrative report opens in Chapter 2 with a description of the management and procurement arrangements that were put in place for the programme. Chapter 3 summarises the research contracts that formed the core of SEACAP, followed by an overview of the main dissemination and facilitation (DF) activities in Chapter 4. Focussing on the goal and objectives of the programme, Chapter 5 reviews the socio-economic impact of SEACAP. Chapter 6 examines the likely sustainability of the programme. Finally, Chapter 7 presents recommendations on future activities that may be developed to support and continue the achievements of SEACAP.

---

<sup>1</sup> KAR: DFID’s Knowledge and Research programme, the research programme running until 2003.

---

## 2 Management and Procurement

### 2.1 Overview

8. SEACAP was a research programme managed and delivered at first by two separate contractors under the overall guidance and supervision of DFID's Central Research Department (CRD) and (initially) DFID's Viet Nam office. To ensure relevance of the programme with local priorities and the acceptance of its results, governments of the three participating countries were represented through country Steering Committees consisting of officers from government agencies responsible for the management of rural road transport. Academic institutions and professional bodies in Southeast Asia were kept involved in the dialogue on programme direction and with the dissemination of results. A Steering Group was established consisting of DFID staff in Viet Nam and of the CRD, with representation from the management contractors.

### 2.2 Governance by DFID

9. The management by DFID of SEACAP reflected the origins of the programme. On one hand, SEACAP was seen as continuing some of the research activities that had started under the DFID KAR programme which was wound up in 2003. It therefore fell under the remit of the CRD, based in London. On the other, SEACAP had evolved in response to DFID's Viet Nam involvement with the World Bank's Rural Transport programme, dealing with specific practical concerns about the use of gravel roads. The DFID office in Hanoi therefore had – for the first few years in particular – a major role in SEACAP's development and its management. A number of SEACAP projects were funded directly by DFID Viet Nam, rather than from the SEACAP budget.

10. The Project Document for SEACAP, with the Logical Framework at its core, appears to have been prepared in response to the need to accommodate or consolidate a series of research projects for Viet Nam and Cambodia that had been under preparation, because of the end of the KAR facility. The body of the SEACAP Project Document does not contain the sections usually found in DFID project documents for development projects, such as a summary technical, social, economic and environment analysis. Neither does it include an analysis of the *risks* related to achieving the programme and project goal and purpose. These goals were formulated at a high level of abstraction, in terms of socio-economic growth and poverty alleviation. The substance of the SEACAP Project Document consisted of the eight Annexes, with detailed terms of reference for the initial eight candidate research programmes. The variations in the style, format and depth of analysis found in these Annexes demonstrate that they originated from different sources, possibly for different purposes. Four of these eight projects seem to have already been committed to a selected research contractor. This initial list of candidate projects did not yet include any work proposed for Lao PDR: the country is not mentioned in the document or logframe. The Review Team understand that no further changes were made to the Project Document or Logframe during the course of the programme to reflect evolving circumstances.

11. This background probably contributed to the ambiguity noted between SEACAP being *either* an applied research project with several components to strengthen the rural road programmes in Viet Nam and Cambodia, *or* an open-ended research programme for rural infrastructure with broad socio-economic goals. It further may have added to the problems faced by contractors in the initial years of giving clear direction to the programme.

12. Internal (annual) reviews by DFID focused on whether *outputs* had been achieved, without analysing the degree to which the Programme Purpose (sustainable access) was being achieved, or assessing the remaining risks involved in the transition from research findings to changing policy and implementation in practice. Research under SEACAP remained largely focused on the broad arena of road construction and maintenance: there was no recording of base-line indicators by which to measure the higher level socio-economic targets.

---

13. *Budgets.* The original budget for SEACAP was approximately £1.5 million, for the first eight research projects outlined in the Project Document. The budget made an overall allowance for dissemination. Later (early 2005), funds set aside for an unused SC 7 project were allocated for more extensive dissemination and facilitation, under a separate “DF” group of activities. SC 10 to SC 16 were funded from DFID Viet Nam sources, with a total value of approximately £1 million. Further funds were gradually made available from the CRD budget, to a total spend for SEACAP of approximately £7.5 million. It appears that SEACAP management was not aware of a set budget ceiling. Instead, management in consultation with recipient governments submitted proposals to DFID for certain activities, which were then assessed on their value, and approved, amended or rejected.

14. *Programme duration and extensions.* The original duration of SEACAP as set out in the Project Document was three and a half years, to start in late 2003. The actual programme started March 2004, and was set to continue for five years, but a contract with management consultants until Dec 2007. Three successive extensions were granted to the programme; for six, nine and three months respectively, leading to a final completion of SEACAP at the end of June 2009. These extensions permitted continuation of training, dissemination and some monitoring. However, the time horizon of each extension was never long enough to embark on new primary research, given the long lead time of co-ordination with government and participating development partners (see para 33). One reason for the extensions was to allow DFID to formulate a successor to SEACAP – an intention which has not yet materialised because of changes in policy and priorities.

### **2.3 Management by contractor**

15. From a list of shortlisted consultants, DFID initially appointed two separate contractors to manage SEACAP: Crown Agents to manage the procurement of contracts, and Halcrow to provide technical guidance and management. At first, management of the programme was largely done from the two firms’ respective UK offices without senior representation by either firm in the SE Asia region. The December 2006 Progress Review commented on the problems experienced during the early years with this management arrangement and the way these issues had been dealt with.

16. Due to questions over performance, Halcrow were removed from involvement with the programme in 2005 and the role of Crown Agents expanded to cover technical issues and procurement. Technical management of the programme was taken over late 2005 by a new Technical Manager (Mr David Salter) who was based in Cambodia, and who had sector-specific experience in the region. The Technical Manager had to be hired by the main contractor Crown Agents through UNOPS, which reportedly added to bureaucratic complications and delays.

17. Interviews with all stakeholders have indicated a marked improvement in the management of the programme since the appointment of the new Technical Manager based in the region. The role of the Technical Manager was critical in identifying new or follow-on project components in consultation with counterparts within governments, through regular participation in steering committees, whether for new research or for dissemination activities. It was noted by stakeholders that in the absence of a locally based Technical Manager, SEACAP management had not been able to provide any technical value-added which was considered to be problematic.

18. Management was also improved by the appointment of a Crown Agents Procurement Manager, based in Hanoi, who worked closely with the Technical Manager in the region.

19. Failure to use the logframe as a framework against which to measure progress made it more difficult to differentiate between SEACAP as a series of research outputs (in which it was very successful) or SEACAP as an overall strategic programme (in which its success is less clear). The lower emphasis on programme goals may have led to missed opportunities to adopt a cohesive communications strategy from the outset, create linkages between projects and countries, link achievements to overall socio-economic goals, strive for greater local buy-in and uptake and generally maximise long-term impact. Improvements were made in this area over the course of the programme by, for example, initiating the annual Practitioners Meetings (beginning in late 2006) which included stakeholders from



outside SEACAP countries and from diverse backgrounds (engineers, government officers, social development specialists, etc).

20. The Review Team takes the view that Crown Agents took proactive and appropriate steps to fix problems that had beset the programme in the early years. They should be commended for this, as should David Salter for his role as Technical Manager. The result of their work has been a high level of technical competence, respected research outputs and relatively good recognition of SEACAP as a brand. We consider this as a good programme-level success important to the sustainability of SEACAP work.

21. The earlier difficulties and the management of relationships (among DFID, Crown Agents and Halcrow to begin with, and DFID, Crown Agents and UNOPS later) did lead to some setbacks and administrative distractions. For example, a planned SEACAP project in Sri Lanka was delayed and then cancelled for various reasons, including uncertainties over a contract extension but also because of disagreement between Crown Agents and UNOPS. Crown Agents has reportedly taken steps to ensure that this administrative arrangement was not repeated as part of AFCAP.

## 2.4 Government participation: Steering Committees

22. Essential to SEACAP's success was the understanding, acceptance and application of the results of the applied research by respective government agencies and the rural roads sub-sector in general. To be fully effective, the conclusions from the research had to find their way into policies and strategies on rural transport, and eventually into budget allocations, into designs and specifications. The establishment and effective functioning of "steering committees" was therefore considered to be a critical component in ensuring a lasting impact of SEACAP.

23. Steering Committees were established in all three countries, generally focused on a transport related ministry. Table 2.1 summarises the composition of the three steering committees.

**Table 2.1 Composition of SEACAP Steering Committees**

	Chair	Members
Viet Nam	Department for Science and Technology, Ministry of Transport (MoT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vietnam Road Authority</li> <li>• Transport Development and Strategic Institute</li> <li>• Institute of Transport Science and Technology</li> <li>• PMUs 5, 6, 18</li> <li>• World Bank Viet Nam</li> <li>• DFID Viet Nam</li> </ul>
Cambodia	Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development (MRD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director General for Technical Affairs, (within MRD)</li> <li>• Director of Rural Roads Department (within MRD)</li> <li>• Road Research Department of Min of Public Works &amp; Transport</li> <li>• Institute of Technology of Cambodia</li> <li>• Engineering Institute of Cambodia</li> </ul>
Lao PDR	Director General of the Department of Roads, within Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MPWT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Roads Division (within MPWT)</li> <li>• Road Administration Division (within MPWT)</li> <li>• Planning and Technical Division (within MPWT)</li> </ul>

24. Steering committees were consulted for proposed future projects or other initiatives, e.g. by submitting terms of reference for review. Senior members of the steering committees played a role in the dissemination process by taking part in international or regional seminars, discussing SEACAP at stakeholders' meetings or presenting SEACAP's research results at international conferences.

---

## 2.5 SEACAP Partners

25. During the course of the programme, SEACAP delivered its components – both research and its dissemination – often in concert with other development partners. Full scale trial sections were funded as part of loan-funded programmes in Viet Nam and Lao PDR from the World Bank and the ADB (with a total construction value of approximately US \$5.7 million), with further interest in SEACAP policy results from AUSAID and regional agencies involved in rural transport.

## 2.6 Procurement

26. The SEACAP Project Document did not specify or recommend the modes of procurement under which SEACAP should operate. In the December 2006 Progress Review, certain recommendations were made in relation to the prevailing procurement practices under SEACAP. These referred mainly to (a) the need for greater clarity on the rationale for sole-sourcing, and (b) a greater involvement by government in the process of formulating terms of reference and in the procurement process itself. These recommendations did not result in revised instructions from DFID to the programme managers<sup>2</sup>.

27. Ambivalence in the procurement process was a probable result of the ambivalence of the nature of SEACAP itself. According to the 2003 Project Document, some of the initial SEACAP projects appeared to have been committed already to a supplier (SC 1, 2, 4, 8).

28. SEACAP management stated that, as a matter of principle, competitive bidding would always be the preferred means of identifying and appointing supplier. However, it was of the view that certain conditions prevailed which made single source, direct appointment the only practical means:

- For pure research, the usual procurement procedures are not necessarily relevant and can be waived. This is laid down in the provisions of the OECD's Frascati Manual (1993), which defines the special role of research activities in the development process.
- SEACAP had experienced problems in the performance by certain commercial consulting companies. "Value for Money" considerations, combined with the need to build on established relationships of confidence with government, directed SEACAP management to revert to appointing a selected group of known research specialists.
- The pool of research firms or individuals experienced in rural roads and transport is allegedly very limited. As a result, even when a pre-qualification procedure was employed, the same service providers tended to re-appear.
- Towards the end of the programme, with the short duration extensions, time did not allow a full competitive bidding process. Management therefore had to revert to extensions or single-source appointments.

29. However, we have to record here that a number of our interviewees questioned the nature of the procurement process. In particular, the recurrence of the same contractors on many contracts was referred to in many instances. Although their technical expertise was not in question, a few respondents argued that (a) the research industry in the region and (b) the SEACAP as a programme may have benefitted from casting the net wider to include other organisations and a next generation of researchers. This finds some resonance in DFID's 2008 Research Strategy, which commits DFID to building research capability in recipient countries.

30. Other observations by stakeholders related to the issue of an independent quality control on the research outputs. Unlike most activities under the KAR programme, SEACAP outputs were not subject to peer review. Other stakeholders wondered whether SEACAP's research role was one of delivering *primary* research, or one of *demonstrating* the results of work that had already been done elsewhere, adapted for the region.

---

<sup>2</sup> For a commentary and status review on the December 2006 review, please refer to Appendix F.

---

## 3 Projects and Research

### 3.1 Overview

31. Most of the key research components had been identified and developed at the outset of SEACAP, with terms of reference included in the Project Document. Many subsequent research (and training) contracts were spin-offs or followed on from these original contracts. Work in Lao PDR was added to the programme in late 2004, with rural road surfacing research similar to that in Viet Nam and Cambodia.

32. The original programme management duration for SEACAP was set at three and a half years. The time required for any applied road research programme that involves trial pavement sections and their subsequent monitoring is at least three, preferably five or more years. In addition, the lead time required to seek government concurrence and essential co-ordination with the rural road construction projects that will incorporate these trial sections adds another one or two years to the process. As a consequence, only at the start of the SEACAP did the opportunity exist to engage in long term primary research using pre-designed trial pavements.

33. SEACAP was extended three times, for an additional 18 months cumulatively. However, the piecemeal nature of these extensions and the last-minute timing of the decisions to extend meant that (for reasons described above) no new primary research could be started. Instead, and as a result, the work done during the final years of the programme have tended to focus on *dissemination* and *training*, as well as further *monitoring* of earlier trial sections.

### 3.2 Viet Nam

34. The seminal research activity for Viet Nam was the “Rural Roads Surfacing Research” (SC 01). Combined with the “Assessment of Existing Rural Road Surfaces” (SC 04), these made a conclusive case against gravel roads as the automatic choice for rural road construction. Other programmes that followed in Viet Nam were to consolidate these findings, disseminate them and support the next World Bank Rural Transport project, RT3. DFID Viet Nam used SEACAP as a channel for conducting additional, tangentially related, research (projects SC 10 to SC 16) using its main country budget.

35. Viet Nam included some research and dissemination projects covering socio-economic issues. These are discussed in detail in Section 5.

36. The programme for Viet Nam has probably achieved more, with demonstrable lasting impact, than the other two participating countries. Several reasons for this were noted. Intensive engagement by both DFID Viet Nam country programme and the World Bank from the outset gave an early focus at executive level in government. Government’s commitment – and an advanced level of skills – enabled greater absorption and acceptance of the programme’s results. On the other hand, Viet Nam’s bureaucracy is such that high level policy is difficult to influence. *Enforcement* of policies is a further related issue. SEACAP’s findings could have an impact on practice through the most direct of channels: from donor to donor. Several donors expressed a positive view of SEACAP work and indicated that they had referred to it in aid of their own work. The broader question this raises for DFID is whether or not they view it as more desirable to influence other donors, or whether the slower, but perhaps more effective in the long-term, process of engaging with governments is desired. This is an area in which more understanding would be required.

### 3.3 Cambodia

37. The work identified for Cambodia in the Project Document (Annex 2) resulted in the “Cambodia Transport Mainstreaming Partnership” (TMP) under SC 02, a comprehensive assessment of the rural transport sector encompassing e.g. rural road standards, guidance or standards on road maintenance, human resource development, road safety etc. This TMP was a coordination, dissemination and mainstreaming initiative, drawing on existing knowledge and best practices, on-going research and

---

development work. Simultaneously, SC 08 “Low Cost Rural Road Surfacing Trials” had been identified in the Project Document (Annex 8) as a follow-on from KAR 7782, and was ready start at the outset of SEACAP. In Cambodia, the programme did not enjoy the benefit of interaction with the DFID country programme.

38. Unlike in Viet Nam and Lao PDR, SEACAP in Cambodia could not develop full scale trials on sections of rural road projects funded by the major development partners. Concerns about mismanagement within the Ministry of Rural Development caused a cessation of new projects funded by World Bank and ADB.

39. The major new initiative for Cambodia was the “Development of Local Resource Based Standards”, under SC 19, which followed on from SC 2 (TMP) and SC 8. SC 19 focused on the formulation and dissemination of standards, producing a total of nine technical papers on road construction and maintenance techniques, materials and unit rates for costing. SC 19 drew in intensive involvement from academia (Institute of Technology of Cambodia ITC) and the ministry responsible for the network of national roads, the Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MPWT).

40. Cambodia was the only one of SEACAP countries where contracts included infrastructure other than roads. Consistent with the terms of reference included as Annex 6 in the Project Document, one of the SC 06 components included a detailed review of the rural water and sanitation sector for Cambodia. No further work was done in this sub-sector.

### **3.4 Lao PDR**

41. In mid 2004, Government of Lao PDR requested DFID for a study on rural road construction. The programme in Lao PDR benefitted from the personal interest of the then minister in charge of roads (MCTPC). The immediate response was the “Development of Rural Road Standards and Specifications” under SC 03 (funded from the finances made available from the cancellation of the initially proposed “Northern Mountains Slope Stability Issues” for Viet Nam, as Annex 3 of the SEACAP Project Document).

42. Two main programmes resulted from SEACAP involvement: Local Resource Solutions to Problematic Rural Road Access (SC 17), and a spin-off under the “local resource” theme, focussing on Slope Stabilisation, which developed into a major research and training activity in its own right under SC 21. Consolidating earlier work by the consultant (Scott Wilson), this has resulted in a significant handbook which deserves a broader readership within the road engineering community than is likely from a project output. However, time and resources constraints have prevented taking this report further towards formal publishing (see also the discussion related to dissemination, para 51).

---

## 4 Communication and Dissemination

### 4.1 Principles of SEACAP communication

43. The dissemination of the results emerging from SEACAP research was an integral and essential component of the programme. SEACAP was considered by DFID to be an “evidence based influencing programme”, aimed at influencing the way governments in the region made decisions on investments on rural roads. In this, SEACAP differed from KAR, where research was primarily conducted to expand a knowledge base, without necessarily identifying a specific target user group. SEACAP required the results be disseminated through channels within government, within the academic world, with road industry practitioners, and within the donor community.

44. Communicating and disseminating under SEACAP used a range of instruments:

- Organisation of and participation in seminars, workshops and conferences.
- Websites
- Media coverage: newspaper features, television films
- Incorporation of material in academic syllabus.
- Networking (especially through gTKP and IFRTD)

### 4.2 Dissemination under SEACAP

45. Part of SEACAP funds were dedicated under the “Dissemination and Facilitation” or “DF” heading for these purposes. Original project design included a single budget line of £ 120,000 for “Programme Development and Dissemination”. In 2005, SC 07 (“Sustainable Mechanisms for ownership by local stakeholders”; originally budgeted at £ 190,000) was cancelled and the funds thus released made available for DF activities. Towards the final stages of the project, DF constituted the majority of the new SEACAP initiatives. The three consecutive project extensions that were granted from early 2008 were generally justified to enable further dissemination and monitoring of research earlier done. The short time span of these extensions precluded a start on new primary research projects.

46. SEACAP latterly developed a more effective decision-making process for dissemination activities whereby the Technical Manager could decide on these expenditures and activities. (e.g. participation in seminars) This improved responsiveness and reduced administrative barriers.

47. SEACAP has built links with two transport-focussed dissemination initiatives; gTKP and the IFRTD<sup>3</sup>, both of which have willingly received and disseminated SEACAP work to their respective networks. The International Focus Group (IFG), an earlier DFID attempt at forming an international channel for dissemination and putting policy into practice was discontinued due to funding constraints and lack of a clear ‘owner’. From discussions with stakeholders in the region, it is clear that the plethora of initiatives by international agencies for collating and disseminating information on the sector, many of which were short-lived, was confusing and possibly counter-productive. It takes many years for such initiatives to become well known and to establish a reliable and authoritative reputation. Developing countries particularly, often have little flexibility in responding to changing circumstances and opportunities and require a certain consistency to enable constructive engagement with global initiatives.

48. In 2005 Halcrow produced a dissemination strategy for SEACAP. In 2006, the IFRTD responded to a call put out by SEACAP for Expressions of Interest for a communications and dissemination strategy. IFRTD prepared and submitted an EOI but did not receive any follow-up. SEACAP management did not know what had happened to this initiative or why it was not taken

---

<sup>3</sup> IFRTD: International Forum for Rural Transport and Development. Established in 1992 with funding from CIDA, NORAD, SIDA, SDC, DfID and the World Bank.

---

forward. A comprehensive communications and dissemination strategy was not pursued though many dissemination activities did take place, planned by the SEACAP Technical Manager.

49. The 2006 Review recommended the formal publication of SEACAP material. Although project management agreed with the concept, the nature of the activities involved would require significant additional and different resources, which were not available within the programme. The suggestion was therefore not taken any further.

50. The SEACAP website was established in 2007 and is clear, informative and easy to navigate. Earlier, SEACAP management took the position that a SEACAP website would be of limited value because of the short-term project nature of SEACAP, not wishing to add to an abundance of project websites of short life-spans. However, DFID recommended that a website would be an important component of dissemination. The website will be taken over by gTKP at the end of SEACAP.

51. SEACAP's dissemination activities were aimed in parallel at many groups of practitioners in the sector, through a variety of channels and for different purposes, based on an approach of mutually supporting influencing.

- *Government* and other official channels. Government was involved in the project steering committees, and through participation in seminars and conferences. The role of government in realising lasting change is critical to incorporating research findings into new or revised policy, strategy and specification. Amending policy can be a long process, gaining political acceptance. In all three countries, SEACAP realised an intensive interaction with government, chiefly with ministries of transport, built on reliable and consistent provision of quality output. Dissemination to government did not extend itself to other sectors of government, such as health, education or finance.
- *Local level government.* SEACAP spent considerable effort on reaching lower level government (provincial, district, commune), by training in road building and maintenance. The strategic importance in reaching provincial government is because of their responsibility in maintaining rural roads. In Viet Nam, a major training programme (under SC 11) reached thousands of provincial and commune level practitioners. Groups of trainers have been trained and otherwise prepared to enable a continuation of training programmes. In Lao PDR, rural road practitioners at local were trained in slope stabilisation techniques. In Cambodia, provincial officials involved in the rural road construction within the de-centralisation programme were trained in SEACAP-approaches to gravel roads. Despite SEACAP's efforts, two areas of risk remain here: (a) Devolving responsibility for road maintenance is not matched with making funding available for adequate maintenance; further work is therefore required to influence budget allocations. (b) Training at a local level fills a vast skills gap. Training therefore needs to be continuous, and regularly assessed for lasting impact, on being targeted at correct level, using appropriate language and methods.
- *Academic.* Representatives from (technical and engineering) universities have been involved on steering committees, and have contributed at dissemination events. The results of various research items were integrated in certain cases with undergraduate engineering courses. In addition, engineering students were involved or exposed to research activities. The ambition was to gain acceptance of certain SEACAP reports as handbooks for road engineering course, but more time is required to prepare reports both in style and format for formal publication (to ISBN standard) as a published book. SEACAP was successful in gaining credibility with academic institutions as a parallel activity stream in its dissemination approach.
- *Road construction industry.* Research into new road construction techniques will only reach its ultimate goal if recommended techniques and procedures are actually applied by consultants and road contractors, during planning, design, specification and construction, and maintenance. Part of dissemination therefore needs to be aimed at this category of practitioners. SEACAP's involvement in this area of dissemination was limited to

---

participation, directly or indirectly, at international events such as at PIARC conferences. There was no other targeting of the road construction industry directly in specifically designed training or influencing dissemination exercises.

- *Development partners.* In the three SEACAP countries, development partners still provide a considerable part of investment in rural infrastructure programmes. SEACAP's interaction with development partners had different dimensions: as participant in and funding of primary research, and as recipient of dissemination activities.
  - Trial sections for research in Viet Nam and Lao PDR were incorporated in the major rural road projects funded in part with loans from World Bank and ADB.
  - Development partners took part in seminars and workshop. In addition, SEACAP presented many of its findings at events organised by development partners, such as the September 2008 Transport Forum at the ADB in Manila. Agencies such as AUSAID used or intend to use the findings from SEACAP in the design and planning of their rural development programmes.

Although infrastructure should be constructed in a manner consistent with national engineering standards and specifications, in practice many projects developed with international loan funding are still designed based on specifications from other countries – such as of those of the country of origin of the design consultants. SEACAP's considerable attempts, through its dissemination activities as described above, to harmonise design standards and specifications is still an ongoing activity – and in that only partially successful. There is a clear role for a follow-on programme, aimed simultaneously at governments and development partners.

---

## 5 Socio-economic impact

### 5.1 SEACAP goal and purpose

52. The Terms of Reference for this Review require SEACAP to be assessed for the “probable socio-economic implications of the different SEACAP outputs in terms of project affected persons”. The overall *goal* stated in the SEACAP Logframe is the sustainable improvement of livelihoods of poor and vulnerable people in SE Asia, verified by a “reduced level of poverty in target communities”. The *purpose* of the programme was stated to be “Sustainable access to health, education and trade for rural communities, creating pro-poor growth”.

53. Relevant socio-economic indicators include improved livelihoods, improved access to health, education and markets and overall poverty reduction. Gender is not mentioned in the Logframe however, it is a critical factor in improving access. Mainstreaming gender equality is a key element of DFID’s Research Strategy. Other issues related to social development and transport include the spread of HIV, migration, trafficking, labour opportunities, road safety, displacement or loss of land and impacts on ethnic minorities. Not all of these are directly relevant to SEACAP but given its focus on developing or improving motorable roads, the potential direct and indirect impacts are significant.

54. Assessment of socio-economic implications requested by the review is a difficult task because high level goals were not strongly or comprehensively linked to the project activities and outcomes. The Review Team understands that there was never an intention to make explicit and direct links with socio-economic consideration. In general, it can be said that SEACAP took the view that any socio-economic impact would be indirect and produced few outputs linked to the stated programme goals or purpose.

55. Socio-economic considerations were not a focus of DFID’s progress reviews and stakeholders reported little discussion of socio-economic factors. Many considered these issues to have been irrelevant to what they were doing. The Reviewer disagrees with this view but it is prevalent among stakeholders at all levels in the transport sector. The Reviewer notes that this situation is improving and some SEACAP stakeholders had a broad awareness of the social impacts and benefits of what they were doing. In general however, they felt it was more their job to “just get on with the work” and that measuring or incorporating more socio-economic considerations would have been a distraction.

56. SEACAP did not take any overall specialist expertise from social development experts who may have been in a position to question the lack of attention to maximising socio-economic benefits, and to more effectively link project research to such key policies and initiatives as the Millennium Development Goals, the country Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers or DFID’s poverty alleviation goals. There was limited DFID advisory input. There appears to have been a lack of imperative in this area.

57. Stakeholders at all levels of involvement in SEACAP, from management to consultants to practitioners, recognised and acknowledged that little focus was given to either maximising socio-economic benefits or measuring any impacts. Some felt that this was a weakness of the programme while others felt it was pragmatic, and that roads-building generally has indirect impacts on social development.

58. The Project Document also noted that most socio-economic impacts of SEACAP would likely be indirect, relating to the advantages of improved access. The Review Team feels that this minimises the importance of social impacts as stated in the programme goal and runs the risk of 1) reducing the overall benefit of SEACAP as a tool for poverty reduction, and 2) not recognising that there may be *negative* social consequences which should be considered. Some examples include loss of land without due compensation, conflict over the ownership of local materials and opening up areas to drugs, diseases, human trafficking, etc. The SEACAP Project Document and subsequent Annual Reviews did not discuss the potential negative impacts.

59. The lack of focus on socio-economic considerations appears to have persisted because it was never questioned at any level. The technical approach, with a singular focus on roads, was always perceived to be the preferred focus.



## 5.2 Socio-economic activities

60. There were four project activities in particular which specifically addressed social development: two research projects and two dissemination projects; one of which was a synthesis paper on SEACAP lessons learned related to gender and transport. Other SEACAP projects made some indirect references to social development considerations, such as road safety (SEACAP 2) and SEACAP 19 which referenced social considerations. Table 5.1 below summarises the direct activities and their outputs:

**Table 5.1: SEACAP socio-economic outputs**

Code	Project Name/ year	Outputs
	Project Country	Comments
SC5	<i>Impact of Rural Road Access on Poverty Reduction &amp; Growth (Dissemination/2005)</i>	The purpose of this project was to sensitize and promote support among the general Vietnamese public for the rural transport program. Two films were produced and shown on the national public television network a number of times in 2005.
	Vietnam	<i>The effectiveness of these films is not known; neither was it clear what, if any, research preceded the filming. They were not widely cited by stakeholders.</i>
SC15	<i>Community Participation in Rural Transport –Contribution &amp; Participation Issues in Vietnam (Research/2005)</i>	The main research objective was to assess the kind and range of contributions (for transport and others) paid by local people and their impact on local livelihoods; to look at the role of local community participation in rural transport, and to propose recommendations to improve participation of local people and increase local employment opportunities in rural transport development.
	Vietnam	<i>One GOV stakeholder noted that, while he did not support greater social development initiatives in the transport sector, he did think that SEACAP has led to a greater understanding on community participation in Vietnam. This report may have been part of that assessment. It was occasionally cited by other stakeholders as well. We understand it was part of the preparatory work for the World Bank RT3 programme and indeed it makes some critiques of the approach taken to community participation by RT2 (inadequate land loss compensation schemes, unclear and unenforced participation and consultation), and reinforces some of SEACAP's research work, such as the use of local materials in road building. It is an interesting and important reference, and contributed to SEACAP's programme goals by underpinning other research and activities with important, evidence-based social and economic considerations. Similar research was not undertaken for Laos or Cambodia.</i>
SC22	<i>Time and Distance Study (Research/2006)</i>	This project aims at improving the quality of statistical data for travel indicators and at developing a technical guidance note on the relative and absolute reliability and accuracy of time and distance reports. The surveys were carried out in the participating SEACAP countries of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam.
	Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia	<i>This project was developed to support a household-surveys initiative of the WB. For Bank purposes it was only required for Vietnam but SEACAP expanded it to include Laos and Cambodia. This research was not cited by stakeholders, other than one who was directly involved. It met the purpose for which it was intended and is a good quality piece of work however it was somewhat peripheral to SEACAP's activities and was not widely used or disseminated. It may influence Bank policy on household surveys but this could not be determined as it is an on-going process. It did not underpin any other SEACAP work.</i>

DF 91	<i>SEACAP experience in transport research in the GMS with lessons for new initiatives on gender &amp; transport (Dissemination 2009)</i>	This paper describes the SEACAP approach and the project outputs that have a gender dimension; and makes recommendations for further research into advancing gender equity in rural access and transport.
	Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia (paper presented in Thailand)	<i>This is an overview, not just of SEACAP activities but also of issues related to gender and transport. It is informative and makes some recommendations on further research that should be done but does not ultimately give the impression that gender considerations were a major part of SEACAP. It is more of a retrospective view though some useful observations are noted.</i>

62. Of the outputs listed above, SEACAP 15 is the most significant as it was designed to underpin other SEACAP work, preparation for the RT programme (which was in turn linked to Vietnam’s PRSP – the Comprehensive Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy) and provide a socio-economic justification for improving roads and decreasing the maintenance burden on communities. SEACAP 15 was only done in Vietnam but the same research goals and principles could be replicated elsewhere. It was a good quality piece of work which highlighted some important challenges created for poor people by badly surfaced roads.

63. The 2008 SEACAP Practitioners Meeting invited several stakeholders through the IFRTD network from a range of social development backgrounds, such as advocates for the mobility impaired and community development specialists. However greater opportunities were apparently (according to some) missed for input from these specialists as the focus of the meeting was dominated by engineering.

### **5.3 Assessment of socio-economic impact**

64. The direct impacts of SEACAP on the lives and livelihoods of poor people, particularly to do with access to health, education and markets, cannot be determined due to lack of baseline information, monitoring and lack of verifiable indicators linked to the programme goal.

65. SEACAP undoubtedly did have some important indirect impacts, some of which could probably be measured although that is beyond the remit of a desk review. For example, SEACAP 15 has provided some important baseline information on community contributions to road maintenance (see Table 5.1 above). One would expect to see these contributions declining if SEACAP recommendations were enforced through policy and the quality of roads were to improve. Other indirect impacts include the emphasis on the use of local materials, some of which also had environmental benefits and supported local industries (e.g. brick making for surfacing in southern Vietnam).

66. Less attention appears to have been given to disseminating social research than other types. The team does not think that attitudes diminishing the importance of social considerations will change quickly or easily; they are often seen to be unnecessary complications and there is resistance (and perhaps ignorance) from stakeholders at all levels. In the absence of involvement of a broader range of stakeholders (such as Ministries of Health and Education) this is somewhat to be expected.

67. There is a tendency on the technical side of transport projects to consider the building or improving of a road to be an intrinsic good. The Review Team observed some of this attitude to be reflected by SEACAP stakeholders, and thus there was some resistance to more direct initiatives targeting social development.

68. The Team agrees that some initiatives may be less suited to direct ties with social development impacts however we still see some scope for improved linkages to achieving the MDGs and tying in with country PRSPs. For example, a slope stabilisation study could select the demonstration areas more carefully with consideration for the local communities, giving poorer communities or more remote roads higher priority. The same is true for pavement trials. There are numerous other examples of small initiatives that could have been mainstreamed throughout SEACAP research which may have led to an over programme with a greater impact on poor people, and clearer ways of measuring this impact.

69. The Review Team takes the view that SEACAP missed opportunities to better understand and incorporate social development considerations, and thus to understand the extent of its impact in relation to its overall goal. When this was done (for example some informal surveys were done as part of SEACAP 1 which questioned women on their labour experiences in road works), they appear to have been somewhat peripheral and not very systematic. It is difficult to draw conclusions from them but it is a positive sign to note that they were done.

## 6 Sustainability of project results

*Summarising the discussion on preceding pages, this section contains an analysis of the risks to the sustainability of SEACAP's achievements.*

### 6.1 SEACAP impact and gaps

70. SEACAP has provided a broad basis for informed and improved decision-making in the rural road sector in Southeast Asia, and beyond. This basis consists of:

- An expanded *knowledge base* on rural road construction, made more *accessible*.
- Amended government *policies* and *strategies*, consistent with research findings and with economic policies on poverty alleviation and growth.
- *Standards* and *guidelines*, reflecting more suitable practice.
- A larger group of *trained practitioners* throughout the region, at many levels.

71. Against these accomplishments, it is important to recognise the following gaps and risks to a lasting impact of SEACAP:

- SEACAP's programme design did not include a component related to *public finance*. In implementation, SEACAP management therefore considered public finance issues to be beyond the scope of its focus. As a result, changes in policies and strategies, such as have been achieved under SEACAP, may not have had their full impact on changes in *budget allocation* decisions or investment priorities. Funding ultimately determines what materialises in infrastructure construction.
- Similarly, full cost-benefit analysis was not done on projects. It is not yet well understood whether higher capital costs would be supported by government in terms of budget allocations, and whether principles of reduced whole-life-costs are fully accepted.
- Study findings have not yet all been published at a level or in a format that will be recognised and accepted by the international academic and engineering community. Project design did not make allowances for the resources required for this additional aspect of dissemination.
- Practitioners in rural development at local levels, whether within government or the private sector, may not have been reached yet in sufficient numbers for the results to be applied at a scale that will have a lasting and significant impact. More generally, the human resources capacity, in particular in Lao PDR and Cambodia, in terms of management, planning and engineering skills at national and local level still requires support and strengthening. Because of the numbers involved and the "low base" that the SEACAP was working from, it must be considered inevitable that this gap will remain for some time to come, in spite of all efforts in programme planning and implementation.

72. Another type of gap that can be identified is that between SEACAP's focus on *engineering* for rural roads, and the stated socio-economic objectives of improving rural livelihoods. This arose early in the programme, was never challenged and thus persisted throughout.

73. In terms of a likely sustainability gap, governments in SE Asia cannot be expected to place the type of applied research as developed under SEACAP as a high priority. Such research and co-ordination seems a suitable continuing role for the donor community and, in particular, DFID (see further para 85).

---

## **6.2 Necessary conditions for sustainability**

74. The essential link in the sustainable application of research results into actual practice is their embedding into policy, law or decree, and into technical specifications that are observed and respected. These further need to be reflected into funding decisions, as in the formulation of national and local budgets. The rational route would be one of sector policy informing strategy and thereby modifying budgeting and investment decisions. Strategy is to have an impact on the technical specifications that are used in planning and design for the sector, which in turn are to be observed by any agency and their consultants involved in the sector.

75. However, decision making by governments is not always fully rational. Agreements or understanding reached with a government institution can be reversed when individual politicians or civil servants move on and are replaced. Budgeting decisions are subject to intense political struggle and not necessarily consistent with accepted sector policies, or rational prioritisation. Local level governments may not fully endorse central government strategies. Development partners and their consultants do not always or immediately take note of government's own technical guidelines and specifications. Customary bureaucratic delays in implementing policy change down to executive agency levels are further compounded by the severe limitations in human resources, in terms of numbers, skills and capacity. The latter, especially in Cambodia and Lao PDR, are severe and can never be underestimated.

76. The consequence of this scenario for a programme such as SEACAP is the need for a consistent, long term effort with a clear message, operating on many fronts. SEACAP has worked along these lines, within the boundaries set by its terms of reference, its budget and the contract duration. That what is now embedded in formal government or donor strategies and specifications will be sustained. Equally, changes in university curriculum and textbooks related to rural road construction techniques are likely to have a permanent impact. Beyond that, though, much will be forgotten and lost if the programme is not rekindled. Many of SEACAP's initiatives deserve continuation, albeit with a renewed focus, such as on embedding changes in funding decisions and at application at local levels.

---

## 7 Recommendations and Conclusions

### 7.1 Learning from SEACAP's achievements

77. On primary evidence, there seems to be adequate justification to continue with SEACAP's activities, with some modifications. This section presents the essential lessons from the review that will shape the recommendations, and an outline of what such a continued programme should contain. Concluding this analysis, Section 7.4 presents some policy considerations that may affect DFID's decision to proceed.

78. The general view of stakeholders was that SEACAP had made important contributions but that its independent continuity is far from assured without some form of continued external support. Most agreed that another phase – with a stronger focus on supporting policy change based on research – was highly desirable. The following considerations, drawn from the experience with SEACAP, may be used in the formulation of any follow-up programme:

- A clear vision and overall research strategy, clarifying the issue of primary research vs. demonstration; based on broad consultation at project design and inception phase, with stakeholders including participating governments and development partners.
- Identification of specific, measureable socio-economic goals in line with country PRSPs and with MDGs.
- Ensuring local ownership through strong steering committees.
- Clarification on methodology of project selection and procurement.

### 7.2 Components of a new programme

79. In response to the considerations described above (para 74 ff), a new programme needs to interact simultaneously in the following areas, for a mutual reinforcement of impact. Some of these activity streams could be part of continuing research programme, others are more suited to become part of the respective DFID country programmes. To ensure consistency and complementarity, these programmes need to be jointly designed, managed and implemented.

- *Government.* The programme needs continuing involvement with participating government in policy dialogue at senior levels, with the aim to ensure impact on *funding decisions*. This is likely to involve a deepening of the dialogue within the existing steering committees. An additional dimension to the programme involving issues on governance, budgets and public financial management for the rural transport sector cannot be ignored in a next phase if real impact is to be achieved. Such a governance initiative may best be suited to become part of country programme.
- *Development Partners.* A continuation of SEACAP, if mobilised relatively quickly, can take a lead role in donor co-ordination for the sector (in the region), backed up by being able to enable applied research into transport and rural development and poverty alleviation.
- *Academic community in the SE Asia region.* An important achievement of SEACAP in the last few years has been the close involvement of technical universities with research process and outcomes. This relationship needs to be maintained within a new research programme, to further consolidate SEACAP research findings into engineering practice.
- *Dissemination and Training.* Continued dissemination of SEACAP findings can be envisaged at three mutually reinforcing levels, which could become the core of the new research programme, focusing on “research into use”.
  1. Strategic seminars and workshops for senior level decision makers and opinion formers, in government, development partners and private sector.

2. Technical material for practicing engineers, as a form of continuing professional development and including support for the research capacity at universities.
3. Operational training and demonstration of best practice, at strategic regional centres.

The role of local training institutions should be consolidated and expanded. Their importance lies in the potential for large scale dissemination of essential SEACAP strategies – at provincial and district level – by training local level practitioners, from both public and private sector. The successful programme of “training of trainers” should be continued and expanded, with the programme maintaining a monitoring and quality control function.

80. *Levels of involvement.* Continuation of SEACAP may be considered at various levels of involvement, incorporating streams of activity as described above. Table 7.1 presents the likely impact and implications of different levels. In our summarising statement (Section 7.3) we recommend our preferred option.

### **7.3 Concluding statement**

81. The Review Team views the High Level of intervention (see Table 7.1 below) to be the preferred approach in order to build most fully on the strengths of SEACAP including, its value in terms of demonstration and research outputs; sustaining the progress it has already made; taking advantage of the credibility that has been achieved, learning from the lessons of the first phase of the programme and demonstrating its impacts on poverty reduction. We believe a follow-on programme should be mobilised as soon as possible in order to maintain continuity and momentum although some will already have been lost. The current Technical Manager will not be able to be a part of the second phase.

82. A second phase would undoubtedly be a stronger and more effective programme given what has been learned.

83. The Review Team feels that while SEACAP had some programmatic weaknesses, it was ultimately an important programme doing important work that is not being done elsewhere. To discontinue it would be to leave a major gap in a sector that clearly underpins poverty reduction, rural development and access to education, healthcare and markets. We recommend that a second phase should maintain focus on building what SEACAP has already made a name doing – roads and community access – in the form of research and demonstration, dissemination and mainstreaming.

84. At a very minimum, we recommend that SEACAP research work should be taken up through a number of channels as suggested above through the Low and Medium interventions (Table 7.1).

Table 7.1 Levels of involvement for SEACAP continuation

Intervention Level	Considerations
<p><b>Low</b></p> <p><i>Recommended actions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continuing to push research already done at policy level.</li> <li>- Ensure SEACAP knowledge is transferred to gTKP.</li> <li>- Formally publish results of research.</li> <li>- Undertake no new research or demonstrations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SEACAP work will still be made visible at the policy level.</li> <li>- It will continue to build on the research achievements that have been made.</li> <li>- It will make the research accessible. Publishing research reports formally as handbooks will lend it the necessary credibility.</li> <li>- It will demonstrate that DFID is committed to supporting greater uptake of knowledge and research at the policy level.</li> <li>- It will continue to build links with governments.</li> <li>- A lot of SEACAP value was built on its demonstration of approaches. There is a <i>risk</i> that it will not be as credible if it is no longer demonstrating these new approaches or undertaking new activities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Medium</b></p> <p><i>Recommended actions - Points as above, plus:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Undertake a training programme at university, local and national level to incorporate research into curricula &amp; implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training has been an important part of SEACAP and of achieving greater uptake. This approach will continue to build greater capacity at the appropriate levels for using SEACAP knowledge.</li> <li>- This will go some distance to addressing the risk mentioned above because training can include site visits to previous demonstration areas in the absence of new projects, and can provide opportunities to build on established relationships.</li> <li>- There is a <i>risk</i> that neither the <b>Medium</b> nor <b>Low</b> interventions will address the need for greater links with social development/poverty reduction and with DFID's broader research priorities (e.g. health, governance, etc).</li> </ul>
<p><b>High</b></p> <p><i>Recommended actions - Points as for Low and Medium above, plus:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop as a fully realised 'SEACAP 2' (or ACAP) incorporating recommendations and lessons learned from SEACAP 1.</li> <li>- Undertake new research/ demonstration.</li> <li>- Consider expanding scope to cover other identified transport needs.</li> <li>- Consider expanding into other countries in Asia.</li> <li>- Be at least five years in duration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would build most fully on SEACAP successes.</li> <li>- Would build on the 'brand' that SEACAP has established.</li> <li>- DFID has established expertise and influence in this important area where very little work is being done by other donors (roads research).</li> <li>- This has the potential to feed effectively into DFID research priorities and to the social development/poverty reduction aims of DFID. In particular, this would present an opportunity for DFID to greatly improve governance, accountability and effectiveness of roads projects by producing evidence-based cases for new approaches that save money, consider local needs and use local materials.</li> <li>- There is a <i>risk</i> that if a second phase is not mobilised relatively quickly some of the momentum built by SEACAP will be lost, particularly in terms of policy change.</li> </ul>



---

## **7.4 Considerations for DFID involvement**

85. Very few organisations around the world are funding transport research in developing countries. DFID is widely recognised as a leader in this area. This status affords it a degree of influence which can be quite valuable, given the huge importance and expense of roads and transport. DFID's involvement through grant-funded independent research puts it in a position to challenge perceived wisdom and simultaneously support improved governance for rural development programmes. The policy dialogue and therefore the research agenda should be broadened beyond the engineering aspects of the road sector, towards rural growth and development issues. The rationale should emphasise the links between improved (rural) transport, access to social infrastructure, local economic growth and poverty reduction, as well as gender issues in transport, underscoring the relevance with DFID's overarching goals.

86. SEACAP and its predecessors under KAR have built up and consolidated considerable credibility and a reputation of quality in applied research amongst development partners and the road construction community. This achievement deserves to be continued – there is no short-cut for replacing it. A long term commitment is essential, consistent with DFID's stated principles of building lasting partnerships.

87. Suggestions have been raised that the research and co-ordination function may be taken over by (government) agencies in the region. We cannot agree with this. Governments in SEA cannot (yet) be expected to give political and financial priority to managing such a programme in continuation. Providing guidance to both governments and development partners alike, consistent with policy and backed up with research, is a "natural" role for a major bilateral partner such as DFID to assume. Considerable work is still required to strengthen skills at national and local levels - in particular in Lao PDR and Cambodia – supporting governments' efforts to recover from the impacts of isolation and civil war in recent history. However, governments could play a stronger role in the demonstration of research, if not in actual research.

88. Road construction continues to be a major component of government's capital budget. It is also an area where corruption leads to wastage at a massive scale. The dialogue that SEACAP has opened on capital vs maintenance spending in rural road technologies needs to be moved across from the transport sector to the public finance arena. Extending the focus to – or at least linking with – broader governance issues, budgeting and public financial management issues is therefore both pragmatic and essential for the programme to have a substantive impact. Such a development would be consistent with DFID's policy agenda on improving governance.

89. Continuing with SEACAP type of activities is consistent with priorities and aims of new DFID Research strategy. Table 7.2 highlights some areas of immediate relevance.

Table 7.2 Linkages between DFID's Research Strategy and rural transport

<b>DFID Research Strategy component</b>	<b>Links and relevance to rural transport for development</b>
<b>Growth</b>	Poor infrastructure, in particular good road access, is a constraint to growth
<b>Sustainable agriculture</b>	Improved access can decrease costs of farm inputs and improves access by producer to markets, reducing role of middle-men.
<b>Climate change</b>	Making road transport run more effectively (along better quality roads) will improve fuel efficiency. On the other hand, better roads attract more traffic.
<b>Health</b>	Improved access is a major contributor to improving access to health facilities, of particular importance in maternal health.
<b>Governance</b>	Road construction is one of the main consumers of public works budgets, and frequently one of the areas where considerable wastage and corruption takes place. Improving value-for-money concepts, and improving the balance between investment and maintenance

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Terms of reference for SEACAP Project Completion Review

Appendix B: SEACAP Logical Framework (from 2003 Project Memorandum)

Appendix C: SEACAP contracts SC 01 – SC 31

Appendix D: People interviewed for SEACAP PCR

Appendix E: Documents consulted for SEACAP PCR

Appendix F: Comments on Recommendations of December 2006 Progress Review

---

## Appendix A: Terms of reference for SEACAP Project Completion Review

### South East Asia Community Access Programme (2004 – 2009) *Project Completion Review* *Terms of Reference*

#### **Objective**

1. The objective of the Project Completion Review is to review the overall performance of the South East Asia Community Access Programme (SEACAP) in achieving its goal, purpose and outputs set out in the Project Memorandum and Logical Framework (current versions are at Annex A), and to draft a Project Completion Report (PCR) (at Annex B) for the project, according to DFID guidelines, drawing together key lessons for DFID and SEACAP partners.

#### **Recipient**

2. DFID Research is the recipient of these services.

#### **DFID Co-ordination and Reporting Officers**

3. The consultants will report to Tony Zachariades, Deputy Programme Manager in the Growth Team of DFID Research. Peter Roberts, DFID Senior Infrastructure and Environment Adviser will be the first point of contact on technical matters.

#### **Scope of Work**

4. The consultants will provide a PCR team to assess and report on the extent to which SEACAP has achieved the programme goals, purpose and outputs.
5. The PCR team will assess and report on progress in implementing the recommendations of previous reviews, the latest being an output-to-purpose review which reported in December 2006. DFID Research will identify and provide some other relevant documentation. DFID Research will also outline the stakeholders to be consulted for this exercise and provide guidance for the PCR team to establish a full list of contacts for interview.
6. In particular, assessment should be made of:
  - a. expected uptake of SEACAP products in the participating countries and more widely;
  - b. probable socio-economic implications of the different SEACAP outputs in terms of project affected persons.
7. The PCR review team will also report on any key lessons identified that offer the opportunity to improve future performance across DFID's research programmes.

#### **Methodology**

8. In the preparatory stage the PCR team will collect and review the required documents and will seek to identify and collect any further material which is necessary for this assignment. The team will compile a map of stakeholders for the project and will propose a substantial sample of these stakeholders to be interviewed. The team will be responsible for identifying the contact details for all agreed interviewees.
9. It is expected that the PCR team will be able to complete this assignment by means of a desk review based on the reports of interim reviews together with project reporting and

---

other documents. The analysis of this material will be complemented and updated by telephone interviews with an agreed list of key stakeholders.

10. The PCR team will undertake a standard DFID PCR for the programme, completing the required documentation. The team will also identify and make recommendations on key lessons and issues for a possible follow-up project to SEACAP. These recommendations will include options for securing and maintaining communication of the lessons and outputs of SEACAP.

## Reporting

11. Within two weeks of being appointed the PCR team will submit a short inception report. This will cover the following:
  - a. schedule of all the key documents and outputs to be assessed for the assignment;
  - b. map of all the key stakeholders together with a recommended sample frame for the interviews; and
  - c. timetable for completion of the assignment.
12. The draft final report will comprise:
  - a. completed DFID PCR proforma in the current format for SEACAP;
  - b. report on key lessons and issues for a possible follow-up project to SEACAP;
  - c. options for securing and maintaining communication of the lessons and outputs of SEACAP if there is no follow-up programme.

This will be submitted to Tony Zachariades, Deputy Programme Manager and Peter Roberts, Senior Infrastructure and Environment Adviser by 18 June 2009.

13. After receiving comments, the report is to be finalised and submitted to DFID Research not later than 30 June 2009.

## Expertise

14. The PCR team will consist of two consultants with combined experience and expertise in:
  - a. needs analysis, design and management for relevant research programmes in developing countries;
  - b. engineering professional development / capacity building;
  - c. socio-economic impact assessment of construction projects;
  - d. infrastructure programme evaluation and reporting.
15. One member of the team should be a suitable transport sector specialist with at least 15 years relevant experience in developing countries (preferably with a substantial portion of experience in South East Asia).

## Timing

16. The assignment is expected to be undertaken between 27 May and 30 June 2009.
17. A total of up to 31 person days has been allocated for the assignment of which about 4 days will be spent on initial literature review and planning. The remaining time will cover further literature assessment, interviews and other tasks to complete and report on the assignment.

---

## Background

18. SEACAP was initiated in March 2004 with a total programme budget of £7,500,000 to cover the duration of the programme up to its end date of 30 June 2009. The project's goal is to sustainably improve the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable people in South East Asia, providing sustainable access to health, education and trade for rural communities and creating pro-poor growth. The programme and funding are managed through Crown Agents and focused in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos.
19. The 2006 DFID Annual Review concluded that targeting of decision makers has improved decisions taken on sustainable access. The programme which commenced initially with 8 projects was extended to 31 projects most of which have been completed. DFID funded projects 1-8, 17-22, 24-25 and the D&F fund with the remaining projects being funded by DFID Vietnam. Small investments for these SEACAP projects have produced large-scale change. The 2006 Annual Review "concluded that SEACAP is an influencing programme and the successes have attracted the ADB to incorporate SEACAP into their programmes, and have persuaded the World Bank to pledge funds to this approach". However, an independent project completion review is sought to look at the programme over its whole duration.
20. The 2006 DFID Annual Review provided the following recommendations:
- (i) Following the success of the SEACAP model, a similar community access programme is going to be launched in Africa. AFCAP has been successfully launched.
  - (ii) An independent review of SEACAP to be carried out.
  - (iii) Expand the programme to other countries.

Growth Team  
DFID Research  
18 May 2009

**Appendix B: SEACAP Logical Framework (from 2003 Project Memorandum)**

Narrative summary	Measurable indicators	Means of verification
<p><b>Programme Goal</b></p> <p>Livelihoods of poor and vulnerable people in SE Asia improved sustainably</p>	<p><i>Reduced level of poverty in target communities</i></p>	<p>Published statistics at a regional level</p>
<p>Project Goal (<i>Programme Purpose</i>):</p> <p>Sustainable access (to health, education and trade) for rural communities, creating pro-poor growth.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved access infrastructure established in 2 countries by 2008</li> <li>- Policies implemented to enhance participation of local communities in infrastructure in 3 districts by 2008</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Government statistics</li> <li>- International development report statistics on meeting MDG's</li> </ul>
<p>Project Purpose (<i>Programme Outputs</i>)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Best Practice on road technology mainstreamed in SE Asia</li> <li>2. Evidence of impact of appropriate rural road technology disseminated</li> <li>3. Sustainable ownership mechanisms for construction and maintenance of local road systems</li> <li>4. Knowledge and research capacity in SEA improved and key knowledge disseminated and adopted</li> <li>5. Status of improving access to basic infrastructure for the poor in Cambodia reviewed and further work proposed</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Guidelines accepted and promoted in at least 2 National Government Transport Depts. by 2006</li> <li>-Use of guidelines by 3 relevant user groups by 2006</li> <li>-improved road practices in at least 2 local government plans by 2005</li> <li>- national road policy statements in at least 1 country by 2006</li> <li>-adoption by at least 1 other donor in regional strategy papers by 2007</li> <li>-community ownership policy adopted in at least 2 local plans by 2006</li> <li>-SEACAP receives financial support from at least 1 government department and 1 additional donor by 2005</li> <li>- Report and recommendations made by mid 2004</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Government planning reports</li> <li>- Feedback reports from stakeholders</li> <li>- Local government reports</li> <li>- <i>Ditto</i></li> <li>- Donor reports</li> <li>- Local government reports</li> <li>- Agreed budget plan</li> <li>- project report</li> </ul>

Project Outputs ( <i>Programme Activities</i> )		
1. 1 Best Practice on Appropriate Surfacing mainstreamed in Vietnam	-Evaluation report of Outputs -Guidelines published by 2005 in Viet Nam	Approval of Report by Advisory Group
1.2 Best Practice on Appropriate Surfacing mainstreamed in Cambodia	-Evaluation report of Outputs approved Guidelines published by 2005 in Cambodia	<i>ditto</i>
1.3 Best practice on Appropriate road technology in Mountainous areas of Vietnam evaluated	-Evaluation report of Outputs approved Guidelines published by 2005 in Viet Nam	<i>ditto</i>
1.4 Existing rural road surface performance in Vietnam assessed	- Performance evaluation report	<i>ditto</i>
2. The impact of rural road access on poverty reduction and growth in VietNam evaluated	-At least 2 district level surveys carried out by 2004 showing use of infrastructure such as roads/markets/schools/ health centres	Socio-economic report
3. Community and Local participation methodologies adopted	-at least 2 infrastructure user groups formed by 2005	Local authority reports
4. Research management system established to include monitoring and learning and dissemination/adoption responsibilities	-Research management network established in SE Asia by 2004	Inception Report
5. Understanding of Infrastructure Constraints in Cambodia, improved	- Phase 2 Plan	



**Appendix C: Overview of main SEACAP research projects**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Contractor</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Dates</b>
SC 1	Viet Nam	Rural Road Surfacing Research	Research	Intech Associates	£ 194,728	Oct 04 – Apr 05
SC 1/001	Viet Nam	Extension: Design of Surface Trials		Intech Associates	£ 207,129	May 05 – Dec 05
SC 1/002	Viet Nam	RRST 2 - Module 2: Trial Construction Quality Control Assessment		Intech Associates	£ 339,474	Jan 06 – Mar 07
SC 1/003	Viet Nam	RRST 2 - Module 3: Trial Data Collection		ITST	£ 124,895	Jan 06 – Jul 06
SC 1/004	Viet Nam	Module 6: Pavement Condition Monitoring of RRST		TRL	£ 26,000	Jan 07 – Jun 07
SC 2	Cambodia	Transport Mainstreaming Partnership	Dissemination	Intech Associates	£ 174,960	Oct 04 – Mar 06
SC 3/001	Lao PDR	Development of Rural Road Standards and Specifications	Mainstreaming	TRL	£ 331,775	Jan 07 – Jan 08
SC 3/002	Lao PDR	Develop guidelines for the application of the Environmentally Optimized Design (EOD) approach.	Mainstreaming	TRL	£ 69,510	Apr 08 – May 09
SC 4	Viet Nam	Assessment of Existing Rural Road Surfaces	Research	Intech Associates	£ 167,280	Apr 04 – Nov 05
SC 5	Viet Nam	Impact of Rural Road Access on Poverty Reduction and Growth	Dissemination	Viet Nam TV	£ 13,889	Dec 04 – Dec 05
SC 6 / 001	Cambodia	Infrastructure Constraints to Growth & Poverty Reduction Inception Phase	Mainstreaming	Oxford Policy Management (OPM)	£ 55,084	May 05 – Oct 05
SC 6 / 002	Cambodia	Infrastructure Constraints to Growth & Poverty Reduction Implementation Phase		Oxford Policy Management (OPM)	£ 214,748	Oct 05 – May 06
SC 6 / 003	Cambodia	Updating the Cambodian Rural Roads Policy and Strategy		Oxford Policy Management (OPM)	£ 68,331	Nov 06 - Nov 07
SC 7	-	<i>reserved budget transferred to DF funds</i>	-	-	-	-
SC 8	Cambodia	Low-Cost Rural Road Surfacing	Research	Intech Associates	£ 115,222	Apr 04 - Nov 05 - Mar 06 – Oct 06
SC 9	-	<i>Deleted</i>	-	-	-	-
SC 10	Viet Nam	Commune Rural Road Maintenance Handbook Training	Mainstreaming	Transport College in the Middle Area of Vietnam	£ 160,290	Sep 04 – Oct 05

Code	Country	Title	Nature	Contractor	Value	Dates
SC 11	Viet Nam	National Training Programme on Rural Road Management	Mainstreaming	Hyder	£ 632,618	Dec 04 - Dec 05 Jan 06 - Mar '06
SC 12	Viet Nam	Road Map Field Verification and Nationwide Roll Out	Mainstreaming	Transport Development Strategy Institute (TDSI)	£ 59,368	Aug 04 – Sep 05
SC 13	-	<i>Deleted</i> (Provincial Handbook)	-	-	-	-
SC 14	Viet Nam	Role of the Private Sector in Rural Transport	Research	Mekong Economics	£ 54,480	Aug 04 – Jan 05
SC 15	Viet Nam	Community Participation in the Rural Transport Sector	Research	Mekong Economics	£ 45,700	Sep 04 – Jan 05
SC 16/001	Viet Nam	Institutional, Incentive and Capacity Analysis of the Rural Transport Sector	Research	TDSI	£ 56,040	Nov 04 – Apr 05
SC 16/002	Viet Nam	Support for TDSI to undertake SEACAP 16		WSP	£23,910	Nov 04 – Apr05
SC 17/001	Lao PDR	Local Resource Solutions to Problematic Rural Road Access	Research	Roughton	£ 761,400	Sep 04 – Mar 09
SC 17/002	Lao PDR	Performance Monitoring of the NEC/ADB Package #1 Trail and Gravel Roads	Research	LTEC	£ 72,460	Jan 09 – May 09
SC 18	-	<i>Deleted</i>	Research	-	-	-
SC 19/001	Cambodia	Development of Local Resource Based Standards	Research	TRL-Intech-Kace	£ 436,400	Apr 07 – May 09
SC 19/002	Cambodia	Low Cost Structures Manual and Condition Survey		TRL	£ 11,450	May 08 – Sep 08
SC 19/003	Cambodia	Appropriate Standards, Specifications and Guidelines for Low Volume Rural Roads (LVRR) in Cambodia	Research	TRL	£ 56,830	Mar – May 09
SC 19/004	Cambodia	<i>Deleted: Condition/Performance Survey and Analysis of Trial &amp; Representative Cambodian Low Volume Rural Roads</i>	<i>deleted</i>	-	-	-
SC 20	Cambodia, Lao PDR & Viet Nam	Development of Locally Made, Low Cost Equipment for the Road Sector	Research	I.T. Transport	£ 143,400	Jan 07 – Dec 08
SC 21/001	Lao PDR	Local Resource Solutions to Problematic Rural Road Access: Slope Stabilisation	Research	Scott Wilson	£ 421,479	Oct 06 – Oct 08
SC 21/002	Lao PDR	Feasibility Study for a National Programme to Manage Slope Stability	Research	Scott Wilson	£ 95,175	Apr 08 – Jun 08

Code	Country	Title	Nature	Contractor	Value	Dates
SC 21/003	Lao PDR	Mainstreaming Slope Stability Management into the National University of Laos Courses and the MPWT	Mainstreaming	Scott Wilson	£ 72,545	Oct 08 – Jan 09
SC 21/004	Lao PDR	Mainstreaming of Slope Stability Management Training Programme for Hazard and Risk Assessment to Laos Practitioners	Mainstreaming	Scott Wilson	£ 115,213	Feb 09 – May 09
SC 22/001	Viet Nam	Time and Distance Study	Research	TDSI	£ 16,894	Mar 06 – Sep 06
SC 22/002	Lao PDR	Time and Distance Study	Research	Indochina Research Ltd.	£ 32,513	Apr 06– Nov 06
SC 22/003	Cambodia	Time and Distance Study	Research	Indochina Research Ltd.	£ 28,865	Jun 06– Nov 06
SC 24/001	Viet Nam	Defining the State of Art for Rural Road Surfacing in IndoChina	Research	TRL - OtB	£ 67,691	Nov 07 – Nov 08
SC 25	-	<i>deleted</i>	-	-	-	-
SC 26	-	<i>deleted</i>	-	-	-	-
SC 27/001	Viet Nam	Medium Term Monitoring of Rural Road Surfacing Research Trials	Research	TRL-OTB	£ 227,845	Oct 07 – Mar 09
SC 28	-	<i>deleted</i>	-	-	-	-
SC 29	-	<i>deleted</i>	-	-	-	-
SC 30/001	Viet Nam	Rural Transport Project 3 (RT3), Trial Preparation, Rural Road Surfacing Research (RRSR)	Research	TRL / OTB / TEDI	£ 109,495	Jan 08 – Mar 09
SC 30/002	Viet Nam	Support Provincial Department of Transport in data gathering	Research	ITST	£ 32,890	Nov 08 – Jun 09
SC 30/003	Viet Nam	Finalising the design package of trials under RT 3	Research	TRL / OTB	£ 40,000	Feb 09 – Jun 09
SC 31/001 (formerly extension of SC 17)	Lao PDR	Trialing the new low volume rural roads (LVRR) standards and specifications and extending the Laos LVRR surface and paving knowledge base (Samphan Road, Phongsaly Province)	Research	TRL/OTB/LTEC	£ 116,038	

---

## Appendix D: People interviewed for SEACAP PCR

NAME	POSITION
<b>Ministry of Rural Development, Cambodia</b>	
H.E. Suos Kong	Secretary of State
H.E. Kim Sour	Under Secretary of State
Dr. Chan Darong	Director General for Technical Affairs
<b>Institute of Technology of Cambodia</b>	
Dr O.M. Romny	Director
<b>Ministry of Public Works and Transport, Cambodia</b>	
Dr. Yit Bunna	Director, Public Works Research Centre
Chhouk Chhay Horng	Head of Civil Engineering Dept.
Vong Seng,	Lecturer, Civil Engineering
<b>ADB Cambodia Mission</b>	
Nida Ouk	Senior Project Implementation Officer (Infrastructure)
<b>Dept of Local Administration, Cambodia</b>	
Tim Grayling	International Infrastructure Advisor
<b>Local Consultants, Cambodia</b>	
Heng Kackada	CNCTP Executive Secretary (Cambodia)
<b>Lao Consulting Group</b>	
Arouny Sukulku	Consultant
<b>World Bank, Laos</b>	
Sombath Southivong	Senior Infrastructure Specialist
<b>World Bank Vietnam</b>	
Simon Ellis	Transport Advisor
Tran Thi Minh Phuong	Senior Operations Officer
<b>DFID Vietnam</b>	
Ngo Thi Quynh Hoa	Senior Programme Officer
Le Thi Yen	Programme Assistant
<b>Vietnam Ministry of Transport</b>	
Mr. Tran Tien Son	Specialist of Local Transport Unit, Planning and Investment Department.
<b>Vietnam Institute for Transport Science and Technology (ITST)</b>	
Ms. Pham Kim Oanh	Transport Infrastructure Development and Investment Consultancy Centre
<b>Vietnam Transport Development and Strategy Institute (TDSI):</b>	
Ms. Nguyen To Ha	Head of International Relations Department

---

<b>NAME</b>	<b>POSITION</b>
<b>DFID</b>	
Simon Lucas ( <i>could not be reached</i> )	On secondment to WB Vietnam during SEACAP
Peter O'Neill	CRD
Peter Roberts	On secondment as WB Infrastructure Advisor (at time of SEACAP)
Gareth Aicken	CRD
<b>International Consultants</b>	
Simon Gillett	Roughton International
Dr Jasper Cook	OtB
Rob Petts	InTech Consultants
Simon Done	TRL
Tim Hunt	Scott Wilson
Adam McCarty	Mekong Economics
<b>Crown Agents</b>	
David Salter (through UNOPS)	Technical Manager, SEACAP
Doug Fraser	Procurement Manager
Karen Harries	Project Coordinator
<b>Others</b>	
Peter Kelly	Ausaid - Adviser - Urban Development & Infrastructure (UDI) Group
Bjorn Johannessen	ILO ASIST – Thailand - Senior Rural Infrastructure Management Specialist
Kate Czuczman	IFRTD Communications Coordinator
Ranjith De Silva	IFRTD Director for Asia
Dr. Do Huan	Managing Director, Educons Co. Ltd
Mark Q. Watson	Consultant on 2006 Progress Review

---

## Appendix E: Documents consulted for SEACAP PCR

TITLE	AUTHOR	DATE
Project Memorandum	DFID	Undated (c. 2003)
Environmental Screening Note	DFID	September 03
Progress Report, March 2004-March 2005	Halcrow Group Ltd	March 2005
Final Progress Review Report	Mark Q. Watson, Christopher Folwell	December 2006
Study into a Successor to SEACAP	Mark Q. Watson	<b>July 2008</b>
<b>Annual Reviews:</b>		
2006	DFID proforma (PRISM)	March 2006
2008	DFID proforma (Excel)	September 2008
Briefing Paper on Dissemination and Knowledge Transfer of SEACAP Results and Findings	Halcrow Asia Pacific	June 2005
<b>Quarterly Reports:</b>		
January to March 2007	Crown Agents	March 2007
April to June 2008		June 2008
July to September 2008 (Revised)		September 2008
October to December 2008		December 2008
January to March 2009		March 2009
<b>Reference Documents:</b>		
<i>Gender Equality Action Plan 2007-2009</i>	DFID	2007
<i>Research Strategy 2008-2013</i>	DFID	2008
<i>Working Paper Series: Mainstreaming Gender in Research</i>	DFID	2008

In addition, the review team has downloaded from the SEACAP and the DFID Research website many of the documents produced under SEACAP, research reports as well as dissemination documents prepared under the “DF” (Dissemination and Facilitation) arrangements.

## Appendix F: Recommendations from December 2006 Review – Status and observations

The Progress Review of December 2006 made a number of observations and recommendations. These are copied here in the first column. The second column represents a consolidated comment on the status of the observation and recommendations based upon the opinions of the PCR team and discussions with SEACAP management.

It is not clear whether some or all of the recommendations of the PCR were communicated by DFID to SEACAP management as official instructions.

Pg.	Recommendation / observation	Comments / action
ii	The objective of seeking to influence policy should be reflected in a revised briefing document for SEACAP. There is considerable scope for future impact on sector policy and practice that is yet to be fully realised. Particularly in Laos, there are opportunities for involvement in helping with the strategy for rural roads and access.	In Laos SEACAP introduced a rational strategy for investing scarce resources in rural access, in particular the “Engineered Optimized Design” approach. A manual was elaborated and training of practitioners was carried out.
ii	SEACAP should explicitly address NGOs as an important intermediary and consider, as part of the outreach and dissemination strategy, engaging with NGOs in each of the SEACAP countries.	NGOs not considered a relevant or substantial intermediary in this sector in these countries at this stage. However, IFRTD has played a regional role in networking and disseminating information on behalf of SEACAP.
ii	Private sector representation and involvement in project initiation and monitoring through transport and road user associations should also be considered. This may pay dividends in helping to educate road users about the problems caused by overloading, which is a very serious problem in all three countries where SEACAP operates.	Not considered relevant or applicable. Road-user associations are not a viable or realistic concept in these countries for the lower class roads. The relationship between overloading and road deterioration is well understood by everyone already. The problem is enforcement of the prevailing laws. This is outside the scope of the current SEACAP.
ii	It is suggested that an annual, short, focussed SEACAP stakeholder workshop should be considered nationally to help involve more groups, engender ownership and buy-in, take account of genuine research needs and gain feedback on work to date. It would of benefit to organise such a workshop outside of the capital city to show commitment to rural access. A similar type of workshop approach with potential stakeholders and policy makers can assist in identifying new projects for SEACAP in the future.	Annual SEACAP meetings have taken place in 2006, 2007 and 2008. Other regional, provincial meetings and seminars have been held at various occasions. These meetings included a good range of stakeholders, including social development specialists, but need to broaden their focus from just engineering to include the range of stakeholders. The feasibility of holding major meetings involving participants from outside the country outside the capitals were explored but were found to be unrealistic: financial costs increase sharply as does the time commitment required. Busy practitioners and decision-makers cannot afford the additional time. A stakeholder and senior policy-maker workshop was the ADB Transport forum held in Manila in Sept 2008.

Pg.	Recommendation / observation	Comments / action
ii	SEACAP should consider formally publishing its research results and lodging them with national and international libraries so that they appear in international bibliographies. They can also be bequeathed to academic institutions regionally and internationally for undergraduate use for curriculum purposes and postgraduate research. It is suggested that developing a resource centre for rural access within a regional academic institution could act as long-term depository for knowledge.	<p>Agreed by all to be an important issue. Publishing has been done to the extent possible. Formal publishing to ISBN or similar requires long process of pre-printing preparation etc. Would need a separate follow-on project to prepare key documents for this level. Informal project reports are unlikely to be accepted by libraries and not taken seriously in academia.</p> <p>Needs a long-term commitment for dissemination of intellectual materials to developing countries but prospects are good – TRL's ORN are still widely used and recognised.</p> <p>"Resource Centre" will require consistent long term support from e.g. DFID through SEACAP follow-on: cannot be realistically expected to be a priority of governments in these countries. Regional organisations that could be considered include AIT (Bangkok) and the Central Road Research Institute (India).</p>
ii	We recommend more systematic consultation with Government in key elements of the work, including scoping and the contracting process. This suggests a need for deeper and more localised programme management. It would also help to include one or more PFM/institutional specialists on a steering committee to ensure that SEACAP addresses institutional and funding issues. Technical capacity could be deepened with the use of external experts on an advisory basis.	<p>There is a regular and comprehensive consultation with Government through the respective Steering Committees.</p> <p>This Review does not agree that involvement of Government in contracting process would be beneficial (see also below).</p> <p>Broadening the scope to include PFM and institutional issues would be a very significant additional step, currently not in the terms of reference. It would be difficult to sustain over three countries and which would reduce the current focus and overlap with other initiatives. A new phase of SEACAP should review budget implications to ensure realisation of proposed changes.</p> <p>The present Technical Manager (DS) has made conscious choice to keep his programme management office to an absolute minimum, and not create a separate central project management bureaucracy, in order to focus on the management of the externally executed (research) projects.</p>
iii	Ambiguities about the respective role of the Technical Manager vis a vis the procurement managers remain outstanding and should be resolved as a priority. There is room for tightening up contractual processes and procedures.	<p>This seems to have been a significant issue during the early phases of the programme. CA management in Hanoi was questionable in its efficiency and not focused on project objectives.</p> <p>This has improved considerably with the arrival of a new part time in-country presence (Doug Fraser + John Gothard), with good communication with technical management in Phnom Penh.</p>



Pg.	Recommendation / observation	Comments / action
iii	The client/contractor relationship of some SEACAP service providers is less clear than it should be. Some potential contractors have expressed concern at the level of sole-sourcing and the relative dominance of a small number of suppliers.	See above. Dealt with to some extent, but sole-sourcing still seems to dominate. Sole sourcing and extension of contracts is acceptable in research – reference Frascati Manual for OECD. Tension caused to a large extent by research nature of contracts. Technical Manager was concerned about problems caused by the incompetence of some commercial firms pursuing commercial agendas to the detriment of presenting honest, ethical and neutral research outputs and advice, thereby presenting a risk to the integrity of the SEACAP. Technical management asserts that within the operational constraints of SEACAP, in terms of horizon and scale and scope of work, good value for money is being achieved (as TRL/OtB/ Intech in VN and Cam; Scott Wilson in Lao)
4	It was suggested to us that SEACAP should be given membership of the Transport Partnership in Vietnam as the transport needs of the Provinces are not currently adequately represented.	Not clear – SEACAP Technical Manager not familiar with Viet Nam “Transport Partnership”. SEACAP priorities in general are guided by the National Steering Committees.
7	The results of SEACAP are of direct interest to members of IFRTD. There is nothing currently on the IFRTD web site that overtly refers to the work and results of SEACAP. There is room for placing information on the IFRTD Asia web page.	Progress achieved: SEACAP website is now linked with IFRTD. IFRTD features issues on SEACAP results. SEACAP is an institutional member of the IFRTD AP. It has financed two IFRTD AP regional annual meetings. It has included reps from IFRTD AP at all international events supported by SEACAP including the ADB Transport Forum and the SPMs.
7	SEACAP does not appear to have any links to IFG web pages or get a mention.	IFG is now defunct – no longer supported by DFID.
7	SEACAP can be more active in promoting its activities and disseminating the results through pages and links on website. The results will be of interest in other continents so a link with the World Bank SSATP (Sub-Saharan African Transport and Policy Partnership) would be of benefit.	Progress achieved. SEACAP now linked with gTKP.
8	There is currently an opportunity in Laos to assist and influence policy on rural roads and to impact upon strategy and policy related to infrastructure at commune/lower levels of government in both Cambodia and Laos.	Government of Lao PDR did not engage on policy discussion with SEACAP. Otherwise results from research are being applied.
8	One challenge for SEACAP is that its primary levels of engagement lie at central Government level and the degree of direct engagement at provincial level is inevitably lower. It was good to note that provincial level officials were invited to the SEACAP Road Trials workshop in December 2006.	Further work has been delivered to provincial level government – but this issue remains a primary challenge that could not be addressed fully in the current phase of the programme. However in all three countries several training programmes targeted at provincial practitioners were held. Most recently in Cambodia, the training of the NCDD provincial technical advisors. Should be considered an important component of any next phase.

Pg.	Recommendation / observation	Comments / action
9	There may be some division between those who have an engineering background and those who have public sector reform/public finance skills. Clearly the main focus to date has been on the former (although the commune training and planning processes supported under SEACAP may provide insight on the latter). One issue is therefore to try- to ensure that these are cross-linked in order to maximize the impact of SEACAP.	Statement not entirely clear: "division" on what? Management of current SEACAP has focussed on engineering issues: a next phase should embrace the essential linkage with budgeting.
9	One suggestion which might help would be to include one or more PFM/institutional specialists on a steering committee who could help to ensure that SEACAP addresses those institutional issues and is mainstreamed into the design and operationalisation of future elements.	See above on PFM. SEACAP management was concerned that embracing PFM would dilute the focus. However, this review agrees that any results will not have a lasting impact until political will has been demonstrated by amending public spending decisions consistent with research findings.
11	i) A greater focus on engagement with academic institutions in the region. Rather than simply targeting one or two leading institutions such as AIT and Chang Mai University, the strategy could reach out to include not just these leading institutions but also the lower level institutions which are likely to train the majority of provincial and district level engineers. If the learning from SEACAP can be mainstreamed into under and post-graduate training, it has a much greater probability of being sustained beyond the current expected life of SEACAP;	In progress. In Cambodia, SEACAP working intensively with Institute of Technology of Cambodia (SEACAP office located within ITC premises). Regional level – SEACAP technical manager on the GMSARN board of advisors. National level - have close relationship with the leading relevant Universities. Includes training, curriculum development, study tours etc Much of SEACAP outputs are fed into University undergraduate programs in all three countries.
11	ii) A focus on professional engineering bodies and associations in order to provide pathways to continued learning. These bodies provide a potentially valuable entry point in terms of dissemination, and also provide potential for two-way interchange of ideas and best practice;	Professional engineering bodies have limited impact in SEA countries. At regional level – SEACAP participates in the Conference of ASEAN Federation of Engineering Originations. SEACAP technical manager is an honorary fellow of AFEO. In Cambodia, the president of the Engineering Institute of Cambodia is on the SEACAP steering committee. The SEACAP TM is an honorary fellow. No organization in Laos. No contact in VN
11	iii) Internet portals: As has already been acknowledged by SEACAP, these offer great potential. It is good to see that care is being taken to ensure that a proliferation of unsustainable "project level" internet sites is being avoided. Our impression is that SEACAP is already addressing the various challenges in mainstreaming information dissemination through the internet, although this is understandably work in progress;	Progress achieved with SEACAP website and linkage to gTKP. SEACAP website only created after agreement from DFID: initially of the opinion (as stated here) that project level websites were not productive.

Pg.	Recommendation / observation	Comments / action
11	iv) Hard copy material: Formally published SEACAP work could be distributed to national and international libraries and so be captured in international bibliographies. Full sets of SEACAP publications could be bequeathed to academic and training institutions in SE Asia for the purposes of learning, training and research, helping to sustain a knowledge bank and to introduce and reinforce policy issues and best practical in rural access, thereby raising its profile in educational and training curricula.	Reaching this stage now: some of the research has resulted in major handbooks that should be considered for a wider audience (such as the work in Lao PDR on Slope Stabilisation. See above: should be considered as component for following phase.
11	v) Formulating a SEACAP project to develop and establish a resource centre for rural access within a regional academic institution, building upon and enhancing an existing academic library.	This should be the subject of a follow-on to SEACAP. Needs to be integrated into a long term programme.
12 - 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• conduct initial stakeholder workshops to identify current research needs with priorities for future SEACAP work.</li> </ul>	Agree that there should be more focus on needs at the outset.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• jointly draw up project procurement plans with the recipient Ministry indicating milestones and jointly monitoring progress. This may take longer so expect delays, try to reduce them and plan accordingly. This should be part of institutional capacity building.</li> <li>• preparing terms of reference jointly with recipient institutions</li> </ul>	The PCR does not agree that this would have presented an improvement. All ToRs are cleared by relevant authorities. Otherwise, there is no local demand for involvement in procurement process. Bearing in mind the reality in SE Asia, this would eventually lead to corruption of process and result in substandard quality advice.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministries actively participate in tender evaluation, both technical and financial. Where capacity is limited (World Bank introducing procurement support in Cambodia) approach the process as a training and capacity building exercise</li> </ul>	Unrealistic. Involvement of government in procurement would slow process down interminably and with the reality of SEA would introduce rent-seeking behaviour in the process.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• making more use of national procurement legislation in line with sentiments of the Paris Declaration</li> </ul>	It is not the aim of SEACAP to strengthen procurement processes: this would be a major diversion of focus.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encouraging Ministry partners to identify a local SEACAP Co-ordinator within their ranks who can act as a “champion” and focal point for all SEACAP work in the institution and will become accountable for monitoring progress. Encourage his/her position/team to be shown in the institution’s organogram/list of responsibilities.</li> </ul>	In progress: this is the function of the Steering Committees.

Pg.	Recommendation / observation	Comments / action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• making Ministries more formally involved in SEACAP contracts, for example lines of reporting. Consider moving more towards contracts made between recipient institution and consultant with oversight/payment made by Programme Manager (EC version as example)</li> </ul>	<p>See above on procurement. Strength of a bilateral funded research programme should be its independence of decision making. Involving ministry in this would threaten such independence and may encourage corrupt practices to enter the process.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encouraging identification of counterpart staff with their written duties to become part of contractual agreements</li> </ul>	<p>Did not materialise: SEACAP management did not see any need or benefit. Has been no call through the Steering Committees for changing existing arrangements.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• formalising the SEACAP initiative through traditional channels such as Ministry of Finance/Foreign Affairs in Laos</li> </ul>	<p>SEACAP managed to operate in Lao PDR without formalisation of relations. Issue has been discussed with Ministry officials, who did not see the need.</p>
12 - 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider “nationals only” workshops to get feedback in certain cases as limited English language capability and cultural sensitivities are an issue.</li> </ul>	<p>Experience has shown that presence of foreign specialists or advisers is valued. Discussions during meetings are largely conducted in own language, with partial translation to English for benefit of foreigners.</p>
14	<p>The procurement process should be strengthened by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) ensuring that technical Terms of Reference are developed by a small team including an appropriate skills mix;</li> <li>ii) a Procurement Strategy with policy and plan should be prepared and followed that takes account of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o appropriate forms of contract for different types of work to share risks,</li> <li>o standard format of responses,</li> <li>o situations applicable for sole sourcing,</li> <li>o reimbursable expenditure including travel</li> </ul> </li> <li>iii) technical evaluation of bids should be undertaken by a small team, avoiding reliance on individual adjudicators;</li> <li>iv) staff from the counterpart ministries should be brought into the bid evaluation process;</li> <li>v) most of the bid management process should be brought into the region, with UK staff limited to quality assurance;</li> <li>vi) bidders should be given clear timetables, reasonable times to bid, kept informed about any changes and delays and provided with clear feedback.</li> <li>vii) preparing a service level agreement which shows target standards for responding to enquiries and correspondence, paying invoices, issuing tenders, keeping to procurement plans etc. against which performance can be monitored.</li> </ol>	<p>PCR agrees with most statements. Some progress has been achieved in these areas, (such as taking the procurement process entirely into SEA) although programme still tends to be centred on a small group of service providers continuing their involvement. The issue centres around the suitability of open-ended research assignments for competitive bidding process. SEACAP management argues that the current system is delivering value for money, taking into consideration all costs.</p>