



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