Nias Reconstruction Program

Aidworks Number:

INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT

Annexes

Ian Teese Team Leader, Evaluation Specialist

Ms Leya Cattleya Community Development and Gender Specialist

December 2009

Annex 1 Evaluation Terms of Reference

Independent Completion Report Mission
AIPRD Nias Rehabilitation Program (NRP) – Small Infrastructure Component, Local Government Assistance and Capacity building

1. INTRODUCTION

The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) will undertake an Independent Completion Report (ICR) mission to review and assess the performance and achievements of the Nias Rehabilitation Program (NRP) – Small Infrastructure Program, and Local Governance Assistance Component and Capacity Building Program.

2. BACKGROUND

The NRP commenced in April 2006 to provide infrastructure that supports rehabilitation in South Nias including the AIPRD priority areas of small infrastructure, local government assistance, livelihoods and capacity building to ensure better services. On 10 May 2006, Murray Proctor, DDG Asia approved an allocation of $10,000,000.00 to fund Nias Reconstruction Program (NRP), a flexible program to rebuild damaged community infrastructure and strengthen the capacity of local leaders to plan and implement development, in the wake of December 2004 tsunami and the March 28, 2005 Nias earthquake.

This two-year A$10 million program has been implemented by Coffey International Development in the district of South Nias, and sub districts of Lahusa, Lolomatua, Gomo, Amandraya, Lolowau, Mazina, Hilimegai, Maniamolo and Pulau Pulau Batu.

The program's overall goal is to contribute to economic growth in South Nias by building or reconstructing village level infrastructure, the restoration of local government services, and associated capacity building and increasing community self-reliance through improved infrastructure, access and capacity building.

In November 2007, the program was redesigned because the original parameters were to broad and assessed as not being achievable. The redesigned NRP comprised small grants for community infrastructure such as feeder roads, water supply, small bridges, gabion walls, construction of sub district offices and community centres. There is also a capacity building component for local government to deliver public services through the subdistrict offices.

The Post considers that the NRP has been a compact, community based project addressing village level needs and supporting delivery of sub-district services to village and town population. The project is relatively simple – it is a project that provides infrastructure and training related to the infrastructure, both at the community level and the sub-district official level. The project has been intended to be highly interactive and community based. This has included demand driven selection of village level benefits, with simple construction managed and implemented by the community themselves. More difficult infrastructure, such as suspension bridges, have been constructed through a combination of village inputs and contracting.

The sub-district activities have been agreed at the level of the South Nias District Government and in discussion with the BRR. The construction has been contracted but the Managing Contractor has provided technical and supervisory services, and delivered a program of capacity building for local officials.

The design of the NRP is intended to involve high level consultation, community and gender participation and empowerment in the identification of eventual activities. South Nias is a less

developed district of Indonesia and very traditional. The project was required to work in appropriate ways to encourage full participation regardless of gender or village status. While less pronounced (given that some SDOs were on alienated land), considerable community involvement was encouraged and required in the development of the sub-district government infrastructure.

The process has overall gone well judging by the positive response from GOI counterparts and partners, however the process has been intensive, and progress slower than expected. It would be useful for the ICR to assess the cost-benefit of a fully realised community approach (which we consider NRP to have been) versus a more traditional or design/implement contracted approach in considering the ultimate cost effectiveness, and development effectiveness of the NRP.

Key aspects of the NRP was that it initially worked in a district that was known for being difficult (terrain, capacity, levels of cooperation) and was in fact the first major international project there. Later in the life of the NRP, other donors also began to operate in the area. It would be useful for the ICR to assess the effectiveness of NRP in operating in this difficult environment, its interaction with other donors; the level of inter-donor cooperation. Also, the position of the BRR as a coordinating agency in Nias is relatively unique situation and the ICR should assess the effectiveness of the NRPs interaction with the BRR. This is assessment would include consideration not just of the effectiveness, decisions, appropriateness of NRP decisions and practices, but should also consider the level of support and advice provided to the NRP by the BRR and the Office of the Bupati (district administrator) and sub-district government.

Also, the NRP was redesigned following recommendations of the PMSG. It would be useful for the ICR to assess whether these recommendations have been implemented and proved to be successful.

3. OBJECTIVES OF ICR MISSION

The ICR will be undertaken to evaluate the activity, focusing on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability and should provide management information to inform future activities, program and strategy design. The ICR's target audience is the community of professionals implementing Australian aid, all of whom need credible, independent advice on the results of past efforts. This community includes such stakeholders as AusAID staff and management, counterpart governments, contractors, multilateral organisations, other donors, NGOs and universities. The ICR also serves the needs of GOI counterparts and implementing agencies by providing them with important valuable information regarding work funded by the Australian Government in South Nias.

The specific objectives of the ICR mission are to:

a. Assess progress towards meeting the overall objectives, outputs and outcomes of NRP, in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability;
b. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of NRP as a rehabilitation, reconstruction and capacity building program to contribute to wider AusAID understanding of effective approaches in this area;
c. Assess how well the program addressed issues of gender, poverty and vulnerability in its design and implementation, and what was the resulting outcome; and
d. Identify lessons learned from the NRP program.

These assessments should be made in comparison to the requirements, objectives and goal of the NRP as contained in the PDD, Subsidiary Arrangement, Contract Scope of Service, and as varied or amended by:

- 6 Monthly Work Plan
- Contract Variations
- PMSG reports, particularly the "NRP Review"

- IMT Reports.

4. SCOPE OF INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT

The ICR will independently assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project. The ICR should include Quality at Completion (QAC) ratings that incorporates overall ratings of the project based on the standard AusAID six-point scale of the quality of the project.

The QAC should be compared with ratings made earlier (QAI) by AusAID at different stages of its project cycle. The final ratings are intended to primarily measure the quality of project delivery against the objective. The quality ratings are not designed to be a summary of the evaluation role of the completion report

Areas to be rated using the ICR Rating Scale

1. Relevance
2. Effectiveness
3. Efficiency
4. Impact and sustainability
5. Overall quality

Definitions of Rating Scale

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6, above the line)
6 Very high quality
5 Good quality initiative; could have improved in some areas with minor work
4 Adequate quality initiative; could have improved with some work

Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3, below the line)
3 Less than adequate quality initiative; needed improvements in core areas
2 Poor quality initiative; needed major improvements in core areas
1 Very poor quality initiative; needed a major overhaul

Key Questions for the ICR evaluation team to consider (in order to obtain evidence to support the ratings):

a. Was the program designed to the highest technical quality, based on sound analysis and learning? Was the program relevant in terms of the aid delivery mechanism, financing and management arrangements?
b. To what degree did the program achieve its objectives, and how well did they contribute to higher level objectives in program strategy?
c. What were the program's achievements in terms of the outputs and outcomes contained in the design?
d. How sustainable are the program outcomes likely to be based on technical (maintenance), financial and organizational conditions?
e. How effectively was the program managed? How did management impact (positively or negatively) on the achievement of outcomes, including management of risk, procurement, involvement of recipients/beneficiaries and relationships with partners.
f. To what degree did the program provide good value for money? Was it cost effective?
g. To what degree did the program incorporate gender, fragility, anti corruption and vulnerability into its design and implementation?
h. How robust was the performance assessment system to measure ongoing achievement of objectives and results?
i. Were there any unplanned impacts or outcomes (positive or negative), such as environmental impacts?

The ICR will validate and follow-up the performance data and relevant assessments made by the Nias Program Monitoring and Support Group, the Independent Monitoring Team (IMT) reports and validate the claims contained within a number of progress reports prepared by Coffey ID.

Field visits should not duplicate the function of basic gathering of performance information, which is the responsibility of the Coffey ID as the delivery organization. The visit should focus on checking the key assumptions in the evidence and analytical base of the progress reports.

Should there be limited primary data available to verify claims of achievements in this activity; the ICR Team should use their professional judgment to assess the initiative's impact and outcomes. Methodology, questions proposed for investigations and any key interview guides or document checklists should be developed prior to the field visit. The ICR Team should provide a list of documents, or information required prior to the in-country visit.

The ICR provides the first evaluation of the impact or potential impact of the complete project and is an important measure of aid effectiveness. Completion is also the time to consider what to keep or repeat in our approach, and what to do differently next time. The progress reports from Coffey ID and the PMSG reports will be important inputs to the ICR. The ICR should not only assess the overall performance of the concluding activity but should be 'forward-looking', and highlight some insightful lessons, and consider how activity outcomes might influence future policy and programs.

In finalizing the ICR, the consultant should pay attention particularly to the assessment of aspects relating to cost, timeliness and quality of building construction and also cross-cutting themes, such as gender equality, partnerships and anti corruption.

5. METHODOLOGY

In undertaking the scope of ICR, the following combination of instruments will be required by the Team:

a. Familiarization with relevant program and activity documentation provided by AusAID;
b. Participation in AusAID briefing sessions both prior to and at the conclusion of the field visit;
c. A field visit to South Nias, North Sumatra Province, including field investigations (interviews with beneficiaries) and consultations with Coffey Project Team, AusAID staff in Jakarta, GoI officials and other agencies as appropriate;
d. Meetings with targeted beneficiaries and Coffey's implementing partners and;
e. Presentation of initial findings of the ICR to AusAID Jakarta and Coffey team, followed by submission of draft and final ICR.

6. TEAM COMPOSITION

The team will be comprised of two members: an evaluation specialist (Team Leader) and a gender and community development specialist. Subject to need, an interpreter may be required for the team. The general requirements and responsibility of the ICR team is as stated below. The technical skills, for example civil engineering degree would be a benefit but evaluation skill are most important for the Team Leader as the construction quality has already been the subject of ongoing assessment.

The Team Leader is expected to have:

a. Extensive monitoring and evaluation experience, including significant experience designing methodologies for development program evaluation
b. Extensive experience in designing and managing civil society and community development programs
c. Understanding of AusAID's policy development context
d. Indonesian language skills beneficial

The Team Leader will be responsible for drafting the evaluation plan, designing the evaluation methodology, field research guide and instruments in collaboration with the technical and AusAID team members. The team leader will then be responsible for planning, directing, coordinating and managing the assignment, including participating

in fieldwork activities and the submission of milestone reports to AusAID. The Team Leader will be supported by staff from AusAID Jakarta and Coffey ID staff in South Nias, as required.

The Team leader should also to have:

a. Broad experience in the planning, design and delivery of social infrastructure in a development context, preferably in Asia
b. Experience in project/program evaluation

The Gender and Community Development Specialist is expected to have experience in:

a. gender and development analysis, and the gender development context in Indonesia
b. Project/program evaluation
c. providing inputs to the design and evaluation methodology and field research guidance
d. participating in fieldwork activities
e. providing inputs to milestone reports to AusAID

f. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Independent Completion Report should be completed in accordance with the attached Independent Completion Report Template (#155)

The ICR Team shall provide AusAID with the following:

a. Presentation and discussion - on the initial findings of the ICR to be presented to AusAID at the completion of the in-country visit;

b. Draft ICR – to be submitted to AusAID within two (2) weeks of completing field visit. AusAID may share the report with, and seek feedback from, Coffey and other key stakeholders, as appropriate;

c. Final ICR – to be submitted within one week of receipt of AusAID's comments on the draft ICR. The ICR Team shall determine whether any amendment to the draft is warranted. The report should be a brief and clear summary of the ICR outcomes and focus on a balanced analysis of issues faced by the activity.

Both the draft and final reports should be no more than 25 pages of text plus appendices and both should include the ICR Terms of Reference, evaluation methodology, field research guidelines and instruments as appendices.

The ICR draft will be considered final only when the document quality is of publishable standard.

g. TIMETABLE

The ICR will take approximately three weeks and is planned to start in late March 2009. The exact date and timeline of the ICR is to be confirmed based on the evaluation plan that will be developed by the team leader. The indicative schedule for the ICR is as follows:

a. three days preparation including a desk study to assess relevant documents, develop an evaluation plan, design the evaluation methodology, field research guide and instruments
b. one day briefing discussion and clarification with the Managing Contractor (MC) and or AusAID
c. six days field visit in South Nias
d. three days preparation/report writing of Aide Memoire
e. one day debriefing
f. three days drafting the ICR;
g. four days finalising the ICR upon receipt of clarification and comments from AusAID.

h. LIST OF KEY DOCUMENTS TO BE REFERRED TO IN DESK STUDY

a. Coffey Contract
b. Coffey Completion Report
c. Infrastructure Monitoring Team (IMT) Reports
d. NRP Monitoring & Evaluation Framework
e. PMSG Reports
f. Quality at Implementation Report
g. Australia Indonesia Partnership Country Strategy 2008-13

Relevant AusAID policies (gender, anti-corruption, partnerships, performance assessment and evaluation)

Annex 2 Program Logframe (from March 2008 M&E Framework and Plan)

	Program Logic	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators**	**Means of Verification**	**Assumptions**
	Goal: To contribute to the development of South Nias District	Increased access to economic opportunities Improved access to public services Reduced transaction costs in doing business	Economic survey Public services survey	Existence of related program by other stakeholders, including government and private sector
	Purpose: To make community infrastructure development responsive to community livelihoods	Project prioritization processes uses livelihoods related criteria in at least 75% of NRP-assisted villages Projects are perceived as responsive to community livelihoods at least in 75% of NRP-assisted village communities	Minutes of community-wide project prioritization meeting Individual and/or group interview/FGD with men and women separately as recorded by NRP monitoring activities	Types of project with livelihoods related focuses exist No negative-sentiment bias from community members which may come outside the control of the project
Components				
1	Component 1: Small-scale Community Infrastructure Outcome Objective: To increase the availability of small-scale community infrastructure	30 villages have completed the construction cycle Improved access and reduction in women's time burden	NRP Activity Completion Report Site visit observation	No shortage of project materials Social dynamics such as conflicts potentially "destructive" to project implementation can be addressed No other significant force majors such as disaster exist Sufficient absorptive capacity of communities (*viz.* existence of other projects)
1.1	Quality small-scale infrastructure provided	75% of projects completed in accordance with NRP quality standard	The NRP infrastructure integrity audit	VAMC is willing and is committed to adhere quality standards
1.2	Manuals/guidelines for quality infrastructure developed include operations and maintenance (O&M)	Manual/guideline of different types of project meet national quality standards	Copy of manual/guideline of different types of project	VAMC is willing and is committed to adhere quality standards
1.3	O&M plans and schedule developed	O&M plans and schedules developed in at least 50% of villages	Record of O&M plans and schedules (monitoring documentation/report)	Time is adequate to develop O&M plans and schedules by EOP
1.4	Village regulations for maintenance in place	50% of villages have regulations for maintenance	Copy of regulations of each village	District and/or sub-district governments are supportive of the development of the regulations

	Program Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
2	Component 2: Community Engagement Strengthening Outcome Objective: To increase community capacities for small-scale community infrastructures development	30 villages have completed the infrastructure management cycle	Village activity completion reports Site visits	Village governments and leaders are cooperative and supportive to the projects Adequate human resources are available within communities
2.1	Village Activity Management Committees (VAMCs) established1	VAM is established in all NRP-assisted villages through community-wide meeting In at least 75% of NRP-assisted villages one of VAMC members is a woman	Record of VAMC Form with names and details of members	Village governments and leaders are cooperative and supportive to the projects Adequate human resources are available within communities
2.2	Village leaders and cadres (including village government and VAMC members) trained2	All VAMC members and cadres and formal village leaders (Kepala Desa and BPD) have improved knowledge on grass-root leadership and community infrastructure project management On-the-job/on-site technical trainings are provided to at least 50 people participating in construction works per village in at least 75% of NRP villages (and at least 50% are women)	Training records, including pre-test and post-test Employment creation records collected through on-going monitoring	Village leaders and cadres are willing and able to participate in trainings
2.3	*Peraturan Desa* (village regulations for O&M) developed 3	At least 2 village government leaders (representing village executive and legislative) per village have improved knowledge on village governance and on the processing of village regulations for infrastructure governance and maintenance in at least 50% of NRP-assisted villages 50 % of NRP-assisted villages have regulations for operation and maintenance	Training records, including pre-test and post-test Copies of ratified regulations bearing signatures of Village Head and BPD members	Sub-district and district governments are involved and supportive Village governments are supportive and have sufficient capacity
2.4	Village Planning Matrix	At least 75% of NRP villages produce good quality of planning matrices[2]	Copies of signed planning matrices	Village governments are supportive
2.5	Appropriately equipped villages	At least 75% of NRP villages receive appropriate equipment[2]	Signed VAMC equipment receipts	Appropriate equipment is available in local markets
3	Component 3: Governance Infrastructure Outcome Objective: To restore sub-district government office facilities and functions focused particularly on small-scale community infrastructure	2 sub-district governments lobby the district government for funding 5 sub-districts have improved complete facilities/equipment District government with sub-district governments develop and issue official guidelines (Juklak/Juknis) for villages to formulate village regulations (Perdes) for community infrastructure development District government with sub-district governments train village leaders in formulating village regulation (Perdes)	Sub-district offices (SDOs) hand-over reports Records of inter-village coordination meeting led by relevant sub-district government staff Records of monitoring visits conducted by relevant sub-district government staff	District and/or sub-district governments have willingness and are committed

	Program Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		District government with sub-district governments will check whether Perdes has been developed or not 2 sub-district governments conduct/facilitate (inter-village) planning meeting to prioritize village development priorities 2 sub-district governments document village development priority within the sub-district 2 sub-district governments regularly hold coordination meetings 2 sub-district governments conduct regular monitoring visits, actively involved in implementation processes, provide advices/feedback		
3.1	Quality Sub-district office buildings constructed	Technical design of 5 SDOs meet national quality standards 5 sub-district offices have completed construction cycle Gender equity related: Separate toilet for men and women Special space provided for women-led activities	Technical design documents Records of construction quality test Sub-district offices construction completion report	Sub-contractors are willing and committed to adhere standards Sub-contractors are able to meet construction schedules Procurement and logistical problems are manageable
3.2	Appropriately equipped sub-district offices	5 sub-district offices are provided with equipment 5 sub-district offices have registered the equipment as government assets	Equipment provision completion report, including signed receipts Copy of registration records Photos	District and/or sub-district government have assets registration system
3.3	Operations and maintenance (O&M) manuals, plans and schedules developed	5 sub-district offices have O&M manuals, plans and schedules	Copy of manuals, plans, schedules	Sub-district government have staff that are designated and/or able to perform O&M tasks
3.4	Appropriately trained relevant staff (Note: gender equity consideration: NRP will ensure women and men will get equal access to training program)	All relevant sub-district government, women and men, have demonstrated appropriate skills on the uses and maintenance of equipment All relevant sub-district government staff, women and men, demonstrate appropriate skills on the uses and maintenance of building maintenance All relevant sub-district government staff, women and men, demonstrate appropriate knowledge on participatory community development approach	Training records, including pre-test & post-test	Sub-district government have staff that are designated to and/or able to participate in trainings
3.5	Sub-district governments attempts to acquire district government support for continues small-scale infrastructure development	2 sub-district governments have compiled all NRP-assisted villages' planning matrices 2 sub-district governments have submitted the compiled matrices to the district government	Copy of compiled planning matrices Receipt or record of event of the submission and lobby	Sub-district governments are willing and committed
3.6	Multi-stakeholders policy dialogues on the	District government conduct at least 2 multi-stakeholders	Records of event	District government has

	Program Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	financing of small-scale community infrastructure conducted	workshops to discuss the future financing of small-scale infrastructure development in South Nias Note: gender equity consideration: NRP will ensure women and men participate in the workshops		willingness and is committed to doing this
	Program Management Inputs and Other Contractual Performance Obligations Objective: To efficiently and effectively manage NRP			
	Community infrastructure are managed professionally, efficiently and to a high degree of quality	Activities identified in accordance with selection criteria, funds disbursed and acquitted effectively, issues identified and resolved, and lessons learned taken into account.	Regular monitoring records	No significant staff turn-over
	Other components (Governance Infrastructure and Community Engagement Strengthening) are managed professionally, efficiently and to a high degree of quality	Activities identified, monitored, and completed, and service providers mobilised and managed in accordance with program procedures, work-plans, and contract	Regular monitoring records Interviews	Service providers and contractors are available and perform sufficiently
	Positive relationships are developed and maintained with stakeholders	Positive and effective relationships developed and maintained with KDP/KRRP, BRR, District and Sub-district governments, other donors, and communities	Interviews	No negative "political" interests among parties
	Contractor shows flexibility, responsiveness, initiative and strategic insight	Proactive identification of potential activities in line with Program direction. Responsiveness to AusAID requests and provision of sound advice to AusAID on strategic direction of program Proactive identification and resolution of issues impacting on program progress	Communication records Interviews	Relationship is guided by positive partnership spirit
	Timely and effective reporting	Reports are provided on time and to the required standard. Contractor controls expenditure effectively, and provides timely financial reporting and invoicing	Communication records	No significant factors exist that may delay reporting

Annex 3 People Consulted

No	Name	F/M	Position	Location
AusAID Jakarta				
1			Infrastructure, Manager	Jakarta
2	Sigit Pratignyo		Program manager, NRP,	Jakarta
3	Lulu Wardhani	F	Program Manager, ARPIC, ACEH	Jakarta
Program Management and Staff				
4	Irfani Darma	M	Former Team Leader	Medan
5	Edisson Sarumaha	M	Former Senior Facilitator	Nias
6	Alex Brian Wav	M	Village Governance Officer	Nias
7	Amos Warowu	M	Former Village Facilitator	Nias
8	Alan Atwell	M	Country Representative, Coffey International	Jakarta
9	Ms Diani Widihastut	F	Project Man. & Support Service Manager	Jakarta
Government Officials				
10	F Laiya, SH, MM	M	Bupati, Nias Selatan	Teluk Dalam
11	Herman Laiya	M	Secretary to the Bupati	Teluk Dalam
12		M	Kimpraswil, Vice Head of Dinas	Teluk Dalam
13	Saronasokhi Buwlo	M	Camat, Lahusa	Lahusa
14	Leo F Halawa A	M	Secretary of Camat Lalomatua	Lalomatoa
15	Al Bu'ulolo	M	Camat	
16	Th Zagoto	M	Head of Village	
17	Darman Laiya	M	Head of Village	Hilimbowo
18	Agzhili Duha	M	Head of Village	Bawosaua
19	Lature Laia	M	Perdes' Team	
20	Deniandulo	M	Member, Village Development Team (VDT)	Hiliotauwo
21	Amaruz Waiya	M	Procurement Team	Swing Bridge
22	Nur Ilana Duha	F	Former, Treasurer, Village development Team	Baawozaua
23	Juari Duha	M	Former Perdes' Team	Baawozaua
24	Saljuari Lature	M	Former Perdes' Team	Baawozaua
25	Lukas Ndoro	M	Former member of VDT (PPKD)	Lelewau village
Beneficiaries, Community				
26	Chrsitina W	F	Teacher	Bridge
27	Atibae Laia	F	Cadre	Hilindasoniha - drain
28	Yantimae Duha	F	Beneficiary, community	Hilindasoniha – drain / water system
29	Fagonafoi Dachi	F	Beneficiary	Hili Simaetano
30	Ina Widiwiati Dachi	F	Beneficiary	Hili Simaetano
31	Ina Krisharianto Dachi	F	Beneficiary	Hili Simaetano
32	Imelda Fau	F	Beneficiary	Hili Simaetano
33	Samsior Dachi	F	Member, Village Development Team	Hili Simaetano
34	Agustinus Laoli	M	Treasurer of Village Development Team	Hili Simaetano
35	Inariska Dachi	F	Beneficiaries, Community	Path Road Hili Simaetano
36	Ina ALfendi Dachi	F	Beneficiaries, Community	Path Road Hili Simaetano
37	Ina Frista Dachi	F	Beneficiaries, Community	Path Road Hili Simaetano
38	Martinia Dachi	F	Beneficiaries, Community	Path Road Hili Simaetano
39	Amaterou Dachi	F	Beneficiaries, Community	Path Road Hili Simaetano
40	Sahabat Laia	M	Beneficiaries, Community	Road Project
41	Budisa Laia	F	Beneficiaries, Community	Road project
42	Yunida Laia	F	Beneficiaries, Community	Road project
43	Harajudi, Halawa	M	Ex Chair, PPKD	Sisarahili Susupi
44	Inarestu,	F	Treasurer, Village Development Team	Sulua
45	Amasabar	M	Chair, Management Team for Water	Sulua/Tandruo
46.	Ina Diani	F	Beneficiary, Water spring and System	Tuhemberua
47	Ya'atulo Waruwu	M	Beneficiary	Talio
48	Deniandulo	M	Beneficiary and Member, VDT	Hiotalua
Other Informants				
49	Hercales Lang	M	Former head of BRR Nisel	
50	Pak Defnas	M	CV Defnas Jaya	NRP Contractor
51	Pak Cristian	M	PT Multi Pilar Indah Jaya	NRP Contractor
52	Walter Ili	M	International Labour Organisation	Through Phone Conversation,

Annex 4 Draft Aide Memoire for Evaluation of Nias Reconstruction Program

Evaluation Background

Activity Background

The Governments of Indonesia (GOI) and Australia (GOA), through AusAID, initiated the Nias Reconstruction Program (NRP or the Program) in response to: (i) the December 2004 and March 2005 earthquakes and tsunamis affecting Nias Island (Nias); (ii) the subsequent fatal crash of a Australian Navy Sea King helicopter in Tuindrao, southern Nias; (iii) link in with ongoing Government of Indonesia (GOI) implementation of policies to decentralise government responsibilities; and, (iv) address issues of poverty, conflict and reconstruction in Nias.

Following a design mission for NRP in March 2006, the Australia Indonesia Partnership for Reconstruction and Development (AIPRD) established to assist Indonesia's post-tsunami reconstruction and development efforts within and beyond Aceh through the AIPRD Secretaries Committee approved an AUD 10 million commitment to support reconstruction in Kecamatan Nias Selatan (Nisel) and directed that design of NRP proceed.

The Independent Completion Report (ICR) team[1] acknowledges that during the NRP design process, GOI, supported by many agencies including AusAID, was committed to implementing a very large and complex disaster relief and recovery program across Aceh and Nias.

Activity Design

The draft project design document (PDD) recommended a three year program focusing on the South Nias District (Nisel) to support the work of the newly established GOI Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency (BRR) as set out in the following summary logframe. The village infrastructure sub-component would work closely with and through the nationwide GOI implemented Kecamatan Development Program (KDP).

Table 1 NRP Design in PDD

Purpose: To reduce poverty and accelerate sustainable development in South Nias	
Component 1. Sustainable Community Development in South Nias Component Objective:	2. Government Capacity Building Improved BRR and local government capacity to support community reconstruction and rehabilitation
Sub-components: 1.1 Construction of village infrastructure 1.2 Support to livelihoods, primarily in agriculture	 2.1 Support BRR operations 2.2 Rebuild or repair sub-district offices 2.3 Training and capacity building support to local government

The PDD recommended an interim phase prior to the appointment of the NRP managing contractor (MC) to enable further on-the-ground assessment to be made, particularly of the infrastructure development strategies and implementation of the livelihoods activities, and to prepare initial activities in Tuindrao village and kecamatan Amandraya. An interim team was mobilised in August 2006. After mobilisation of the management contractor (MC), Coffey International Development, in January 2007 the design continued to evolve until September 2007. Then it was decided that, due to the limited remaining time[2], the Program would focus on developing community infrastructure, strengthening community engagements and improving local government facilities and capacity at kecamatan level. The final design is summarised below. This design focused on outputs with limited attention to outcomes and impacts.

Main features of the final design included:

(i) Construction of SDO new kecamatan (sub-district) offices (SDO) (a further three SDO were added).

[1] The review team were Ian Teese, team leader / evaluation specialist, and Ms Leya Cattleya, gender and community development specialist. During the field visit, former program staff provided organisation and interpretation support. The Team worked in Indonesia from 3-12 August and visited Nias from 4-10 August 2009.

[2] AusAID wished to finish inputs to the reconstruction process by the time the BRR mandate was completed in early 2009.

(ii) Funds allocated for community infrastructure in Teluk Dalam, Amandraya, Lolowau and Lolomatua kecamatans. Village development and infrastructure facilitators assisted the village communities plan and implement these activities.
(iii) Training provided mostly at community and kecamatan level.

Table 2 Final NRP Design

Goal: To contribute to the development of South Nias District		
Purpose: To make community infrastructure development responsive to community livelihoods		
Component		
1. Small-scale community infrastructure Objectives: To increase the availability of small-scale community infrastructure	2. Community Engagement Strengthening To increase community capacities for small-scale community infrastructures development	3. Governance Infrastructure To restore sub-district government office facilities and functions, focused particularly on small-scale community infrastructure
Outputs: 1.1 Quality small-scale infrastructure provided 1.2 Manuals / guidelines for quality infrastructure developed 1.3 O&M plans and schedules developed	2.1 Villages activity management committees (VAMC) formed 2.2 Village leaders and cadres trained 2.3 Peraturan Desa (village regulations for O&M) developed 2.4 Village planning matrix 2.5 Appropriately equipped villages	3.1 Quality Sub-district office buildings constructed 3.2 Appropriately equipped sub-district offices 3.3 Operations and maintenance (O&M) manuals, plans and schedules developed 3.4 Appropriately trained relevant staff 3.5 Sub-district governments … acquire district government support for continues small-scale infrastructure development 3.6 Multi-stakeholders policy dialogues on the financing of small-scale community infrastructure conducted

The implementing team were mainly national staff and sub-contractors with limited inputs from international consultants.

Evaluation Process

AusAID commissioned preparation of this ICR as part of its internal quality management systems. In addition to the standard evaluation questions on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, the main evaluation objectives and questions defined by AusAID included:

(i) Was the program designed to the highest technical quality, based on sound analysis and learning?
(ii) To what degree did the program achieve its objectives, and how well did they contribute to higher level objectives in program strategy?
(iii) To what degree did the program incorporate gender, fragility, anti corruption and vulnerability into its design and implementation?
(iv) How robust was the performance assessment system to measure ongoing achievement of objectives and results?
(v) Aspects relating to cost, timeliness and quality of building construction and also cross-cutting themes, such as gender equality, partnerships and anti corruption.
(vi) Were there any unplanned impacts or outcomes (positive or negative)?

Information sources included managing contractor reports plus reports by the AusAID Program Monitoring and Support Group and Independent Monitoring Team. After a briefing by AusAID Jakarta, the ICR team visited the program area in Nisel, met with a range of program stakeholders including participating communities. A draft list of people met is attached.

Initial Findings

Impact:

The construction activities added much needed new or upgraded SDOs and community level infrastructure to Kabupaten Nias Selatan. Kabupaten and kecamatan government officials were very complementary about the standard of the infrastructure provided through the Program.

The village access paths, bridges constructed provided greatly improved access for households living in remote villages of Nisel. The improved water supplies and drainage systems improved living conditions in the villages.

However, the Program has only made a limited contribution to addressing the underlying development issues in Nisel of poverty, conflict and reconstruction.

Relevance:

The NRP concept was highly relevant to both the relief and reconstruction activities and to supporting development in a severely disadvantaged remote area of Indonesia which was not serviced by other donors. In addition there are strong relationships between Nisel and Australia through the recent tragic helicopter crash and also a much longer engagement through Australians visiting Sorake surf beach.

Effectiveness:

The Program largely met the objectives defined in the final program design which focused on outputs of infrastructure and capacity building material. The designs of the SDOs were highly regarded by the stakeholders but ongoing issues of building security and ventilation plus some remaining construction, water supply, removal of waste glass and generator problems were observed by kecamatan staff and the ICR team. Two of the six SDOs visited had started use of the 'one roof/door' service areas included in the SDO designs. The designs also make it almost impossible to exclude dust from computer and record storage areas.

For the community infrastructure activities, small scale Chinese designed crushers suitable for local condition were introduced and have been adopted by local contractors (this innovation was noted by ILO as a major contributor to improved concrete construction standards while reducing costs). The quality of concrete path construction was improved by the use of steel formwork which made quality control much easier to monitor.

The initial program design and PDD were inadequate and was much closer to a feasibility study rather than a document to guide implementation. This lack of design structure and subsequent further development of the program design contributed to the very slow start up to program activities and limited the program benefits.

AusAID's decision to refocus the program's scope in 2007 was appropriate. However, the lack of program design focus and quality had led to significant delays, and thus, inefficiencies. Coffey's approach in using mainly a national program team with some facilitators from Nias was effective in accelerating implementation.

An issue not resolved during in the PDD or during implementation was the function of the community engagement processes. Some processes were established, particularly at the program inception stage through the development of village assessments and facilitators' manuals. However, the failure to clearly develop, articulate and implement a strategy of community development, community participation or community contracting has limited the effectiveness (and sustainability) of the community infrastructure activities[3].

While some training activities on construction and maintenance of small scale community infrastructures and governance were carried out, the program's stakeholders and the ICR team noted that the Program did not properly address the capacity needs of the stakeholders. Program implementation did not link efforts to reduce women's time and work burden to practical gender related issues in small infrastructures, including issues of gendered division of labour and women and children's safety, i.e. water supply infrastructure.

Efficiency:

The Program has delivered infrastructure built to a higher standard than would be achieved through normal GOI processes, such as KDP, due to higher design and construction standards which have increased the construction and supervision costs. Initial indications are that these costs could be at least 50 % higher than under GOI processes (further analysis will be included in the ICR). Unless adequate operations and maintenance (O&M) funds are provided by GOI, the benefits of the higher construction quality will be greatly reduced.

[3] The community development aspect of the Program could be challenged in terms of lack of community ownership and encouraging community dependencies through the use of paid community labour to implement the community infrastructure program.

Compared to the KDP and similar GOI or loan supported development activities, or community infrastructure activities implemented by agencies such as the International Labour Organisation (ILO) the Program fielded a much larger team of facilitators to support the community level construction activities. Interviewed stakeholders, however, indicated limited engagement with the village technical and community development facilitators. There was little indication that the village level consultation and coordination structures developed through the Program would continue post-program as there are no GOI funds to continue the facilitator support. Staff turnover, particularly among facilitators, and program delays during the mobilization stage required higher resource inputs to produce the agreed outputs.

The AusAID funded inputs during the interim phase did not greatly reduce the implementation lag as the MC implementation team was mobilized.

Sustainability:

While the SDO designs were, in general, appropriate, they have not minimised ongoing O&M costs[4]. Also there were no specific O&M clauses in the hand over documentation. While the project has initiated some capacity development for local government officials to implement the Bupati's decree on O&M, there has been limited O&M implementation. The kabupaten government has allocated some funding (about Rps. 5 million per month per kecamatan) for O&M of the new SDOs. This will not be adequate and the kabupaten and kecamatans are seeking additional O&M funding.

At village level, there was little indication that the O&M initiatives developed and introduced systematically by the Program have been implemented yet, partly because many of the construction activities were only completed in the last 6-12 months. Training on O&M and the development of *Perdes* (Village Regulation) on O&M and consecutive extension of the *Perdes* to the participating villages, while considered useful, has not led to significant results yet. Also, because the community participation processes have not fully engaged and not been taken up by the communities, the ICR team does not expect strong community ownership and implementation of O&M activities for most of the activities. This is a common problem on community infrastructure activities in all developing countries, not just for the NRP. Nonetheless, basic maintenance such as clearing wild grass along pathways in some villages is already needed to improve the life of program infrastructure.

Issues with the Tuindrao water supply identified in the report of the visit of PMSG in 2008 have not been resolved. The water supply system is not operating as planned and users are not paying the proposed water fees which were to fund O&M activities.

Interviews at the Lawa-lawa Luo suspension bridge site reported loosened bolts and turnbuckles which had not been addressed after reporting the cases to the contractor (sub-contractor.

Crosscutting Issues:

Gender and Disadvantaged Groups: Efforts to adequately address gender equality concerns were limited, and merely carried out in the reporting of female and male participation in program activities. Gender related training used generic and traditional material and approaches, neglected the need of having appropriate uses of practical tools linking to small infrastructure development and sustainability. While the activity completion report claims the high level of gender sensitivities among the program staffs, obvious gender insensitive approaches and practices were noted and found during the field visits, i.e. 'one stop service table' and water sanitations. While less female staffs were employed in Kecamatan offices, the need to have separate female and male latrine in SDOs was undermined.

Nias is considered a challenging area to promote gender equality but a practical approach to gender equality was neglected. In the absence of any analysis and proper community engagements / consultations, there are strong indications that awareness of the program staff to what women face and need in dealing with inequities and challenges in their participation in the village infrastructure planning and implementation is limited.

[4] For example, the disproportionate numbers of light bulbs in most SDOs, relatively expensive energy costs of generators, etc.

There was no clear definition of who were disadvantaged groups within the program area or articulation of how these groups could be included resulting in the needs of this group probably not being addressed.

Environmental Issues: During the field visits, no major environmental issues arising from implementation were observed. However, some of the new infrastructure was already being undermined due to inadequate protective measures around bridge and culvert abutments, slumping embankments behind SDOs or inadequate embankment foundations.

Monitoring and Evaluation:

Because of the long period spent finalising the program design, the program M&E framework was not finalised until May 2008. As indicated earlier, the program design and, therefore, the M&E framework focused on quantifying activities and outputs rather than outcomes and impacts.

Even though the Program had a large field team working in the communities, it is disappointing that the MC completion report (and other documentation sighted by the ICR team) could not document the number of households benefiting from the community infrastructure activities and did not attempt to quantify the limited number of outcome and impact indictors specified in the higher levels of the program logframe. Unlike many other AusAID funded community / rural development projects, the Program had the field and management resources need to undertake these studies and quantify the benefits and impacts.

Draft Recommendations and Lessons Learned

Recommendations:

1. Sub-district Offices AusAID should consider rectifying current problems in the SDOs due to a lack of security grilles for windows, inadequate / non functioning water supplies, unstable and poorly drained embankments around the structures, low quality generators and removal of waste building materials.
2. Water supplies:
   a. Tuindrao AusAID should arrange for an appropriate organisation (GOI or NGO) to support the current water system management committee to make the system fully functional as designed and to provide short term support to the committee to manage the water system O&M sustainably;
   b. Lolomatua (Tuhemberua): The current steep pathway to the washing facilities should be replaced with steps to reduce the chance of injuries to women and children who fetch and transport water.
3. Capacity building AusAID should encourage the program kabupaten and kecamatan governments to link with the new UNDP Nias Island Transition Project to continue and strengthen the capacity building activities started by the Program. This should include linking with AusAID initiatives such as ISP3.
4. Maintenance of Hilisondrekha suspension bridge. The contractor should carry out a safety inspection and conduct a basic training to the community's team for maintenance and security.

Lessons:

1. Community development processes take time to implement in a difficult environment such as Nisel. Without appropriate approaches, time and continuing resourcing, community infrastructure activities may be more effectively implemented through community contracting as used by ILO. These include gender equality promotion within the community development processes.
2. Additional investment in higher quality construction of buildings and roads needs to be supported by committed O&M funding and inputs to maximise benefits from the additional investment.
3. In a disaster response and recovery situation, the use of a design and implement contractor (overseen by an appropriate advisory group) may be more efficient and responsive.

Acknowledgements

The ICR team greatly valued the insights and experience of the stakeholders at kabupaten, kecamatan and village level. Coffey International Development through its Jakarta office provided support to the ICR team and linked the Team with former program staff who provided much information on program implementation and guided and assisted the ICR team during its visit to Nisel. AusAID Jakarta staff provided guidance and feedback on the Team's activities.

Annex 5 Program Key Dates

Significant key dates are shown in the table below

Event	Date
AusAID emergency response and Interim phase	December 2004 to January 2007
Earthquake 1 Tsunami (Aceh) Joint Ministerial Statement establishing the AIPRD signed by GOI & GOI Earthquake 2 Tsunami (Nias Island) Australia Sea King helicopter crashes in Tuindrao village, South Nias killing 9 crew members	25 Dec 2004 17 March 2005 28 March 2005 2 April 2005
Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency (BRR) Nias Stakeholders conference appealing to international donors	6 Dec 2005
AusAID and World Bank, Joint Scoping mission to Nias NRP Design mission AIRPD Secretaries Committee approve AUD 10 million for NRP	January 2006 15-25 March 2006 May 2006
Interim phase commenced Pilot implementation of community infrastructure commenced - Batch 1 (3 villages)	August 2006 November 2006
Appointment of MC for NRP First six-months (Inception and Program Strategy & Work plan) January 2007 to June 2007 Commencement and mobilization of NRP implementation team Contract between AusAID with MC - CID (Coffey International Development) signed Submission of inception report First Program Coordinating Committee (PCC) meeting to endorse NRP work plans	December 2006 13 January 2007 17 January 2007 April 2007 10 May 2007
Batch 2 of community infrastructure (6 villages) commenced Second Six Months (Second Progress Report and Workplan-12 months) July 2007 to January 2008	July 2007
Program re-focus by AusAID and MC	October 2007
Batch 3 of community infrastructure commenced	November 2007
Third Six Months (Third Progress Report and Workplan-6 months) January 2008 to June 2008	
PCC meeting	March 2008
Batch 4 of community infrastructure (19 villages)	March 2008
PMSG mission	7 – 14 April 2008
Construction of the five SDOs commenced	April 2008
Feasibility Study to Tello and Hibala Islands	May 2008
Fourth Six Months (Fourth Progress Report and Workplan-6 months) July 2008 to January 2009	
Approval given by AusAID to construct an additional SDO on Tello Island	14th July 2008
Construction of the Tello Island SDO commenced	18th July 2008
Outcome of the environmental impact assessment (AMDAL) presented to district, sub-district and village government representatives	July 2008
Asset Management training for local government officials and asset managers	29 Aug to 12 Sept 2008
PCC meeting	12 Sept 2008
BRR withdrew from Nias	20 December 2008
Project Extension Approved with additional AUD 1 million	October 2008
Construction of additional three new SDOs (main office only) commenced	November 2008
First five SDOs completed and handed over to the local government	December 2008
Three Month Project Extension (Progress Report and Workplan-6 months) January 2009 to April 2009	
SDO on Tello island completed and handed over to the local government	January 2009

Annex 6 Observations of ICR Team on Program Achievements

Comments on Achievements of Objectives

Purpose: To make community infrastructure development responsive to community livelihoods		
Indicators	ACR	ICR's Team Findings
• Project prioritization processes uses livelihoods related criteria in at least 75% of NRP-assisted villages • Projects are perceived as responsive to community livelihoods at least in 75% of NRP assisted village communities	Achieved. Projects in all villages were selected on the basis of livelihood criteria. Achieved. Projects were identified through community- wide meetings, involving men and women. Random interviews conducted by the NRP during the implementation of activities and in February 2009 revealed that community members were satisfied with the selection and benefits of their projects.	While projects were identified through community meetings, involving men and women, the interviewed communities did not recognize the use of livelihood criteria during the community discussions/consultations. The Client Satisfactory survey was considered useful. However, more proper methodology for selecting sample and designing questionnaires as well as assigning persons with appropriate skills for collecting information would provide more useful feedback information from beneficiaries.

However, the failure to clearly develop, articulate and implement a strategy of community development, community participation or community contracting has limited the effectiveness (and sustainability) of the community infrastructure activities[5].

Component 1: Small-Scale Community Infrastructure Outcome Objective: To increase the availability of small scale community infrastructure		
• 30 villages (75% of all villages) have completed the construction cycle • Improved access and reduction in women's time burden (Quality small-scale infrastructure provided	- Achieved. 37 villages and a private school run by a local NGO (YHN) – a total of 40 grants completed the construction cycle and the 75% of projects completed in accordance with NRP quality standards The majority of projects include roads, bridges, and water supplies have significantly improved access to clean water, schools, farms, markets, health centers, etc . - Manuals/guidelines for quality infrastructure developed - Manual/guidelines of different types of project meet national quality standards - Emphasis in the Manual was given to the construction of quality concrete pavements where the NRP also introduced appropriate practical tools. O&M plans and schedules developed in at least 50% of villages and NRP assisted 19 villages in developing their O&M regulations, including plans and schedules (19/37 >50%)*	Some delays occurred in the mobilization of the program, leading to significant delays of both implementation and completion of some projects. Beneficiaries have significantly better access to better roads, bridges, and cleaner water supplies, making them more accessible to schools, farms, market, and health centres. Unfortunately no available information regarding the number of community who benefited from the projects. Such information could be easily gathered by the recruited village facilitators through a provision of practical format as a monitoring tool.

While some training activities on construction and maintenance of small scale community infrastructures and governance were carried out, the program's stakeholders and the ICR team noted that the Program did not properly address the capacity needs of the stakeholders. The Program could actually claim more rigorous capacity building exercises through its activities. Unfortunately, the way the project perceives capacity building had been limitedly to training activities, and less taking opportunities to activities that could provide learning by doing and mentoring interventions at the SDO development and community infrastructures. For gender capacity building, for example, instead of exploiting efforts to assess program's approach of how reduction of women's time and work burden in practical gender related issues in small infrastructures, including issues of gendered

[5] The community development aspect of the Program could be challenged in terms of lack of community ownership and encouraging community dependencies through the use of paid community labour to implement the community infrastructure program.

division of labour and women and children's safety, i.e. water supply infrastructure, which could be assessed quite easily by village facilitators. Below are more specific notes on each components of the Program, referring to the ACR's formats.

Component 2: Community Engagement Strengthening Outcome Objective: To increase community capacities for small scale community infrastructures development		
30 villages have completed the infrastructure management cycle	37 villages and 1 private school (YHN) completed their infrastructure management cycles. Specific notes from the ACR are : (1) increased the capacity of local communities in community infrastructure planning, construction, O&M ; (2) assisted the establishment of Village Activity Management Committees (VAMC) in all villages; (3) provided comprehensive project management training, direct technical assistance and ongoing facilitation through all stages of the infrastructure cycle; (4) increased participation for women and provided motivation and support for women to be involved in the election and representation on village committees; (5) provided assistance to at least 50% of villages in processing formal village legislation to guide the operations and maintenance of their infrastructures; (6) provided assistance to the district and subdistrict governments to develop formal policy guidelines on how villages should legislate. This policy has now been issued as an official decree by the Head of South Nias district (Bupati). This is the first initiative of its kind in South Nias district which will have a significant long-term future impact for all villages in the district; (7) assisted the district and sub-district governments to train village leaders in village governance and the drafting of legislation.	It can be said that the NRP's infrastructure management cycle within the NRP's community infrastructure projects was completed. While the ACR of the NRP claimed to be able to increase the capacity of local community infrastructure planning, construction, and O&M, the implemented community engagements, which were carried out through about 3-4 *Musyawarah Desa/Musdes* or village consultative meetings and were done for about 3 -4 hours for each meeting, considered very limited to enable meaningful engagements for the community to learn from. The VAMC was established only for the NRP's purpose. After the NRP ended, the VAMC ceased to exist. Women participated during the Musdes, and resulted VAMC. No information was available on how they participated in the final decision of selecting the infrastructure that would be funded by the village grant. Some interviewed women, however, indicated that they actually found that provision of water systems were preferred or similarly critical, as compared to the rural roads. Perdes development considered useful. Operationalization and sustainability of the Perdes, unfortunately, was not well planned and strategized. No information and claims were made by the Kabupaten and Kecamatan officials that they were part of the trainer's team on the drafting of legislation. Kecamatan officials reported their attendance during the opening of the training.

Annex 7 Community Infrastructure Developed

(see separate PDF file)

Annex 8 Notes on NRP Infrastructure Constructed

(Based on NRP reports and field visit inspections. Some of these issues have possibly arisen since the MC completed their inputs))

District	Village	Sub-project	Issues Observed (or noted in Community Infrastructure Completion Report - CICR)	Noted in CICR
1. SDOs				
Lahusa			Generator needing repairs after less than 12 months use, security bars on windows, lining under rear eave falling off, one toilet not working. Generator kept inside building rather than in supplied security cage outside (which was probably too small).	
Amandraya			Generator, security on windows, slipping embankment around building, poor drainage around building, lining under rear eave falling off. Generator kept inside building rather than in supplied security cage outside (which was probably too small).	
Lolowau			Generator, security on windows, slipping embankment around building, poor drainage around building, no functioning water supply (taps off pipes in toilets, no water in tanks), blocked toilet drainage, fence pulled down in place of gateway. Generator kept inside building rather than in supplied security cage outside (which was probably too small).	
Hilimegai			Generator (very cheap and nasty, electric start already broken and air filter missing), security, water pipes close to surface, non functioning toilet, badly fractured poor quality concrete in main entry driveway (very obvious)	
Lolomatua			Generally good except for water leak marks in office ceiling and security. Section of fence pulled down where there should be a gate. Generator kept inside building rather than in supplied security cage outside (which was probably too small).	
2. Community Infrastructure				
Amandraya	Hilimbowo	Village road	Undercutting of bridge abutments (ICRT)	Yes
			Truck restriction barrier cut down	No (but concern expressed on bridge overloading)
	Sisarahlil	Suspension bridge	Erosion under embankments	
	Susua 1		Lack of lateral stays. Bridge deck stolen	Yes
		Retaining wall	Being undercut by meandering stream	
	Tuindrao	Water supply	Not functioning properly, very low flows into tanks with lowest tank dry during day	No. Surprising given PMSG interest.
Teluk Dalam	Bawodabara 1	Concrete track (1 m)	Concrete 75 %	Yes
	Bawodabara 2	Concrete path	Box culverts only 60 %. No comment on what to do	Yes
	Hilimaenamolo	Concrete path	Concrete 67 %. Box culvert fair Built Nov 2008	Yes
	Hilimaetaniha	Concrete path	Retaining wall and path across slope failed due to poorly compacted fill	Yes
	Hilindrasoniha	Drainage	Drain ponding in parts (ICRT)	Yes
	Hilisondrekha	Bridge	Bridge failed. Suggested relocation – but who to do?	Yes
	Siwalawa	Concrete path	Concrete 67 %	Yes
	Yayasan Harapan	Water supply	Poor pipe installation, 70-80 % installation / construction standard	Yes

District	Village	Sub-project	Issues Observed (or noted in Community Infrastructure Completion Report - CICR)	Noted in CICR
	Nias			
Lolowau	Bawohosi	Telford road	Photos show a very rough finsh	Yes
	Federo Ewo	Concrete path	Concrete 63 % march 2009	Yes
	Hilimbowo	Concrete path	Concrete 74 % Oct 2008 (ICRT)	Yes
	Lowohawa	Telford road	Road surface becomes quite rough towards end. Also steep slope up from main culvert and village at end. Probably too steep for vehicles, > 15 % (ICRT)	Yes but no comment
	Maluo	Concrete path, Telford road	Concrete 18 % June 2008	
	Olayama 1	Twin concrete paths	With twin paths 4 wheel vehicles can travel down them (spacing in picture is ideal). This will really challenge the life of the paths.	
	Sisarahili Ekholo	Concrete, Telford path	Concrete 63 % Feb 2009	
	Sisa Huruna	Concrete path	Concrete 43 % March 20009	
	Talio	Steel bridge	Sides on the bridge are too low (ICRT and villager comments) Deck seems very light material – will it stand up to 250 kg wheel loads from motorbikes. Also will it have 10 year life? It will be dangerous as steel deck deteriorates and rust holes develop, particularly for school children who will use it each day.	
Lolomatua	Amorosa	Water supply	Hazard / risk assessment is generic and should have been dealt with in preparation phase	Yes
	Hiotalua	Concrete path	ICRT walked first section of path. Description of steps does not seem correct. Issues with steep slopes should have been dealt with in design / construction phase.	Yes
	Hiliwaebu	Concrete paths (twin)	If vehicles use will challenge life of paths	
	Koendrafo	Concrete path	Identified weak foundations in short section which should have been identified by engineering facilitator during construction	Yes
	Lawa-lawa Luo	Suspension bridge	ICRT. Suspension turnbuckles loose, broken welds on safety fence on east side, CICR notes bridge not closely built to design. Painting is average with kangaroo signs welded on without rust proof painting the welds. Weld quality is average in observable locations so ?? on non visible welds. As with Talio bridge built by same contractor - Tiara, the deck seems very light with associated maintenance and safe working life issues.	
	Marao	2 m concrete path	As only finished in March 2009, surprising that issues of surface water scouring along path and slopes above and below path already failing were noted in February 2009.	Yes
	Tuhemberua (best estimate)	Spring tappings and short path	ICRT. The description (and others checked) does not fit the site visited. Path down to spring and washing area is too steep and will be dangerous for women and children carrying water or going down to use facilities. The path should be made as steps (see ICR recommendation). The old unused spring source tank is dangerous as there is no way to get out if a small person slides in. The spring source is directly below houses on the road raising queries on water quality	Generic water supply hazard and risk assessment

Annex 9 Issues Relating to Construction and Completion Issues Raised in Draft Completion Report

1. There are some outstanding construction and completion issues in the SDOs which reduce the amenity of the new facilities and leave some safety and/or security issues.

Recommendation:

R #1 Sub-district Offices:

AusAID should consider rectifying current problems in the SDOs due to a lack of security grilles for windows, inadequate / non functioning water supplies, unstable and poorly drained embankments around the structures, low quality generators and removal of waste building materials. Further details are provided in Annex 8.

2. Much of the community infrastructure has been developed to a good standard and is being widely used by community members reducing travel times, providing improved access during the wet season and improving living conditions within the villages. The ICR (and CICR) identified some sub-projects where immediate attention is needed to complete construction work properly or implement O&M activities to lengthen the life of the provided infrastructure.

R #2 Water supplies:

R# 2.1 Tuindrao AusAID should arrange for an appropriate organisation (GOI or NGO) to support the current water system management committee to make the system fully functional as designed and to provide short term support to the committee to manage O&M the water system sustainably;

R#2.2 Lolomatua (Tuhemberua): The current steep pathway to the washing facilities should be replaced with steps to reduce the chance of injuries to women and children who fetch and transport water.

R# 3 Bridges:

R#3.1 Lawa - lawa Luo The construction contractor be contracted to update the O&M training processes using current problems with loose turnbuckles and broken welds as examples of how the O&M should be undertaken.

R#3.2 Talio AusAID should review the safety of the low sides on the bridge and consider increasing the height.

R#3.3 Hilimbowo and Sisarahali Susua (Amandraya) bridges On both bridges the abutments are being undercut by the streams and additional protection with gabions should be added.

R#3.4 Maintenance of Hilisondrekha bridge. The CICR indicates that there are problems with the bridge. The contractor should carry out a safety inspection and conduct a basic training to the community's team for maintenance and security.

R# 4 Paths and Roads

R#4.1 Hilisimaetano path road. Problems in the critically eroded land that was found in Hilisimaetano's path road should be reviewed reduce further erosion, which might inflict detrimental costs among the community, if it is not responded. While some discussions between the program staff and the community to build bamboo embankment reinforcement occurred, this has not occurred.