

Nias Reconstruction Program

Aidworks Number:

INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT

Ian Teese Team Leader and Evaluation Specialist

Ms Leya Cattleya Community Development and Gender Specialist

December 2009

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

AID Activity Summary

Location

Executive Summary

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Activity Background	1
1.2	The Nias Reconstruction Program	2
1.3	Evaluation Process	3
1.4	Acknowledgements	4
2	RELEVANCE	4
2.1	Objectives	4
2.2	Activity Design and Links to Overall Aceh/Nias Programs	4
3	EFFECTIVENESS	5
3.1	Achievement of Objectives	5
3.2	Standard of Outputs	9
3.3	Benefits	9
4	EFFICIENCY	10
4.1	Timeliness and Appropriateness	10
4.2	Value for Money	11
4.3	Implementation	12
4.4	AusAID Management and Monitoring	14
4.5	Sector Stakeholder Monitoring	15
5	SUSTAINABILITY	16
5.1	Institutional Capacity	16
5.2	Community Links	16
5.3	Recurrent Costs	17
5.4	Remaining Construction or O&M Issues	18
6	CROSSCUTTING ISSUES	18
6.1	Gender and Disadvantaged Groups	18
6.2	Environmental Issues	19
6.3	Anti-Corruption	20
7	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	20
7.1	Monitoring and Evaluation Processes	20
7.2	Contribution to Improved Recovery Processes	21
8	ANALYSIS AND LEARNING	21
9	IMPACT	22
10	CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED	23
10.1	Overall Assessment	23
10.2	Conclusions and Recommendations	23
10.3	Lessons and Good Practice	25

List of Tables

Table 1	NRP Design In PDD	2
Table 2	Final NRP Design	2
Table 3	ICR Team Findings on Purpose Level Achievements	5
Table 4	Infrastructure Constructed During NRP	6
Table 5	Achievement of Outputs	6
Table 6	Summary – Whole Project	11
Table 7	Summary Community Infrastructure	12
Table 8	Indicative Costing For ILO Community Infrastructure Component of LEDP	12
Table 9	NRP and KDP Community Participation Models	13
Table 10	NRP Final Logframe Indicators	20
Table 11	Evaluation Ratings at Completion	23

Annexes

Annex 1	Evaluation Terms of Reference
Annex 2	Program Logframe
Annex 3	People Consulted
Annex 4	Draft Aide Memoire Presented
Annex 5	Program Key Dates
Annex 6	Observations of ICR Team on Program Achievements
Annex 7	Community Infrastructure Developed
Annex 8	Issues Noted with Sub-projects
Annex 8	Issues Relating to Construction and Completion Issues Raised in Draft Completion Report

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACR	Activity completion report (for AusAID)
AIPRD	Australia Indonesia Partnership for Reconstruction and Development
AMDAL	Environmental Impact Assessment
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
Bupati	Head of the District Government
BRR	Badan Rehabilitasi dan Rekonstruksi (Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Agency for Aceh)
Camat	Head of Sub District
CICR	Community infrastructure completion reports
Coffey	Coffey International Development
CPG	Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines
Desa	village
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GOI	Government of Indonesia
IASTP	Indonesia-Australia Specialised Training Project
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMT	Infrastructure Monitoring Team
Kabupaten	District
KDP	(World Bank funded) Kecamatan Development Program
Kecamatan	Sub-district
Kimpreswil	Dinas Permuliman dan Prasarana Wilayah (District Infrastructure (roads, etc.) Department)
LEDP	Livelihood and Economic Development Project
MC	(AusAID) Managing contractor – Coffey International Development
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
Musdes	Musyawah Desa (village consultative meetings)
NGO	Non Government Organisation
Nisel	Kabupaten Nias Selatan (South Nias District)
NRP	Nias Reconstruction Program
O&M	(infrastructure) operations and maintenance
PCC	Program Co-ordinating Committee
PDD	Program Design Document
Perdes	Village regulations
PMSG	Program Monitoring and Support Group
SDO	Sub-district (kecamatan) offices)
SEKDA	District Secretary
SUMUT	Sumatra Utara (North Sumatra)
SWGs	Sector Working Groups
VAMC	Village Activity Management Committee
YHN	Yayasan Narapan Nias (a local NGO which the Program supported)

Disclaimer: The views expressed in the evaluation are those of the author only, and do not represent the views of the Government of Indonesia or the Government of Australia.

AID Activity Summary

Aid Activity Name		Nias Reconstruction Program	
AidWorks initiative number			
Commencement date	August 2006 (interim phase) January 2007 (AMC)	Completion date	April 2009
Total Australian AUD		\$8,720,844	
Total other AUD			
Delivery organisation(s)		Coffey International Development	
Implementing Partner(s)		The Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency for Aceh and Nias (BRR NAD-Nias) and the District Government of South Nias	
Country/Region		Indonesia	
Primary Sector			

Program Location and Sites



Executive Summary

Evaluation Background

The Governments of Indonesia (GOI) and Australia, 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 GOI implementation of policies to decentralise government responsibilities; and, (iv) issues of *poverty, isolation, conflict and reconstruction* in Nias. Following a NRP design mission in March 2006, the Australia Indonesia Partnership for Reconstruction and Development approved an AUD 10 million commitment to support reconstruction in Kecamatan Nias Selatan (Nisel).

Activity Design

The draft program design document (PDD) proposed a three year program focusing on Nisel to support the work of the newly established GOI Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency (BRR). It included: village infrastructure, support to livelihoods, support to BRR, rebuilding sub-district offices (SDO) and capacity building for local government but there was limited detail on implementation. To speed up implementation, an interim phase prior to the appointment of the NRP managing contractor (MC) was implemented for further on-the-ground assessments, particularly of infrastructure development strategies, implementation of the livelihoods activities, and to prepare initial activities in Tuindrao town and kecamatan Amandraya.

After mobilisation of the MC, Coffey International Development (Coffey), in January 2007 the design continued to evolve until September 2007 when it was decided that, due to the limited remaining time available, the Program would focus on developing community infrastructure, strengthening community engagements and improving local government facilities and capacity at kecamatan level. The final logframe focused on outputs with less attention to outcomes and impacts.

The final design included: construction of six new kecamatan (sub-district) offices (SDO) (a further three SDO were added) and community infrastructure in Teluk Dalam, Amandraya, Lolowa'u and Lolomatua kecamatans, and training provided mostly at community and kecamatan level. Village facilitators assisted the communities plan and implement these activities. The implementing team were mainly national staff and sub-contractors with limited inputs from international consultants.

Findings

Impact: The construction activities added much needed SDOs and community level infrastructure in Nisel. Kabupaten and kecamatan government officials were very complementary about the designs and standard of the infrastructure provided. The village access paths and bridges constructed provided greatly improved access for households living in remote villages of Nisel. 37 villages have improved community infrastructure that will directly benefit up to 78,000 village members and, in the case of the bridges and pathway construction, even more households in villages which did not take part of the construction processes but who use the infrastructure regularly. It was estimated that more than 22,000 farmers including 15,000 rubber farms would benefit from the improved pathways and bridges. The improved water supplies and drainage systems improved living conditions in the villages.

Relevance: The NRP concept was highly relevant to the recovery activities and to supporting development in a severely disadvantaged remote area of Indonesia which was (and is still) not serviced by other donors. There are strong relationships between Nisel and Australia through the tragic helicopter crash and also a much longer engagement through Australians visiting Sorake surf beach.

Effectiveness: The Program largely met the final design objectives which focused on outputs of infrastructure and capacity building material. The initial design and PDD were much closer to a feasibility study so the lack of design and community engagement strategies and structures, and subsequent further development of the program design contributed to the very slow start up to program activities and limited the program benefits and sustainability. Implementation did not link reduction of women's time and work burden to practical gender

related issues in small infrastructures, including gendered division of labour and women and children's safety with water supply infrastructure.

Efficiency: The Program has delivered infrastructure built to a higher standard than would be achieved through normal GOI processes due to higher design and construction standards which increased the construction and supervision costs. Unless adequate operations and maintenance (O&M) funds are provided by GOI, the benefits of the higher construction quality will be greatly reduced. The relatively large team of village facilitators did not increase the costs of community infrastructure compared to activities implemented by agencies such as the International Labour Organisation (ILO). 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 for facilitators to provide ongoing support.

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

Sustainability: While the SDO designs were, in general, appropriate, they have not minimised ongoing O&M costs. Also there were no specific O&M clauses in the hand over documentation. 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. Recommendations are made on where further AusAID inputs should be considered to enhance the sustainability of program investments.

Gender and Disadvantaged Groups: Efforts to adequately address gender equality concerns were mainly limited to reporting of female and male participation and representation in program activities. Gender analysis considering issues of gendered division of labour in community infrastructure, lack of recognition to women's contribution to infrastructure works, and issues of male and youth unemployment in Nisel were not exploited to improve gender relation in the targeted area. Gender related training used generic and traditional material and approaches, and neglected the use of more tailored and appropriate practical tools linking to small infrastructure development and O&M activities. There was limited definition of vulnerable or disadvantaged groups or articulation of how these groups could be included limiting the addressing of the group needs.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Because of the long period spent finalising the program design, the program M&E framework was not finalised until May 2008. It focused on activities and outputs rather than outcomes and impacts. Even though the Program had a large field team working in the communities, the AMC 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 indicators specified in the higher levels of the program logframe.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

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 and INDII.

Lessons:

Development of community infrastructure

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. The engagement of the community at large through the establishment of VAMCs along with the provision of training and on-the-job technical assistance proved to be significant in strengthening their capacities not only in the implementation of their infrastructure development but also in broader village governance terms.
4. An embodied accountability mechanism could be developed within the program's system, for example in the procurement panel of SDO development, in involving representative of community members as the signatory of village grant agreement and in the hand over of infrastructures, as well as in building embodied incentive mechanisms for promoting performance and local governance in the program's human resource management, procurement, and within the community's mechanisms (VAMC).

Community Development Processes

5. Longer inputs by a long-term community development expert and integrated inputs by short term gender specialists with proven experiences in similar infrastructure program would improve the soft aspects of community infrastructure activities.
6. Gender issues need to be addressed by all community members (and implementation team members). Awareness building and specific gender related training should be provided for male and female community members.

Response to Natural Disasters

7. In a disaster response and recovery situation, the use of a design and implement contractor (overseen by an appropriate advisory group) building on an agreed project concept and basic design may be more efficient, responsive and reduce the lag time for implementation.
8. Effective capacity building requires empowerment of the target groups to use the knowledge and skills provided through training. In an infrastructure reconstruction scenario, insufficient time is usually allowed for O&M (and further infrastructure development) processes to be implemented before the close of the programs.

Implementation Modality

9. A community construction program that attempts to promote community-managed processes requires a longer implementation period than if implementation is driven by the managing contractor in full control of the procurement and supervision processes. This longer implementation period (with associated community facilitation and empowerment and ownership of the planned infrastructure) may, however, lead to the infrastructure being better maintained and having a longer life (for example, issues with the Tuindrao water supplies). Also stronger and more motivated community groups are more likely to seek funding for additional community infrastructure from both GOI and other donor sources.
10. Development of close working relationships with community groups to plan and develop community infrastructure activities requires a balance of social, and language skills with technical knowledge. For NRP, this balance between technical skills and community engagement experience contributed to community buy-in and ownership as well as producing quality outcomes.

Good Practice

11. The engagement of the community at large through the establishment of VAMCs along with the provision of training and on-the-job technical assistance strengthened their capacities not only in the implementation of their infrastructure development but also in broader village governance terms.
12. The Program's focus on South Nias and establishment of small base camps in two sub-districts are considered good practices

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Activity Background

1.1.1 Policy Setting

In 2001, the Government of Indonesia (GOI) began a decentralisation process. Although the success of decentralisation exceeded expectations many challenges remained. In poorer regions, including Nias Island, low community participation, low capacity, rent seeking, and generally poor performance constrained effective service delivery. Local governments also struggled to generate adequate revenue¹.

Nias Island has not received the same degree of development support from government as other parts of North Sumatra and Indonesia despite poverty levels on Nias being significantly above the national average². Within Nias, per capita average incomes in Nias District (the northern part of Nias Island) are about double those of South Nias District (Nisel)³ reinforcing that Nisel needs more assistance than the northern district. However, few donors had (and have) worked in Nisel. This is partly due to more difficult access and physical conditions, and also donors' perceptions that Nisel was socially volatile and difficult.

GOI has had massive challenges of reconstruction and rehabilitation after the December 2004 earthquake and associated tsunami mainly affecting Aceh and the March 2005 earthquake and tsunami directly affecting Nias. The earthquakes caused significant loss of life, severe social and economic disruption, and extensive damage to housing and all aspects of physical and social infrastructure⁴.

To expedite recovery and rehabilitation, GOI established the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency (BRR) as the agency responsible for coordination, implementation and monitoring reconstruction. Most reconstruction financing on Nias came from GOI and was channelled through BRR. In December 2005, BRR conducted a Nias Stakeholders meeting which identified a significant need for physical infrastructure including village roads and water supplies. AusAID and the World Bank conducted a joint scoping mission to Nias in January 2006 which confirmed the existence and importance of the identified infrastructure problems.

Earlier in April 2005, an Australia Navy Sea King helicopter providing emergency support crashed in Tuindrao village, Nisel, killing nine crew members creating awareness and linkages between the Nisel area and Australia.

The Australia Indonesia Partnership for Reconstruction and Development (AIPRD) was established to assist Indonesia's post-tsunami reconstruction and development efforts within and beyond Aceh. After the scoping mission, the AIPRD Secretaries Committee approved an AUD 10 million commitment to support reconstruction on Nias and directed that the design of a Nias Reconstruction Program (NRP) proceed.

1.1.2 Program Formulation and Design

A design mission for NRP was undertaken in March 2006. The main development issues in Nisel at this time could be summarized as: *Poverty, Isolation, Conflict and Reconstruction*. The draft program design document (PDD) recommended assistance for a three year program focus in the South Nias District (Nisel) and outlined two major components as set out in the following summary logframe. The degree of detail and analysis in this draft design document (summarized in the above summary logframe) could be more closely aligned to a feasibility study. The village infrastructure sub-component would work closely with and through the nationwide GOI Kecamatan Development Program (KDP).

¹ NRP PDD paragraph 11, pg 2

² According to the World Bank (2006), 'more than one third of the population – twice the national average – lived below the poverty line before the tsunami struck' (p. 125).

³ NRP PDD paragraph 24, pg 4

⁴ NRP PDD paragraph 14, pg 2

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 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 to support further on-the-ground assessments, 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 for these tasks in August 2007.

1.2 The Nias Reconstruction Program

The successful managing contractor (MC), Coffey International Development (Coffey), fielded its implementation team in January 2007 and took over responsibility for the interim activities. Some staff continued from the interim team. The design continued to evolve until September 2007 when agreement was reached that, due to the limited remaining time⁵, 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 and focused on outputs with limited attention to outcomes and impacts. The final logframe is provided in Annex 2.

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

⁵ AusAID wished to finish inputs to the reconstruction process by the time the BRR mandate was completed in early 2009.
Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

Main features of the final design included:

- (i) Construction of six new kecamatan (sub-district) offices (SDO) including office areas, a client service area and a covered meeting area built to standards that would ensure at least a 10 year life. As additional funds were made available, a further three main SDO offices (without the meeting area and additional offices) were added to the program.
- (ii) Funds were allocated for community infrastructure with a menu of village footpaths, light roads, drainage improvement, specialised light bridges and water supply and improved sanitation. KDP systems and processes of project selection, financial management and community engagement, were used with some modifications. However, the NRP implemented activities independently from the KDP and provided block grants and technical assistance directly to selected villages⁶.
- (iii) Communities received payments⁷ for labour contributed to the community infrastructure activities. Village development and infrastructure facilitators were employed by the Program to facilitate and assist the village communities implement their priority activities and manage fund disbursements.
- (iv) All contractors for program construction and services were contracted using Australian tender processes and documentation and were supervised by program funded supervision contractors⁸.
- (v) Training was provided mostly at community and kecamatan level with some provided at kabupaten (district) level (the only course was provided through the now completed Indonesia-Australia Specialised Training Project (IASTP) Phase III).
- (vi) The Program worked across villages in four kecamatans – Teluk Dalam, Amandraya, Lolowa'u and Lolomatua.

As for other AusAID projects and programs supporting the Aceh / Nias recovery activities, the AusAID Program Monitoring and Support Group (PMSG) and the Infrastructure Monitoring Team (IMT) provided monitoring and program design inputs to the NRP. The PMSG inputs in April 2008 identified key issues and proposed processes for resolving these issues.

1.3 Evaluation Process

AusAID commissioned preparation of this ICR as part of its internal quality management systems. The evaluation terms of reference are provided in Annex 1.

1.3.1 Evaluation Objectives and Questions

In addition to the standard evaluation questions on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, the main evaluation objectives and questions defined by AusAID included:

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

1.3.2 Evaluation Scope and Methods

Information sources included contractor reports plus reports by the AusAID PMSG and IMT. After a briefing by AusAID Jakarta, the ICR team visited the program area in Nisel and met with a range of program stakeholders including participating communities. The meetings between the Team and program stakeholders and participating communities and former program's facilitators were arranged with assistance from former

⁶ Instead of working with and through the KDP on-budget (GOI budgeting processes) and kecamatan sub-district level inter-village processes.

⁷ These payments were usually Rps.40,000 – Rps.50,000 per day which was higher than comparable rates for other day labour in the program area.

⁸ For the last SDOs, the Program directly contracted the construction supervision staff.

program's facilitators in addition to adhoc meetings with village informants during the village field visits. Six SDOs from Lahasa to Lalomatoa were visited together with more than eight communities where NRP activities had been implemented (locations and a list of people met are detailed in Annex 3). The Nisel district government was debriefed at the end of the field work.

1.3.3 Evaluation Team

The review team were Ian Teese, team leader / evaluation specialist, and Ms Leya Cattleya, Jakarta based gender and community development specialist. During the field visit, former program staff provided organisation, guidance and interpretation support. The Team worked in Indonesia from 3-12 August 2009 and visited Nias from 4-10 August. A draft aide memoire (provided in Annex 4) was circulated and then discussed with AusAID and Coffey before the end of the mission.

1.4 Acknowledgements

The ICR team greatly valued the insights and experience of the stakeholders at kabupaten, kecamatan and village level. Coffey 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. AusAID Jakarta staff provided guidance and feedback on the ICR team's activities.

2 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 and Nisel surf beaches.

2.1 Objectives

The objectives proposed in the initial design study (Table 1) were weak and poorly defined. The final component objectives (Table 2) were relevant to the situation but did not practically link to the purpose level objective – 'To make community infrastructure development responsive to community livelihoods'. The objectives were also output oriented rather than addressing medium term outcomes and improving processes so that the limited GOI / GOA inputs and outputs would be developed further after the end of the Program.

2.2 Activity Design and Links to Overall Aceh/Nias Programs

As outlined above, the design process for the program was less than satisfactory. The objectives (and outputs) identified in the March 2006 study were too vague and not cohesively linked. The ongoing discussions during the interim and inception phases on the relative importance and resources to be allocated to reconstruction, community infrastructure, capacity building and livelihoods were not satisfactorily resolved until September 2007 with leadership from the AusAID PMSG team. At this stage, it was agreed to focus on the SDOs, community infrastructure and some capacity building, particularly at village and kecamatan level.

Although the reduced time available before the proposed closure date⁹ may have limited opportunities for developing livelihoods activities and enhancing capacity building, the inability of the program (and AusAID) processes to effectively resolve these issues quickly, reduced program effectiveness.

The objectives and activities included in the NRP were consistent with the activities in other AusAID supported activities across Aceh and Nias. Attempts were made to learn from the recovery activities that had already started in Aceh through study tours, etc. Despite these efforts and the experiences of the MC in Aceh recovery programs, program management struggled during the first eight months of the Program to quickly build on the Aceh experience and the work undertaken during the interim phase.

⁹ When BRR completed its mandate. For Nias this was in November 2008. For Aceh - April 2009.
Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

3 EFFECTIVENESS

3.1 Achievement of Objectives

The Program largely met the objectives defined in the final program design which focused on outputs of infrastructure and capacity building material. A listing of program key dates is provided in Annex 5. A comparison of the achievements outlined in the activity completion report (ACR) and observations by the ICR team is provided in Annex 6. A summary for the purpose level indicators is provided below. A detailed list of participating villages and the activities undertaken is included as Annex 7.

Table 3 ICR Team Findings on Purpose Level Achievements

Purpose: To make community infrastructure development responsive to community livelihoods		
Indicators	ACR	ICR Team Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The Client Satisfactory survey was considered useful. However, more proper methodology for selecting sample and designing questionnaires as well as assigning persons/enumerators with appropriate skills for collecting information would provide more useful feedback information from beneficiaries.</p>

Beneficiaries have significantly improved access to better roads, bridges, and cleaner water supplies, making them more accessible to schools, farms, market, and health centres. Unfortunately, information regarding the number of community who benefited from the projects has not been collated. Such information could have been easily gathered by the recruited village facilitators through a provision of practical format as a monitoring tool. Information on beneficiaries that were disaggregated by gender and income levels could also be easily collected by using such monitoring tool. Also limited attempts were made in the draft ACR to quantify these benefits. Additional information has been provided in response to the draft ICR as follows and in Section 9.

The 1 km ring road at Bawozaua near Teluk Dalam.

This ring road had been originally built by the local government and then rebuilt by other donors. When NRP first engaged the community they wanted the road rebuilt but were reluctant to proceed as they felt NRP would be just like the other donors and the government; that is, do the job quickly and then go away leaving sub-standard infrastructure. NRP continued consultation and in 2007 supported the community to rebuild the road and cover it with bitumen to a much higher standard than previously. It has now been over 18 months since this road was completed and it is one of the very few roads in Nias without potholes. This is testament not only to the NRP's community consultative and quality processes but more importantly to the motivation of the local community to maintain, build on and leverage further development from the quality infrastructure provided. On the day that AusAID and Coffey staff arrived on 22 October 2009 the community were building a cement road from the NRP ring road to their new school 50 meters away. Even though delivery trucks had been delivering steel, cement and bricks to the school the road remained in excellent condition.

Source: Response to the Draft Independent Completion Report Oct 2009

The functionality of the infrastructure built was, in general, appropriate. However, program implementation may have been improved (and speeded up) if the strategy for community engagement (community development, community participation or community contracting) had been resolved more quickly. This delay in developing the strategy has reduced the effectiveness (and sustainability¹⁰) of the community infrastructure activities. AusAID design processes and tasking processes to mobilise the interim team were partially responsible for the delays in finalising in the first 10 months until the MC was mobilised. However, a further nine months was needed for AusAID and

MC to finalise the implementation processes.

¹⁰ 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.
Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

Coffey's approach in using mainly a national program team with a high relative proportion of facilitators from Nias¹¹ was effective in accelerating implementation. An issue not resolved 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.

(a) Community Infrastructure

More than 62 community infrastructure activities were implemented in 37 villages. The details of this construction are set out in Table 4 sourced from the draft program booklet prepared by Coffey.

Table 4 Infrastructure Constructed During NRP

Type of facilities	Total volume	Unit	Located in
Concrete pavement road	37,297	m	33 Villages
Telford	3,287	m	4 Villages
Drainage	1,723	m	5 Villages
Retaining wall	1,647	m	17 Villages
Asphalting	1,000	m	1 Village
Box culvert	294	unit	27 Villages
Gabion wall for rivers	220	m	2 Villages
Spring capture	17	Unit	5 Villages
Water distribution tank	11	unit	3 Villages
Water piping system	11	unit	5 Villages
Reservoir	11	unit	3 Villages
Rain catchment	6	unit	1 Villages
Public latrine	3	unit	3 Villages
Bridge (width 3 m, span < 6 m)	3	unit	2 Villages
Concrete bridge (width 4.5 m, span > 6 m)	2	unit	1 Villages
Suspension bridge (New)	2	unit	1 Villages
Suspension bridge (Rehabilitated)	1	unit	1 Village
Spring catchment	1	unit	1 Village
Concrete stair	1	unit	1 Village
Gutter provision	1	unit	1 Village

Program records indicate that about 75 % of the sub-projects met the standards set by NRP. For this component, the MC ACR documented the Program achieved the three logframe outputs as follows.

Table 5 Achievement of Outputs

Program Output	Indicator	Achievement
Quality small-scale infrastructure provided	75% of projects completed in accordance with NRP quality standards	Achieved. Of the planned 64 projects, 62 were completed. Completed projects met NRP quality standard. See details in ACR annex F
Manuals/guidelines for quality infrastructure developed	Manual/guidelines of different types of project meet national quality standards	Achieved. Emphasis in the annual was given to the construction of quality concrete pavements where the NRP also introduced appropriate practical tools.
O&M plans and schedule developed	O&M plans and schedules developed in at least 50% of villages	Achieved. NRP assisted 19 villages in developing their O&M regulations, including plans and schedules (19/37 >50%)*

¹¹ The ICR team acknowledges the difficulties in recruiting facilitators with these unusual skill requirements and the competition from many other recovery projects for experienced facilitators.
Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

(b) Local government offices

An initial issue in this component was whether some of the existing SDOs should be rehabilitated or rebuilt. There had been little earthquake damage to the existing structures but they were very rundown and the designs were not conducive to implementation of the 'one stop (roof / door)' process for servicing community needs as articulated in the GOI decentralisation processes. They also had limited office furniture and no computers. The 2007 redesign mission recommended building and equipping new facilities.

Six SDOs were originally planned with office space for the Camat and kecamatan staff, an open meeting area and a separate office area for use for women related activities by *Dharma Wanita*. In 2008, it was agreed to build three more SDOs with only the main office building in newly formed kecamatans split from the initial participating kecamatans.

While SDOs were developed, during the ICR team visit, it was noted that only few of them have made full use of the supported facilities and much of the office spaces of SDOs were mostly empty. The 'one stop' service counter included in each SDO was being used in two out of five SDOs visited. The SDOs of Kecamatan Maniamolo and Lolowa'u, for example, have put announcements on front of the counter on a list of services that it provides, differentiated different colours of folders for different services, and also have established and presented the paperwork flows of the service counter. In fact, Kecamatan Maniamolo, which is a newly established kecamatan, reported that the new SDOs have served more people. It was reported by the Camat Maniamolo that by April 9, 2009, over 500 ID cards, about 100 birth certificates of both new born babies and children who have had no birth certificates, and 25 business permits had been served.

In other SDOs, the counter was either not accessible¹² or not used correctly. In Kecamatan Amandraya, for example, the kecamatan secretary used his office window as a counter for providing community services to visiting community members. While there are several reasons for the ineffective or non use of the 'one stop' counter, capacity building activities could have pro-actively introduced practical skills and mechanism for the kecamatan staff to make use of the 'one stop' counter to implement the GOI policy of providing a 'one stop' service to community members visiting the kecamatan offices.

(c) Community engagement strengthening

This work was supported by the development of village activity management committees (VAMC) to facilitate inputs by a cross section of community members to planning, design, construction and maintenance of the constructed infrastructure. The VAMCs were established only for the NRP's purpose. The ICR team found that most of the VAMCs have limited ongoing activity.

Women participated during the Musyawarah Desa (Musdes or village consultative meetings), and the VAMC formed from them. However, no information was available on how they participated in the final decisions of selecting the infrastructure that would be funded by the village grant. Some interviewed women, however, indicated that during the Musdes, they indicated that provision of water systems were preferred or similarly critical, as compared to the rural roads or drainage supported by the men in the villages.

The ACR observed that the infrastructure management cycle within NRP's community infrastructure projects was completed. While the ACR claimed an increase in the capacity of local community infrastructure planning, construction, and O&M, the implemented community engagements, implemented through 3-4 Musdes with 3 - 4 hours for each meeting, were considered very limited to enable meaningful engagements for the community to learn from.

(d) Capacity building

The Program implemented a range of training as a main capacity building activities at community level with training for male and female village leaders and community members. Detailed breakdowns of the composition of the participants of training courses are provided in the ACR.

¹² Office furniture was placed in front of the counter of SDO of Kecamatan Amandraya
Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

While some training activities on construction and O&M of community infrastructures and governance were carried out, the program's stakeholders and the ICR team noted that the Program did not fully address the capacity needs of the stakeholders. The Program largely implemented capacity building as training activities, and has not taken opportunities to introduce activities that could provide learning by doing and mentoring interventions at the SDO development and community infrastructures.

For gender capacity building, for example, the Program did not explore ways to implement the program's approach to reducing women's time and work burden in practical gender related issues in small infrastructure activities, including issues of gendered division of labour and women and children's safety, i.e. water supply infrastructure, which could be assessed quite easily by the village facilitators.

The Program had not used a strategic approach to using capacity building activities as an effective mechanism to encourage learning among village communities and to enhance performance of VAMC members, as part of promoting good local governance. The Team noted the Program had not pro-actively followed up relevant opportunities (for example: leadership training) to engage with the existing capacity building programs that were carried out by the villages to strengthen the program's results. For example, leadership training planned for later in the Program was not conducted as the implementation team considered that similar training had already been done by the local government¹³. The ICR team believes the recruitment of some village facilitators who were not considered representative of the community's members also reduced the potential of stronger community ties and links that was gained from the program community engagements.

The Program indicated on-the-job/on-site technical trainings were provided to at least 50 people in each village participating in construction works in at least 75% of NRP villages, whereas at least 50% are women¹⁴. However, less attention was given to the level of knowledge enhancement from the on-the-job technical training, which was mostly on improved composition of construction material (stone, cement, and water) for better quality construction. There was limited feedback on improved knowledge and skills of the community with regard to job safety and community-managed village constructions. These training activities were more relevant for the village road constructions, but not for other village infrastructures such as water supply systems and rural bridges.

Although the ACR noted that the kabupaten and kecamatan officials trained village leaders in developing official guidelines (Juklak/Juknis) for villages to formulate village regulations (Perdes) for community infrastructure development¹⁵, interviewed respondents from kabupaten and kecamatan levels reported that their involvement had been more on the coordination of the training. Also, while it was planned for SDO staff to participate in participatory planning training and community development approach, it was difficult to find any SDOs officials who benefited from such training.

(e) Operations and maintenance

The Perdes on operations and maintenance (O&M) developed were considered useful but implementation of the Perdes was not well planned and is not likely to assist sustainability. Using a Peraturan (Regulation) Bupati, Perdes were also developed for later implementation of the O&M processes for the new infrastructure.

The development of Perdes for O&M had involved village leaders who are often elites in the villages. While knowledge on how to develop the Perdes were gained from the program's activities, efforts to sustain the training and to develop results were limited. Awareness raising to the broader community members on the existence of the Perdes and on how the community should participate in making the Perdes operational was not reported by interviewed community members. Monitoring of how the Perdes were implemented has not

¹³ Nias Reconstruction Program, Activity Completion Report page 10, March 2009, page 8

¹⁴ Ibid

¹⁵ Nias Reconstruction Program, Activity Completion Report page 10, March 2009
Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

been developed with no processes observed by the ICR team for kecamatan or kabupaten staff to regularly check O&M activities on the new infrastructure.

The kabupaten and kecamatan officials interviewed did not indicate 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.

3.2 Standard of Outputs

SDOs: The designs of the SDOs were highly regarded by the stakeholders. The SDOs' architectural style was based on the local South Nias style and, with good quality materials, the standard of construction was better than local and BRR's building standards. Most beneficiaries reported the program's infrastructures as stronger than what other donors have developed. The supervising contractor had, in some cases, requested the building contractors and workers to rebuild less than adequate work as per the required condition. This was especially so during the construction of the first SDOs but the quality improved as the same contractors constructed the later SDOs. One contractor constructed five SDOs and achieved a satisfactory standard of work. These efforts have resulted in infrastructure with the required quality.

However the ICR team noted ongoing issues of inadequate building security and ventilation plus some remaining construction, water supply, removal of waste glass and generator problems were noted by kecamatan staff and the ICR team.

3.3 Benefits

Community services: Beneficiaries have significantly improved access to better roads, bridges, and cleaner water supplies, making them more accessible to schools, farms, market, and health centres. 37 villages have improved community infrastructure that will directly benefit up to 78,000 village members and, in the case of the bridges and pathway construction, even more households in villages which did not take part of the construction processes but who use the infrastructure regularly. For example at the Talio bridge, the safety of more than 200 students from villages including and beyond Talio who use the bridge twice daily to go to school has been improved.

The eight SDOs and extensive community infrastructure will improve the access to and services available to households across eight kecamatans in Nisel.

Cash incomes: The Program has contributed cash income to the communities where program infrastructure was developed directly through payment for work on the community infrastructure and also when employed by contractors undertaking work on the SDOs and major community infrastructure. About half of the staff employed by contractors (260) and 3,257¹⁶ village workers, approximately 28% were females. In some cases communities or local contractors provided basic building materials for making concrete. Some will have the opportunities to continue to use these skills with the basic construction equipment that has been distributed to communities and small contractors after the community infrastructure work was completed.

Skills: As for cash incomes, village workers who worked on the SDOs or the community infrastructure developed planning and construction skills which were relevant to their ongoing needs. On the SDOs, these workers were also able to observe and work with the specialised tradesmen brought in to install the steel roof frames and cladding, plastering and other specialised building skills not widely found on Nias.

Improved Communications: The concrete paths, Telford paths and roads and associated culverts and bridges have provided improved access to the 33 villages plus several additional villages beyond the program villages that have also been able to use the new infrastructure (also see Section 9, Impact).

¹⁶ Nias Reconstruction Program, Activity Completion Report page 10, March 2009, Annex, table A.2.
Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

4 EFFICIENCY

4.1 Timeliness and Appropriateness

As already discussed, the initiatives implemented were very appropriate to the needs of the communities in the program area, particularly as immediate relief and recovery efforts had addressed the direct affect of the earthquake and tsunamis on the affected communities.

As the immediate response was managed through emergency support, the time lag between the initial design (March 2006), mobilisation of the MC (January 2007) and finalisation of the design (September 2008) is not as critical but does not reflect well on the implementation partners. The ICR team believe the timeliness of implementation activities was restricted by:

- (i) Evolution of a relatively small program in Nias at a time that GOI and AusAID were mobilising and implementing much larger programs in other parts of Aceh which diverted management attention from development of the NRP;
- (ii) The difficult physical and social conditions in Nisel (also see later note on language);
- (iii) The inadequate initial design (pre-feasibility to feasibility study standard) which was accepted without using the agreed interim phase inputs to develop a more robust design for the implementation contractors to firstly bid against and then facilitate full-scale implementation;
- (iv) The uncertainty of how a potentially valuable, but conceptually more difficult, livelihoods component should be designed and incorporated into the more straight forward infrastructure construction program with supporting capacity building;
- (v) This uncertainty contributing to the initial MC team perhaps not having leadership with a strong understanding of implementing livelihoods and infrastructure programs.
- (vi) The uncertainty on how the community activities should be implemented. With hindsight and given the delays in implementing the final community infrastructure activities, the time necessary to implement the proposed six month preparation phase was not a major constraint. The more significant issue may have been the process of engaging with the community in the development process. Alternatives in this situation are: a. a full community development approach considering all constraints and opportunities; b. a community participation approach which strengthens the community's roles in building and maintaining their priority infrastructure projects; c. a community-managed construction where a democratic village development committee manage constructions such as those used by PEKKA¹⁷ under the KDP or, d. a community contracting arrangement for construction as used by the ILO model;
- (vii) Some constraints as the MC implementation team took over the responsibilities of the interim team and moved into the wider implementation activities;
- (viii) The difficulties in assembling and maintaining a field team with capacity in Bahasa Nias and the ability to live and work in the villages of Nisel.

Given these constraints, the NRP team and AusAID have achieved a credible outcome with the completed SDOs and community infrastructure. A disappointing aspect of the delays in implementation is that the Program was not allocated and did not disburse the initially planned AUD 10 million. After an AUD 1 million increase in the budget in 2008, total expenditure should be about AUD 8.5 million. Thus the main 'cost' of the delays in implementation is that AUD 1.5 million (~40% of actual expenditure on community infrastructure) was not available for additional community infrastructure. If the Program had been implemented in a more timely way, these additional funds could have been used in a 'challenge' fund to fund additional activities in

¹⁷ Perempuan Pemimpin Keluarga, Female Headed Family, a sub-program under the KDP where women headed households managed their construction work. This included consulting the design, buying supplies, recruiting labors, managing the book keeping, and checking on the quality. Houses that built by PEKKA considered the first houses and infrastructures established after the Tsunami in Aceh. PEKKA has operated in Aceh even before the Tsunami occurred in 2004.

communities which demonstrated a commitment to community participation in construction of and O&M of the new infrastructure.

The other main 'cost' of the reduced timeliness is that there was little time left for program staff to support communities implement proposed O&M activities on the completed community infrastructure. Problems that could be expected after 6-12 months and the wet season could not be addressed along with follow-up capacity building in areas where the provided O&M documentation and systems were inadequate.

4.2 Value for Money

4.2.1 Sub-District Offices

The Program has delivered infrastructure built to a higher standard than would be achieved through normal GOI processes or programs, 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 processes¹⁸. Unless adequate O&M funds are provided by GOI, the benefits of the higher construction quality will be greatly reduced.

4.2.2 Community Facilitators

Compared to the KDP and similar GOI or loan supported development activities, or community infrastructure activities implemented by 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 more intensive 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 facilitators¹⁹, and program delays during the mobilization stage required higher inputs of resource to produce the agreed outputs. The AusAID funded inputs during the interim phase did not greatly reduce the implementation lag after the MC implementation team was mobilized.

4.2.3 Budget Analysis

Tables 6 and 7 provide an analysis of the NRP budget²⁰ in total and, with estimated adjustments, for the community infrastructure component.

Table 6 Summary – Whole Project (AUD)

	AUD	% of Total
Personnel	3,554,899	41 %
Reimbursable costs	711,892	8 %
Training	125,050	1 %
SDOs	1,757,873	20 %
Community Infrastructure	2,429,705	28 %
Total	8,579,705	

Sources: NRP reports

¹⁸ NRP contracting and supervision approaches also minimised leakages of funds from construction activities, thus enhancing building quality.

¹⁹ About 31% of facilitators had work only for less than 5 months – ACR, Annex C Personnel page 2.

²⁰ These estimates are based on the latest budgets and expenditure estimates provided by Coffey In August 2009.

Table 7 Summary Community Infrastructure (AUD)

	AUD	% of Total
Personnel (1/2 non imprest)	2191,790	43%
Reimbursable costs (2/3)	474,832	9%
Training (1/2)	56,386	1%
SDOs		0%
Community Infrastructure	2,429,705	47%
Total	5,152,713	

Sources: NRP reports

The ILO has been implementing similar community infrastructure development activities throughout Aceh and parts of Nias. The first project is almost finished but ILO has been planning the start up of a new community infrastructure component²¹ of a larger Livelihoods and Economic Development Project (LEDP) funded through the Multi-Donor Fund supporting recovery and reconstruction activities in Aceh and Nias. This project will focus on a small number of kabupaten in Nias and northern Nias. The latest indicative costing for the project is provided in Table 8. It shows that the proportion of project funds spent on actual construction is slightly less (44 %) than that which has been achieved by NRP.

Table 8 Indicative Costing for ILO Community Infrastructure Component of LEDP

	Construction and Supervision		Training and Capacity Building		Total	
	US\$	%	US\$	%	US\$	%
Staff (incl. missions, travel, evaluation, audit)	1,742,533	24%	1,901,036	68%	3,643,569	36%
Operations (incl. training, equipment, miscell.)	319,733	4%	589,733	21%	909,466	9%
Construction works*	4,414,345	61%	0	0%	4,414,345	44%
Program Support Costs	401,877	6%	154,553	6%	556,430	6%
Contingencies	343,924	5%	132,266	5%	476,190	5%
Total	7,222,412	100%	2,777,588	100%	10,000,000	100%
As percentage of total	72%		28%		100%	

* Including US\$ 0.5 million for cultural heritage construction works

Source: July 2009 LEDP project appraisal document

The ability of NRP to match the proportion of project funds that ILO plan to use for construction is to be commended given the additional resources put into providing and managing village level facilitators to assist in the design and construction activities. Nevertheless, interviewed community members indicated that village facilitators often only made visits during the 'pay-day', making the community engagement cost was relatively high, based on the limited time spent by facilitators in the communities each month.

4.2.4 Operations and Maintenance

The main factor which will influence the useful life and sustainability of the new community infrastructure is ongoing O&M implementation and funding. The kabupaten government has allowed a small budget for O&M which is totally inadequate. As in most developing countries, O&M is a very low priority for recurrent funding. The O&M issue is discussed further in Section 5.3, Recurrent Costs.

4.3 Implementation

(a) NRP approach to community infrastructure development compared to KDP

A major element of the initial design continued into implementation was that the NRP community infrastructure activity would be based around the approach used for the GOI implemented KDP. The following table compares the two models – NRP and KDPIII. While it shows that the proposed KDP model was not followed closely (the roles of cadres, Kecamatan government roles, and community development approach, there are

²¹ As at August 2009, due to delays in finalising the delay, ILO is planning to implement the community infrastructure activity as a separate project. Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

some situations where the NRP could have been more effective than the KDPIII. As an example, the capacity development activities for NRP facilitators and the greater number should have provided more intensive engagements between facilitators and the communities, enabling them to be more empowered by the end of the Program.

Table 9 NRP and KDP Community Participation Models

Aspect	NRP	KDP III
Facilitator	1 Facilitator to 3 villages.	1 Facilitator to 12 villages
Training for Facilitators	A series of training for facilitators to include community development, legal drafting, and gender.	5 days training to include management training, community development, gender.
Village level cadre roles	Unclear. While they were trained, no sustainability plan was designed and agreed, with regard to cadres' roles after the project ended.	Assist the village facilitators. They meant to sustain the work that have been initiated by the village facilitators
Kecamatan government roles	No specific links between kecamatan and Villages, except for coordinating the Perdes' legal drafting.	Linking the process and results from Village's consultations (Mudes), kecamatan consultations (MusKec), and kabupaten consultations (Mus Kab)
Community development approach	Community participation in planning process (through VAMC. Main involvement through community labour whom mobilized for the construction's work	Participatory Planning started from problem mapping, and used some principles, including speedy and cost-effective delivery of construction/reconstruction assistance, and building local governance and accountability
Use of local labour	Community construction as much as possible utilized community members to participate as largely paid workers/labours.	Workers were primarily hired from the targeted villages. The use of labour can be also caused by a way to compensate land resettlement, for example, and the value was equal to the compatible productivity. These also applied for material, labour, and plants that damaged due to the program.
Village Development Team (PKPD)	Elected. The PKPD team was paid an honorarium ranging from 3% -5% of the projects' total value or a fixed amount of Rps. 22.5 million in two villages (Botohili and Bawodobara) where a PPKD was not agreed to be built due to elite's conflicts, and the projects were finally led by the village head	Elected. No payment
Specific grants for women	No specific grant for women	KDP offers a special grant for women. This had been very useful in an area such as Nias where poverty and isolation is deep so that the specific needs of women and men could be responded. Women, for example has tended to choose water sanitation while men to select other infrastructures such as road. It was proven also that water systems that were managed by women have been more sustaining.
Cost sharing	The where the community labour was paid in an amount of lower than the average labour price, i.e. Rps. 40,000 was considered as providing cost sharing to the program.	Community contributed to the activity costs

Source: PDD of KDP III, as compared to findings from the ICR field mission.

Although KDP had some complications due to program size, which is nation-wide, it promoted more decentralized decision making and improved local governance. The NRP may not have been able to fully learn from KDP experiences and incorporated more of the positive features. These included empowering communities to identify their needs, deciding on projects to address these needs, managing resources and contracts, monitoring implementation, and evaluating outcomes from the outset, which have promoted a more robust model for sustainable growth. NRP also could have used NRP experience with community engagement to engage better in communities as KDP households have been able to make informed decisions regarding the type of system and the level of service they required.

While KDP requires longer term interaction and working with the community, the Program could have incorporated experience from other AusAID funded program that promotes community development such as

the Australian Community Development and Civil Society Strengthening Scheme (ACCESS). This has established more sustained infrastructure and stronger local governance where the local and indigenous knowledge, including the knowledge of women were incorporated into the decision-making process concerning their village infrastructure.

(b) Materials logistics

The Program operated during a period when there was a high demand for construction materials due to the reconstruction efforts and there were major increases prices for cement, steel and other building materials. This was compounded by the relative isolation of Nias and the program sites which made logistics more difficult. To better control these variables, the MC became more involved in the supply chains by coordinating purchases and shipments to Nisel and also by building a base in the northern kecamatans where materials could be stockpiled and distributed (and the facilitators could work from). This assisted and speeded up implementation.

At community level, the intention had been to delegate procurement of the basic building materials to the communities but this evolved to the Program taking a more pro-active role²² in sourcing better quality materials.

(c) Concrete construction

As concrete was a basic construction material for the SDOs and the community infrastructure, the quality of concrete prepared and how it was laid were important factors in producing improved quality. The Program developed guidelines in suitable local formats to guide the concrete making process that addressed raw material quality, mix proportions and use of mechanical mixers to ensure a more consistent mixing process.

The size, consistency and quality of the crushed rock used for concrete was improved by program sourced small scale Chinese designed crushers which were found to be much more suited to local conditions and much cheaper than crushers sourced from within Indonesia. These simple crushers are now being made in Indonesia and have been adopted by local contractors for ongoing construction contracts. A major improvement from this innovation was that it replaced much manual rock crushing done with hammers by women and children with its long-term health risks such as eye damage and injured finger joints. The new crushers could produce about one cubic metre of crushed material per hour compared to one cubic metre per week produced by hand²³.

A common problem with building village concrete paths using community labour with limited supervision is that concrete thicknesses and concrete mixing standards are not maintained. The quality of concrete path construction was improved by the use of steel formwork²⁴ which made quality control much easier to maintain as the forms had to be placed on a level base and the building the tracks in small sections with the forms provided expansion joints at regular intervals to reduce cracking. Concrete quality was further improved by changing the proportions of cement, sand and crushed rock in the concrete mix. See the later lessons section for possible improved approaches to managing construction quality for community infrastructure.

4.4 AusAID Management and Monitoring

As part of the AIPRD, AusAID implemented a monitoring process involving both the PMSG and IMT groups to support the Jakarta based program management team. The NRP documentation does not describe all the inputs of these groups through the design and inception phases when strengthened outside guidance may have addressed some of the issues which were slowing down program development and implementation.

²² An issue raised during the ICR team field visits was in the management and control of the supply of these materials from outside as there may not have been sufficient checks and balances to ensure all ordered materials were delivered and paid for after delivery, and yet, issues of delays remained up to the end of the Program.

²³ Source: Coffey draft program booklet

²⁴ This technology is used in other countries and has been sourced from Africa for inclusion in the new ILO infrastructure project for making se

Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

The documentation indicates the PMSG became more involved in the Program during the first half of 2007 with PMSG members participating in the redesign mission in September / October 2007 and then undertaking a further review in April 2008 plus having inputs into production of the M&E framework. The IMT made several inputs to monitor and guide construction of the SDOs and the community infrastructure. Feedback from the MC on remaining construction issues identified by the ICR team indicated that some of these issues (for example, unstable embankments behind the SDOs) remained as the IMT did not agree on their importance.

4.5 Sector Stakeholder Monitoring

(a) Program coordination committee

The program coordination committee (PCC) comprised representatives of GOI, AusAID and the MC. A senior BRR Nias staff member was nominated to represent GOI. Unlike coordination committees on other projects, there was no formal representative of the direct clients (kabupaten and kecamatan governments) or the provincial government which has direct responsibility for the kabupaten and kecamatan governments. As good informal communication links were maintained with the kabupaten and kecamatan governments, their non membership did not create significant problems. However, stronger linkages with the North Sumatra province (SUMUT) government²⁵ may have been useful in strengthening the sustainability of the program initiatives, particularly O&M funding for the infrastructure constructed.

(b) Coordination at kecamatan level

Planned monthly coordination meeting were not regularly implemented. In Kecamatan Teluk Dalam and Lolomatua coordination meeting were organized in more regular basis. Kecamatan Amandraya only conducted one coordination meeting (in January 2009) between March 2008 and January 2009²⁶. More frequent coordination meeting may have assisted in developing closer linkages for communicating the community infrastructure works' processes and procedures as well as planning for sustainability of the community infrastructures.

(c) BRR coordination

Some sector stakeholder monitoring activities were carried out by the Program through its participation in BRR's coordinating meetings. Unfortunately, as indicated in the ACR²⁷, multi-stakeholders policy dialogues planned by the Program at kecamatan level to discuss future financing of small-scale infrastructure development were not implemented. While the ACR indicated that the kecamatan governments were planning to carry this out as part of their Musrenbang activities, these were considered as activities that go beyond what the Program could claim²⁸. Pro-active initiatives on Musrenbang linkages could have strengthened outcomes as well as the sustainability of the NRP.

(d) Role of North Sumatra Provincial Government

The program local governance report indicated that the government of SUMUT, coordinates various government departments at provincial level and had formal links with recovery efforts through a national Advisory Board Secretariat for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation (*Sekretariat Dewan Pengarah Rehabilitasi dan Rekonstruksi*) with a branch secretariat in Medan. However up until the end of the NRP, little engagement was noted except consultations during inception period. Also there were few linkages with the Provincial Planning Board. While NRP did not require SUMUT government officials' involvements in specific details of the programs and activities, consultations with the SUMUT government on the strategic focus and direction as well as progress of the Program may have been useful.

²⁵ It is understood that there have been tension between the Nisel kabupaten government and the SUMUT government as reflected in the holder of SEKDA position in the kabupaten government being changed several times in the past 12 months.

²⁶ Op cit, Annex A, Table A7 Coordination Meeting.

²⁷ Nias Reconstruction Program, Activity Completion Report page 10, March 2009, page 13

²⁸ Ibid

5 SUSTAINABILITY

5.1 Institutional Capacity

The Program used several approaches to strengthening sustainability of the program funded infrastructure including:

- (i) Improved design standards for the SDOs and village infrastructure;
- (ii) Closer supervision of construction to ensure the design standards were met including closer management of the supply of construction materials;
- (iii) Development of O&M manuals and processes for the infrastructure;
- (iv) Systematic handover processes including training for kecamatan staff
- (v) Development of Perdes on O&M of the structures.

Due to the completion of most construction close to the end of the program, there has not been time for the kecamatans or villages to implement the proposed O&M processes and, more importantly, source the required funds for O&M.

The Program had carried out a series of capacity building activities for different levels of government officials in relation to infrastructure development and O&M. The kabupaten and kecamatan officials participated in asset management and O&M training that the Program organized and village government's officials and village leaders joined training in formulating Perdes for community infrastructure development.

During the Team field mission, there was little feedback that kecamatans had conducted and facilitated the process of setting up development priorities of the village infrastructure development and regularly carried out coordination meeting with village governments' officials, as well as conducted regular monitoring visits and provided feedback.

Coordinating roles of the local governments were also critically required in areas where other projects including NRP were working in the community. It was noted that ILO, Asian Development Bank, and the World Bank's KDP program have worked in some program sites. A positive outcome was that the ILO and other projects were able to upgrade and/or extend NRP supported village roads as found in Hilimbowo and as reported in Sisarahili Susua.

Although the ACR noted that the kabupaten and kecamatan officials trained village leaders in developing official guidelines (Juklak/Juknis) for villages to formulate Perdes for community infrastructure development²⁹, interviewed respondents from kabupaten and kecamatan reported that their involvement had been more on the coordination of the training.

It was noted that Perdes for community infrastructure O&M have been formulated in many participating villages. However, there were few indications that monitoring of Perdes implementation was undertaken (or that the Perdes were being implemented).

5.2 Community Links

Within the community infrastructures' component, efforts to increase community capacity for small scale community infrastructures development were assessed by the Program on the number of villages completing the infrastructure management cycle and through the provision of grants and community-managed processes. Interviewed members of the PPKD or VAMC reported different experiences.

Most of the VAMC members found their participation in the VAMCs had increased their experience in managing the infrastructure work and their financial aspects. This included experience in responding to their community's requests for infrastructure development. Some of the VAMC members have also joined similar roles in other projects, including *Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat* (PNPM) - the Community

²⁹ Nias Reconstruction Program, Activity Completion Report page 10, March 2009
Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

Empowerment Program, a nation-wide replication of the KDP, using their experiences in NRP. Nonetheless, other interviewed VAMC members stated also that as the VAMC is not sustained within the village government operations and structures, such experiences would only be used when there are similar programs in the village and their participations have not necessarily linked to any constituency relationships with the community.

The Program had worked with village leaders and participating village cadres to improve their knowledge on grass-root leadership and community infrastructure project management. Very limited comments were made by interviewed village leaders and village cadres on their improved knowledge and improved capacities to manage community infrastructure projects. Some cadres could barely recall on what they had learned from the Program. Few cadres, for example, recognized their roles during the community infrastructure development. They also did not understand the reasons they were tasked to participate in the village projects.

Working in an area such as Nias where social and political conflicts have been ongoing issues, more preparatory works at the community level would have been beneficial in addressing conflict resolution and peace building. The ICR team acknowledges the program team's efforts in systematically managing potential conflict issues during implementation.

Regarding further activities of the VAMC and of the village members working together to further improve the village environment, there was disappointing feedback in some villages that community members did not believe that they could / should work together for free to build additional priority community infrastructure, even if the materials were provided from outside. The ICR team believes that the program activities have not had enough time to greatly develop and strengthen a culture of working together³⁰.

In summary, at village level, there was little indication that the O&M initiatives developed and introduced systematically by the Program have been implemented yet. Training on O&M and the development of *Perdes* on O&M and consecutive extension of the *Perdes* to the participating villages, while considered useful, has not led to significant results yet.

5.3 Recurrent Costs

While the SDO designs were, in general, appropriate, they have not minimised ongoing O&M costs³¹. There also were no specific O&M clauses in the hand over documentation viewed by the ICR team. While the Program 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 is inadequate and the kabupaten and kecamatan 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* for O&M and subsequent extension of the *Perdes* to the participating villages, while considered useful, has not led to significant results yet. Feedback at Tuindrao and Lawa Lawa Luo indicated that the communities were having difficulties in collecting small monthly amounts to cover O&M costs. This was most concerning at Tuindrao as the water supply could potentially benefit a large number of households.

Also, because the community participation processes have not fully engaged with 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.

³⁰ This is not surprising given the cultural and social conditions in Nias.

³¹ For example, the disproportionate numbers of light bulbs in most SDOs, relatively expensive energy costs of generators, etc.

5.4 Remaining Construction or O&M Issues

Based on information provided in the community infrastructure completion reports (CICR) and the ICR site visits, a listing of activities where outstanding issues remain is provided in Annex 8. Following submission of the draft ICR report, Coffey moved quickly to review the identified issues and make recommendations to AusAID. A combined AusAID / Coffey field visit in October 2009 reviewed the proposed actions. The ICR team had suggested that the following areas needed follow-up: (i) SDOs, The design and construction of the SDOs were generally highly regarded. It was noted from the SDOs capacity building reports that training on O&M was mostly carried when the SDOs were not finished. Thus practical training was not implemented in real setting³²; (ii) Tuindrao water supply; and, (iii) three bridges needed follow-up.

6 CROSSCUTTING ISSUES

6.1 Gender and Disadvantaged Groups

(a) Gender

Although a gender strategy was not clearly articulated in the PDD or the inception report, the Program attempted to promote gender equality within its activities. Some training activities, including gender training for facilitators and cadres on gender, were reported by the ACR as being implemented.

However, the ICR team did not observe significant indicators that the Program had adequately addressed gender equality concerns in its activities. The Program has included reporting of female and male participation and representation in program activities, i.e. labour participation in the construction works and in training activities.

The ICR team found that gender related training used generic and traditional material and approaches, and neglected the need of having appropriate uses of practical tools linking to small infrastructure development and sustainability. While the ACR indicates a high level of gender sensitivity among the former program staff, gender insensitive approaches and practices were not presented in the infrastructure development, i.e. 'one stop service table' position that is too high for local women to access, and the steep and slippery path road to water sanitations and public toilets where women and girls transported water for over ten times per day. Also, separate female and male latrines in SDOs which were intended were introduced without proper information on the reasons.

Nias is a challenging area to promote gender equality but a practical approach to it was not explored, exercised or implemented. There are strong indications that program staff awareness of the issues villages women face and need in dealing with inequities and challenges in their participation in the village infrastructure planning and implementation was limited. While the ACR indicated the overall NRP team was gender sensitive, it was noted during the ICR field visits that former facilitators interviewed still had traditional perspectives of gender relations. Composition of the VAMC members by gender also focused more on meeting the Project's affirmative requirement by selecting at least one female member within the committee, without considering the balanced roles of female and male members of the committee. Most female members of the VAMC mandated as treasures or/and secretary, indicating that females were trusted in the community when it comes to money and administrative works, but at the same time it showed gendered stereotyping roles.

Women were perceived by the community as those who need to be protected and could not assign with work for making money. In the Program, however, female labours tended to be given work as helpers for which their wages were relatively lower than those for the main labourers, indicating low recognitions to women's contribution to the family's economy. The Program recognized the roles of Nias women in the family economy i.e. rubber and cocoa plantation, but did not challenge the gendered roles to promote women to work as main labours, and not to be limited to be helpers or 'kenek', making women were also not accessing any practical

³² Report on Maintenance building, SDOs, 2008
Independent Completion Report Nias Reconstruction Program

training or capacity development in cement mixing and other rural infrastructures' techniques. In reality, the workloads of women who worked as helpers were similar to those males who work as main labours.

The ACR reported that gender awareness training was carried out for female cadres only. If the curriculum or material or the training was some kind of women empowerment training, this is only one of several ways to approach gender equality promotion. However, specific gender training would only reinforce indications that the Program had not adequately developed strategies to influence the society in order to be more balanced in their gender relations.

Some interviewed female cadres remembered their participation in gender awareness training, but others did not. One female VAMC member who was considered as performing well by the community indicated her disappointment as she considered capacity building such as gender training would be a useful incentive for her as a female member of the VAMC to recognise good performance, but she was not given the chance to participate in such training. Those who participated in the training, on the other hand, indicated that gender awareness training was important for women to participate in the Program in the form of female labour. These indicated that the Program had both limited interventions to engage with cadres in meaningful ways and had no gender strategy on place.

Little information could be gathered by the ICR team with regard to competence of male and female facilitators within the Program. While a program staff list was presented in the ACR, this only reported gender disaggregated numbers. No information was available to allow comment on the benefits the Program had gained from having female facilitators in the team, and how those female facilitators helped easing discussions on gender issues in the community and in the program.

It is not clear why the Program did not use gender consultants who understood the local cultural setting of Nias to strengthen the Program's understanding on the local gender issues.

(b) Disadvantaged groups

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

6.2 Environmental Issues

(a) AMDAL process

The Program implemented the GOI environmental assessment process (AMDAL) across the activities and presented the results to the kabupaten, kecamatan and village governments. The field visits did not indicate any major issues apart from those identified earlier with the SDOs. The local climatic conditions are conducive to rapid revegetation of areas stripped of vegetation during construction. The field visits indicated that most embankments had generally revegetated well³³ (apart from example given above).

A disappointing aspect noted during field visits was that drains on some of the newly constructed Telford roads were not wide enough to handle probable storm flows and there were already slumps of embankments and other blockages in some road drains leading to water running down the roads eroding the surfaces.

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. The leakage of the waste pipe of the Lolowa'u SDO toilet as well as lack of running water requires attention.

³³ It was noted that the embankments constructed as part of the additional road work undertaken in Hilinbowo were very steep and had not revegetated to stabilise them.

(b) Materials

Observations during the field visits supported the MC documentation on the implementation of AusAID policies on the use of sustainable timbers. Compliance was enhanced by the use of steel roof structures and cladding, and aluminium windows and frames which should provide a longer effective working life with minimal maintenance. MC test documentation certifies that sheet materials did not contain asbestos.

The policy of not using sand from beaches appears to have been largely followed. As noted above, the introduction of the simple rock crushers facilitated the use of original rock sources. The development and use of steel concrete forms for the concrete paths and for building construction was an important part of implementing the policy of only using sustainable timber sources.

6.3 Anti-Corruption

Following the KDP approach, the NRP used similar methods to promote democratic local governance. Some training activities to respond the need to promote better transparencies and anti-corruptions were carried out. Inadequate systematic efforts were noted to embody mechanisms and tools to assure that anti-corruption was promoted in a practical way, not only in the program-managed procurement but also in the operation of community managed construction. Possible ways to improve the mechanisms are suggested in the lessons section.

7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

7.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Processes

Because of the long period spent finalising the program design, the program Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework was not finalised until May 2008. Three different M&E advisers worked on the Program reflecting the time taken to finalise the design. The program design and, therefore, the M&E framework focused on quantifying activities and outputs rather than outcomes and impacts. The high level outcome / impact indicators in the logframe are set out below. The remaining indicators in the logframe were largely outputs and were documented in the completion report.

Table 10 NRP Final Logframe Indicators

Objective	Verifiable Indicator
Goal: To contribute to the development of South Nias District	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased access to economic opportunities• Improved access to public services• Reduced transaction costs in doing business
Purpose: To make community infrastructure development responsive to community livelihoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Component 1: Small-scale Community Infrastructure Outcome Objective: To increase the availability of small-scale community infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 30 villages have completed the construction cycle• Improved access and reduction in women's time burden
Component 2: Community Engagement Strengthening	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 30 villages have completed the infrastructure management cycle
Component 3: Governance Infrastructure Outcome Objective:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Described in the completion report

The Program employed an M&E assistant / database operator who maintained a database of the progress of the program activities and participants in them. However, 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 indicators 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 and use them not only as M&E tools but also as learning mechanisms.

7.2 Contribution to Improved Recovery Processes

Feedback from the stakeholders in Nias indicated they were satisfied with implementation of the Program and the outputs produced. The outputs were largely new infrastructure for the area which will support ongoing development but was not directly rehabilitating or reconstructing infrastructure damaged in the earthquakes or tsunamis.

There was little indication on how the Program introduced basic knowledge or capacities to the local governments' officials regarding earthquake resistance infrastructures development as well as basic knowledge on disaster mitigation due to earthquakes. While these were not necessarily to be specific capacity development activities, such basic knowledge that was embodied in the program's capacity building activities would have assisted the Program leave relevant and meaningful capacities in the targeted area.

The mostly national implementation team has implemented the activities well but still has had difficulties in communicating with the local communities who speak Bahasa Nias. Given the substantial demands for national professionals to support the recovery activities across Aceh and Nias, the Program has been able to mobilise and manage relatively effective engineering and field teams to support the infrastructure programs.

8 ANALYSIS AND LEARNING

It is important for an infrastructure program that adopts a community development approach to consider a clear, while practical, definition or elaboration on what capacity development concepts that are being used in the Program to achieve its purpose. While the Program indicates implementation of its infrastructure construction and training activities as outputs, it needs to appreciate community engagements and processes in the related activities.

Such approaches may provide the basis for specifying the role and responsibilities of all parties, and for specifying the nature of Coffey as the contractor. To produce notable results and introduce learning fora, the Program could actually explore some potential learning mechanisms, including its monitoring and evaluation functions, embodied within the activities' planning, reporting and budgeting system. These are relevant to the development of SDOs as well as the community's infrastructures to introduce more sustaining results.

Such program will need to focus on enabling communities and local organisations to analyse their own capacities and assets (as well as problems), and formulate strategies, mobilise local resources and manage actions to fulfil their aspirations to contribute to the Program's objectives.

9 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 complimentary 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. It was estimated³⁵ that more than 22,000 farmers including 15,000 rubber farms would benefit from the improved pathways and bridges. The booklet also estimated that the bridge at Lawa-Lawa Luo had cut the distance from the village market for villagers on the other side of the river from approximately 12 kms to 4 kms (more than 2 hours walking to about 12 minutes³⁶. Reduced travel times to schools and increased safety during the wet season has been provided by the three major bridge works and construction of larger culverts on new tracks. A proxy indication of the benefits of the path and bridge construction is that in several of the program villages, the value of land adjoining the newly constructed paths had doubled³⁰.

Other perspectives of program benefits³⁴:

These (program) benefits thus go much deeper than only improving access and reducing isolation. The economic impacts are substantial. For example the concrete pathways and the connecting bridges has meant that travel distances have been cut in half in some cases and by up to two thirds in others. In addition to the shorter distances, the purpose-built concrete pathways provide an opportunity for substantial economic benefits through the introduction of motor bikes to carry cocoa, rubber, firewood, fish and coconuts rather than by the method of by-foot. Very conservative estimates suggest motorbikes have sped up delivery time of produce by 4 to 5 times and opened up new productive areas. Rubber for example, delivered by motorbikes, has a 1% - 2% higher moisture content than that delivered hours later by foot. This provides a better price to the farmer as sales are calculated on weight.

Source: Response to the Draft Independent Completion Report Oct 2009

The construction of formed drains (3,723 m) to reduce the amounts of rainwater that run through villages during the wet seasons and have reduced the water that has pooled creating breeding areas for disease carrying insects.

An unforeseen benefit has come through the introduction of simple small scale rock crushing technology. This innovation was noted by ILO as a major contributor to improved concrete construction standards in the area while reducing costs. A significant side benefit of this initiative is that it has greatly reduced the use of crushed rock obtained through hand breaking of rocks which is a dangerous task, often uses women and children who only earn a menial wage and provides a more consistent material for making higher strength concrete.

For several reasons including the narrowing of the program focus, the short implementation period and limited funding, the Program has not been able to widely address the underlying development issues of poverty, conflict and reconstruction in Nisel, as well as critical and lingering cross cutting issues such as gender equality and governance.

³⁴ According to the National Managing Contractor for KDP, PT Amythas, one of the key reasons for the expansion of KDP across Indonesia was the rates of return on many largely Java based community projects. Up to 800% Return on Investments were recorded. The reason explained for these outstanding figures (which were triple checked for accuracy), was because of the removal of bottlenecks between the areas of production and their markets. Although Coffey cannot claim such high figures as it has not conducted a formal economic analysis, it is claiming that all participating villages have received substantial economic, health and social benefits for the following reasons.

³⁵ Coffey draft program booklet. The methodology is not documented.

³⁶ Source: Coffey draft program booklet

10 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

10.1 Overall Assessment

The eight SDOs and extensive community infrastructure will improve the access to and services available to households in the eight kecamatan in Nisel. 37 villages have improved community infrastructure that will directly benefit up to 78,000 village members and, in the case of the bridges and pathway construction, even more households in villages which did not take part of the construction processes but who use the infrastructure regularly. For example at the Talio bridge, the safety of more than 200 students from villages including and beyond Talio who use the bridge twice daily to go to school has been improved.

NRP management, with support from AusAID Jakarta, has encouraged and supported the Nisel kabupaten government to seek apply for further infrastructure and maintenance funding through AusAID's Indonesia Infrastructure Initiative (INDII).

The Program has constructed and developed O&M systems for community infrastructure in isolated areas of Nias. The ICR team assessment of the Program is provided in the following table.

Table 11 Evaluation Ratings at Completion

Evaluation Criteria	Rating (1-6)
Relevance	6
Effectiveness	4
Efficiency	4
Sustainability	4
Gender Equality	4
Monitoring & Evaluation	4
Analysis and Learning	4

Rating scale: 6 = very high quality; 1 = very low quality. Below 4 = less than satisfactory.

10.2 Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The Program was an appropriate intervention supported by AusAID and stakeholders acknowledge the quality of the infrastructure provided.
2. There were implementation delays and uncertainty because the program concept and basic design were not finalised before the MC commenced implementation. This uncertainty was possibly due to AusAID not being able to direct sufficient management attention to the evolving design (which is understandable given the major recovery effort underway across Aceh and Nias). The interim team that was mobilised does not appear to have been tasked with improving the initial concept put forward in the PDD. This uncertainty possibly also contributed to the contractors bidding for the MC contract not being given clear guidance on the priority areas to be implemented.
3. The lack of detail in the initial design, lack of follow-up during the interim phase and difficulties in finalising a strategy and design during the first six months of implementation led to the infrastructure activities starting much later than was initially planned. This led to pressures on quality management and raw material supply systems. In addition, the O&M systems introduced by the Program have not been implemented and tested while program support was still available.

4. While AusAID and its contractors have much experience in community led development and has had a major role in Aceh's post Tsunami reconstruction and rehabilitation, NRP may not have effectively captured and used this previous experience. There were some indications that the Program lacked checks and balances, in the quality of the program's design, mobilization, and implementation.
5. As the Program planned to adapt the KDP approach, detailed design was not necessarily required as the KDP has been in Indonesia for over 10 years, and there were project design and evaluation documents. The Program, however, would gain benefits from contextualizing the design of the KDP III into the Nias setting through provision of proper baseline analysis. Addition of a livelihood assessment to the existing KDP design would have been more appropriate, to anticipate urgent needs for program mobilization. While there was pressure to speed up implementation, partially through reducing the time allocated for preparing the community and villages, this should not be necessarily have led to reduced program facilitator engagement with the community. In fact, more intensive engagements of village facilitators could be expected to happen in the NRP due to the higher proportion of facilitators per village as compared to the KDP.
6. The Program promoted significant involvement of women during the community infrastructure implementation cycle. Special efforts made by the program, included the hiring of local women facilitators to increase program outreach to women's groups, proved to be effective in encouraging women to participate in the program. Also, during the initial community consultations within these very traditional societies, the NRP facilitation team encouraged women to participate in all meetings and voice their opinions. Even though some resistance was met, women became involved in every VAMC, in construction activities such as village pathways and drainage canals, and in the decision making related to implementing village regulations. Initial resistance by the village elites was broken down by using local facilitators and highlighting the importance of the involvement of women in these decisions and work assignments to release a valuable and underutilised community asset
7. The use of informal, but distinctive logos such as the Yellow Kangaroo warning signs on some of bridges that cater students in the targeted area was an innovative but effective way of highlighting Australia's support to the activity and improved AusAID's visibility. Such approach could be replicated by other AusAID community infrastructure programs, particularly those that relate to more informal government links.
8. As issues relating to construction raised in the draft report have been addressed by Coffey and AusAID, the recommendations relating to this area in the draft report have been attached as an annex.
9. Capacity building activities were largely undertaken at village and kecamatan level. As most of the O&M training was undertaken before construction was completed or close to program closure, the groups responsible for O&M have not had the opportunity to try out the proposed systems and also to secure ongoing funding. The only training course (Asset Management) run at kabupaten level was run as a workshop rather than allowing participants to make use of the skills they were learning.

R#1. Capacity building:

AusAID should act timely and pro-actively to facilitate sustainability of its investment that was carried out through the NRP with regard to capacity building. These will include, but not to be limited to:

R#1.1 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.

R#1.2 AusAID should encourage the managers of other related AusAID capacity building initiatives such as ISP3 and INDII to make contact with the NITP and kecamatans to ensure the stakeholders are aware of the capacity building resources available from other AusAID programs.

10.3 Lessons and Good Practice

10.3.1. Lessons

(a) Development of Community Infrastructure

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. Engaging local sub-contractors alongside communities has been beneficial. For large and technically challenging projects such as the large bridges at Lawa-Lawa Luo and at Talio, the NRP opted to use sub-contractors with bridge building experience. The program found it more effective to manage the sub-contractors than the communities themselves to achieve the required outcomes. In turn, the sub-contractors engaged the local communities during construction, generating local incomes and providing skills and capacity building.
4. Recruitment of village facilitators would be more appropriately carried out, with some criteria that could promote more widespread representation of community members. An embodied accountability mechanism could be developed within the program's system, for example in the procurement panel of SDO development, in involving representative of community members as the signatory of village grant agreement and in the hand over of infrastructures, as well as in building embodied incentive mechanisms for promoting performance and local governance in the program's human resource management, procurement, and within the community's mechanisms (VAMC).
5. Processes to improve the quality of concrete path construction and other activities such as village bank and drain construction may have been improved through using random testing of completed sections before payment for the work. This may have reduced the need for close supervision and help change the supervision processes from top-down facilitator driven to where the community took more responsibility as their payments would have been tied to the outcomes.

(b) Community Development Processes

6. Longer inputs by a long-term community development expert and integrated inputs by short term. Gender specialists with proven experiences in similar village level infrastructure projects would improve the soft aspects of community infrastructure activities.
7. Gender issues need to be addressed by all community members (and implementation team members). Awareness building and specific gender related training should be provided for male and female community members.

(c) Response to Natural Disasters

8. In a disaster response and recovery situation, the use of a design and implement contractor (overseen by an appropriate advisory group) building on an agreed project concept and basic design may be more efficient, responsive and reduce the lag time for implementation. AusAID should consider using the workable and existing program with similar objectives i.e. development of rural infrastructures within the KDP's framework for rural area and for the Urban Poor Project for urban area is recommended.
9. The higher ratio of facilitators of NRP than that of the KDP should offer more intensive engagement between facilitators and communities. NRP's capacity development activities should be included with more enhanced learning by doing and mentoring of facilitators to work with the community. A full time community development specialist should be assigned to prepare and monitor the implementation of a capacity development strategy.
10. If separate design and implementation contractors / teams are to be used, more structured links need to be made between interim teams and the final implementation contractor. This could range from

comprehensive briefing of the implementation bidders by the interim team before final selection through to the implementation contractors having defined positions in their team for interim phase team members.

11. Combining reconstruction with capacity building. Effective capacity building requires empowerment of the target groups to use the knowledge and skills provided through training. In an infrastructure reconstruction scenario, insufficient time is usually allowed for O&M (and further infrastructure development) processes to be implemented before the close of the programs.

(d) Implementation Modality

12. (From ACR³⁷) *'An on-ground presence and working closely with local counterparts is important. AusAID made an important early decision to focus only on South Nias and to locate the main program office in Teluk Dalam. In order to achieve more effective and direct engagement, the NRP branched out to the more remote locations and established small base camps in two sub-districts. These allowed the program to promote stakeholder ownership and work more closely with local counterparts in resolving issues and challenges collaboratively and effectively.'*
13. A community construction program that attempts to promote community-managed processes requires a longer implementation period than if implementation can be driven by the managing contractor in full control of the procurement and supervision processes. This longer implementation period (with associated community facilitation and empowerment and ownership of the planned infrastructure) may, however, lead to the infrastructure being better maintained and having a longer life (for example, issues with the Tuindrao water supplies). Also stronger and more motivated community groups are more likely to seek funding for additional community infrastructure from both GOI and other donor sources.
14. (From ACR) *'Development of close working relationships with community groups to plan and develop community infrastructure activities requires a balance of social, and language skills with technical knowledge.'*
15. Stronger linkages need to be developed with and greater use made of other relevant AusAID capacity building programs such as IASTP III, ISP3 and INDII.
16. Noting the challenge of promoting transparency in Nisel, more proactive strategies and efforts that were developed to promote transparency in more concrete ways would have been useful. In an area such as Nias where models of good local governance are limited, showcasing program staff as role models in such matter is critical. These could be developed, through, but not to be limited to:
 - Participation of kabupaten and kecamatan level government officials in the procurement panel of SDOs development. This issue was considered by the MC as the implementation team had been subjected to some lobbying by local business people. To meet AusAID's procurement guidelines, streamline the procurement processes and limit local interventions, a decision was made to not include local representatives in the tender assessment process. Following on the earlier discussions, this may have been an appropriate place to have included SUMUT representatives in the process to assist in building their capacity³⁸ to support the kabupaten and kecamatan governments.
 - Participation of community members as part of the signatory of village grant agreement;
 - Participation of community members as the signatory of hand over processes of community infrastructures;

³⁷ These have been acknowledged as having come from the ACR as the ICR team largely agrees with them.

³⁸ During the preparation of the NITP, the SUMUT government indicated they would be seeking support to improve their procurement processes.

- Introduction of complaint mechanisms within the SDO development and community-managed infrastructure activities to encourage transparency;
 - Introducing multi-stakeholders mechanism right on the start of the program where discussions on check-balanced mechanisms within the planning cycle of the infrastructure could be introduced, facilitated, and sustained; and,
17. More effective coordination and communication between the South Nias program office with the provincial government would offer better coordination on any possibility of replications and O&M policies.

9.3.2. Good Practice

18. The engagement of the community at large through the establishment of VAMCs along with the provision of training and on-the-job technical assistance strengthened their capacities not only in the implementation of their infrastructure development but also in broader village governance terms.

The VAMCs and the village governments have played important roles in promoting improved accountability and transparency practices, formulating and enacting village legislation for maintenance and operations, mobilizing community-wide support and dealing with various issues such as community conflicts and land disputes, and in promoting women's involvement in decision making processes.

19. The Program's focus on South Nias and establishment of small base camps in two sub-districts are considered good practices.