SEACAP

Dissemination beyond target countries to date
Background

→ SEACAP operational since 2004

→ Completed 23 projects, 16 ongoing (www.seacap-info.org)
→ 2nd SEACAP Practitioners Meeting
  → Attended by participants from many more countries than the target SEACAP countries
→ Represented at 6 International Events
  → Attended by participants from many more countries than the target SEACAP countries
→ Website up and running
→ Documentation disseminated beyond the target countries

→ It is therefore reasonable to expect SEACAP to have influenced interventions in other countries
Impact Beyond Target Countries

→ Based on a desk study influence of SEACAP on projects in two countries shall be specifically looked at

  → Afghanistan
  → Sri Lanka

→ It is possible that there has been impact beyond these countries

  → Require to carry out surveys
  → Require to gather further project documentation and feedback from practitioners in these countries
Scope & Scale of Impact

→ Afghanistan

→ Implementation of projects initiated late 2002 / early 2003

→ Has influenced in excess of 9 projects to since 2003

→ Value in excess of USD190M
→ In excess of 3,600Km constructed under these projects
→ Basic access as well as paved roads were constructed
Scope & Scale of Impact

→ Afghanistan contd.

→ Has been some impact on policy also
  → Uptake of whole life costing as part of decision making
  → Uptake of a range of surface options resulting from SEACAP 1 primarily
Scope & Scale of Impact

→ Sri Lanka:

→ Rural road sector projects being implemented for many years
→ Well developed road sector
→ Renewed funding post tsunami – to Government but also through NGOs and UN Agencies

→ 3 projects to date influenced by SEACAP outputs in Sri Lanka

→ Value of approx. USD40.6M
→ In excess of 412Km of paved roads founded on SEACAP methods
→ Some influence of policy at Local Government level
How did SEACAP influence these projects?

→ Similar mechanism in both countries

→ Advocacy – initially in country

→ Demonstration projects in country

→ Participation in international events
How did SEACAP influence these projects?

→ Advocacy:

→ To Government counterparts
  
  → Directly from SEACAP Practitioners in the case of Sri Lanka
  → Through implementation consultants familiar with SEACAP in the case of Afghanistan

→ To Donors

→ In partnership with the Government
→ Support of Local Government in Sri Lanka since these are responsible for the rural road network
→ Also strong support and participation of Central Gov in Sri Lanka
→ Support of Central Government in Afghanistan
How did SEACAP influence these projects?

→ Demonstration Projects

→ Implemented in Afghanistan within the restraints of existing large scale projects
→ Projects therefore were often not set up to manage these in the early stages of implementation
→ This had detrimental effects in one case – that of construction of a stone paved road demonstration

→ Two differing projects constructed demonstration sections in Sri Lanka
→ Three locations and three differing technologies appropriate for the local area
→ Quickly had buy-in from the local Government

→ Demonstration projects were used to reinforce the advocacy work previously carried out – to prove the point as it were.
Lessons Learnt

→ Advocacy:

→ Required to be continuous
  → Both countries experienced general elections during the period which SEACAP intervened or was introduced

→ Ease of access to SEACAP documentation would be useful for demonstration to donors, Governments and Implementing Consultants that the methods are not experimental – SEACAP webpage and others could be used for this
  → Material to change previous perceptions of rural roads

→ Will lead to requests for proof – a database of application of methods proposed within SEACAP target countries and others would be most useful – again large-scale applications proves the methods are proven
  → Neither Government staff nor donors want a large risk associated with their investment
  → Requirement to change perceptions
Lessons Learnt

→ Demonstration Projects
  → Required to be constructed in a geographical location allowing visits by Government counterparts
    → was not the case in Afghanistan, was the case in Sri Lanka with marked effects
  → Should be constructed to the highest standards
    → Dito above
  → Construction should be timed to allow sites to be used for advocacy prior to major investment

→ Attendance to international events
  → SPMs were beneficial in reinforcing advocacy, advocacy material used and demonstration projects constructed