



# South-East Asia Community Access Programme

## SEACAP

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEACAP PRACTITIONERS MEETING

14 – 15 JUNE 2006

*The Sunway Hotel*

*Phnom Penh – Cambodia*

**South-East Asia Community Access Programme  
SEACAP**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEACAP  
PRACTITIONERS MEETING**

**14TH – 15TH JUNE 2006**

**The Sunway Hotel  
Phnom Penh – Cambodia**

## CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
1. BACKGROUND OF SEACAP PROGRAMME .....	5
2. OBJECTIVE OF SEACAP PRACTITIONERS MEETING .....	5
3. DATE AND VENUE .....	6
6. PROGRAMME AND ASSOCIATED EVENTS .....	7
7. SPEECH AND PRESENTATIONS.....	10
7.1 OPENING ADDRESS.....	10
7.2 OVERVIEW ON SEACAP .....	13
7.3 SUMMARY OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME AND PROGRESS TO DATE .....	16
7.4 IMPACT OF COMPLETED SEACAP PROJECTS .....	17
8. WORKING GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND OUTCOME .....	19
8.1 OUTCOME OF GROUP A.....	19
8.2 OUTCOME OF GROUP B.....	20
8.3 QUESTIONS & ANSWERS .....	24
9. DISCUSSION ON THE THREE IDENTIFIED TOPICS.....	28
9.1 DISCUSSION ON THE DEFINITION OF ACCESS AND RURAL ACCESS .....	28
9.2 DISCUSSION HOW SHOULD SEACAP INTERACT WITH DIFFERENT COUNTRIES?.....	28
9.3 DISCUSSION ON NETWORKING AMONGST SEACAP PRACTITIONERS .....	33
10. SEACAP DOCUMENTATION FILM ON THE STORY ABOUT RURAL ROADS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.....	35
10. CLOSING REMARKS .....	38
LIST OF APPENDICES .....	39
APPENDIX A: POWERPOINT PRESENTATIONS.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
APPENDIX B: DRAFT DISSEMINATION MATRIX.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
APPENDIX B: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

South East Asia Community Access Programme (SEACAP) is a poverty-targeted transport initiative facilitating the improvement of sustainable access to rural communities, centred on Vietnam, Cambodia and Lao PDR. The purpose of this programme is to provide low-cost, maintainable, locally owned access to poor people through rural transport research, uptake and dissemination. This programme is principally funded by DFID and was launched in March 2004.

During the past months, transport sector practitioners in countries participating in SEACAP have expressed interest in having the opportunity to meet others who are also involved in SEACAP. The reasons expressed for this interest is to share their knowledge and experiences and also to more effectively direct their own country programmes.

In response to these expressions of interest, DFID agreed to support a SEACAP Practitioners Meeting (SPM). The SPM brought together primarily those countries who have been involved directly in SEACAP, but also a number of countries who have expressed an interest in participating in SEACAP in the future such as Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and Bhutan.

The key objectives of this first SPM were:

- a) Refresh the understanding and purpose of SEACAP;
- b) Share experiences from the implementation of SEACAP projects;
- c) Review achievements and progress to date;
- d) Consider future direction and priorities for SEACAP.

Under this initiative, the Ministry of Rural Development of the Royal Government of Cambodia and the Cambodian National Community of Transport Practitioners hosted a one and a half day meeting which was held on 14 and 15 of June 2006 at Phnom Penh, Cambodia's Capital City.

The meeting was attended by approximately 70 participants, comprising presenters, and officials from the Ministry of Rural Development and other transport development partners in Cambodia, SEACAP practitioners, consultants and implementers from Vietnam, Lao and also delegations from non-SEACAP countries; namely Bhutan, Sri Lanka, and Afghanistan.

SEACAP practitioners and consultants provided twelve presentations which resulted in extensive discussion among the participants.

As a result of the meeting, SEACAP practitioners and participants were able to refresh their understanding of the purpose of SEACAP and to hear about the progress of SEACAP and its projects. All the SEACAP completed projects were reviewed on their impacts and the lessons learned.

Two different Working Groups were formed to enable discussions on two different subjects.

- Group A was to consider and investigate the Gaps of Current Research and Knowledge relating to Rural Access while
- Group B was to identify the Challenges for Dissemination and Mainstreaming of SEACAP.

**Group A** identified five gaps of current research and knowledge and those were related to:

- Maintenance and funding issues
- Traffic patterns and overloading

- Whole-life cost comparisons
- Actual rural community benefits and other related topics
- Appropriate institutional strengthening and monitoring.

**Group B** recommendations were that SEACAP should have effective dissemination strategies in order to reach not only technical and academic practitioners but to aim to also reach the most influential people such as politicians, the prime minister or president in each country. This was actually quite a difficult and complex process and the time available was not sufficient for the group to complete this exercise. The group recommended that this should be an ongoing process for SEACAP's Management to address in the coming month within individual countries

This group also found that dissemination alone is not enough. We can tell people about good things, but decision makers are often afraid of, or constrained from, adopting new ideas. There is a risk involved. If they promote something and it does not work, they will be responsible. Therefore those risks should be removed or minimised through broadcasting and mainstreaming of SEACAP activities. Knowledge and experiences gained from research and studies should be transformed into standard practice for people at technical levels to adopt; they should not have to make a special case for adopting a sustainable solution.

The meeting also highlighted the need for improved interaction between SEACAP Management and the host Governments. There were comments on the needs for wider consultation in the creation of future SEACAP projects especially with the Ministry or department of the host government, in order to improve ownership and better response to the needs of the specific challenges for each country.

There were also suggestions that SEACAP should have clear guidelines for the procurement of services and timeframes for SEACAP project cycles so that other SEACAP partners are able to plan accordingly. The comment was well received and SEACAP management will consult with DFID regarding this suggestion.

For improved networking among SEACAP practitioners, the meeting recommended that SEACAP should initially share information regarding proceedings within each country.

A list of contacts of SEACAP practitioners should be prepared and circulated.

Information relating to SEACAP projects and reports should be circulated and posted on the website.

Suggestions were received that it is a good idea to keep the current local websites that have been already established with support from SEACAP. These should be maintained and continue to function until a better knowledge exchange solution is found, however the participants believed that there would always be a use for a local website providing local information that would not otherwise be available.

## **1. BACKGROUND OF SEACAP PROGRAMME**

Dependable access to social and economic opportunities is essential for reducing poverty and accelerating growth. Efficient and affordable transport is a necessary pre-condition for rural communities to access these opportunities. It facilitates trade and integration, is crucial for advances in agriculture, and is fundamental to human development, including the delivery of health and education services to poor women and men. Improved access is directly linked to improved standards of living in rural communities.

DFID's role in the transport sector is to influence regional policy and achieve sustainable poverty reduction, pro-poor growth and contributes to effectively addressing gender related issues. Within the framework of the Global Transport Knowledge Partnership, DFID is funding SEACAP and working actively with other development partners, including the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank and is also forging close links with recipient governments.

SEACAP is a poverty-targeted transport initiative, aimed at improving sustainable access focused on the needs of poor women and men in rural communities, with projects currently in Vietnam, Cambodia and Lao PDR. The programme's goal is to identify and support the uptake of low cost, sustainable solutions for rural access. Fundamental to the approach is maximising the use of local resources, which include labour, materials, enterprise and most importantly ingenuity. To do this, the programme provides funding for applied research, its dissemination to implementing agencies and support to help them adopt improved techniques and approaches. This programme has now expanded to twenty-four projects within the three countries. The individual projects demonstrate best practice responses to local demands and in combination create a comprehensive multi-level approach with high expectation of the results being mainstreamed into national practice.

## **2. OBJECTIVE OF SEACAP PRACTITIONERS MEETING**

During the past months, transport sector practitioners in countries participating in SEACAP have expressed interest in having the opportunity to meet others who are also involved in SEACAP. The reasons expressed for this interest is to share their knowledge and experience and to more effectively direct their own country programmes.

In response to these expressions of interest, DFID agreed to support a SEACAP Practitioners Meeting (SPM). The SPM brought together primarily those countries who have been involved directly in SEACAP, but also a number of countries who have expressed an interest in participating in SEACAP in the future.

The key objectives of this first SPM were:

- a) Refresh the understanding and purpose of SEACAP;
- b) Share experiences from the implementation of SEACAP projects;
- c) Review achievements and progress to date;
- d) Consider future direction and priorities for SEACAP.

### 3. DATE AND VENUE

The meeting was held on 14-15 June 2006 at the Sunway Hotel, Phnom Penh; the Capital City of Cambodia.

### 4. FUNDING AND ORGANISERS

The meeting was funded by DFID through the South East Asia Community Access Programme (SEACAP).

The meeting was organised by the Cambodian National Community of Transport Practitioners (CNCTP), in collaboration with the Royal Government of Cambodia through the Ministry of Rural Development and SEACAP Management.

### 5. ORGANISING COMMITTEE

The organizing committee consisted of the following persons:

**Chairman** H.E. Suos Kong  
Secretary of State,  
MRD National Coordinator of DFID-SEACAP Programme  
Chairman of CNCTP

#### **Secretariat**

- 1 Mr. Heng Kackada  
Secretary of Cambodia National Community of Transport Practitioners (CNCTP)
- 2 Mr. Ly Savuth  
Deputy Director General of Administration and Finance Department  
Member of CNCTP Secretariat  
Tel: (855)-12 421789
- 3 Ms. Heng Puthy,  
Office Secretary of CNCTP Secretariat
- 4 Mrs. Try Kim Ly  
MRD counterpart staff to CNCTP
- 5 Mr. Kong Vichea  
MRD counterpart staff to CNCTP
- 6 Crown Agents - Hanoi  
Ms. Le Minh Nguyet, Project Manager  
Ms. Pham Tuyet Giang, Assistant Project Manager
- 7 David Salter, SEACAP Programme Manager

## 6. PROGRAMME AND ASSOCIATED EVENTS

### The Programme for the SEACAP Practitioners Meeting

<b>Wednesday 14 June - DAY 1: Morning Session - All in grand plenary</b>			
Item	Time	Description	Facilitator
1	09:00 - 09:15	Welcoming address.	H.E. Sous Kong, Secretary of State, MRD, Cambodia
2	09:15- 09:30	Overview of SEACAP status with respect to objectives, scope of work, future orientation	SEACAP David Salter
3	<b>Summary of Country Programs: Progress to date</b>		Mr. M.B.S. Fernando, Chairman, RDA, Ministry of Highways, Sri Lanka
3.1	9:30 - 09:45	Vietnam: Dr. Nguyen Van Nhan, Director of Department of Science & Technology, Chairman of Rural Road Surfacing Trials Steering Committee. Ministry of Transport Vietnam	
3.2	09:45 - 10:00	Cambodia H.E. Sous Kong	
3.3	10:00 - 10:15	<b>Lao PDR:</b> Mr. Somnuk Metakul Deputy Director, Department of Local Roads, MCTPC	
4	10:15 - 10:45	Coffee/Tea/Networking	
5		<u>Impacts of Completed Projects</u>	Mr. Botong, Deputy Director General, MCTPC, Lao PDR
5.1		<b>Vietnam</b>	
5.1.1	10:45 - 11:00	SEACAP # 1& 4: Dr. Jasper Cook, Intech/TRL	
5.1.2	11:00 - 11:15	SEACAP # 11: Dr. Do Huan, Managing Director EDUCONS Co. Ltd.	
5.2		<b>Cambodia</b>	
5.2.1	11:15 - 11:30	SEACAP # 2 & 8: Mr. Heng Kackada, Intech Cambodia	
5.3	11:45 - 12:15	Discussion: Are these impacts relevant to the needs of others and can the successes be replicated elsewhere?	
6	12:15 - 13:15	Lunch	

<b>Wednesday 14 June - DAY 1 - Afternoon Session: Divide into two groups, each with an even representation of the participating countries.</b>				
Item	Time	<b>Group A</b>		Facilitator
7A		<b>Subject for discussion:</b> Current Research and Knowledge Gaps related to Rural Access		Dr. Maisy Viengvilay Director, Planning and Technical Division, Department of Roads, MCTPC, Lao PDR
7.1A	13:15 - 13:45	Group A Plenary:  Consultant: Dr. Jasper Cook,  Define parameters of research and knowledge gaps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify different types of gaps.</li> <li>General discussion.</li> </ul>		
7.2A	13:45 - 14:30	Sub-Group work: For each country (all countries attending) identify three priority gaps where research is needed.		
7.3A	14:30 - 15:15	Group A Plenary: Countries report back on three key areas where research is needed.		
Item	Time	<b>Group B</b>		Facilitator
7B		<b>Subject for discussion:</b> Challenges for Dissemination and Mainstreaming		Dr. Do Huan
7.1B	13:15 - 13:25	Group B Plenary: Consultant: Mr. Mike James - Consultant Roughtons International <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define dissemination and mainstreaming in the context of SEACAP.</li> </ul>		
7.2B	13:25 - 14:10	Present Rural Transport Strategies from Cambodia and Vietnam: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cambodia - Dr. Farhad Ahmed ITT/OPM</li> <li>Vietnam - Dr. Doan Thi Phin, Deputy Director, Transport Development and Strategy Institute, MoT</li> </ul>		
7.3B	14:10- 14:30	Discussion on Strategies		
7.4B	14:30- 15:00	Present draft Dissemination Mainstreaming Strategy Matrix - Mike James.		
7.5B	15:00 - 15:15	Discussion on Dissemination and Mainstreaming Matrix.		
<b>8A</b>	<b>15:15- 15:45</b>	<b>Coffee/Tea/Networking</b>		
9.1	<b>Working Group (continued)</b>	<b>Group A</b> Identify strategies appropriate to address the research gaps.	<b>Group B</b> Develop dissemination and mainstreaming strategies specific to each country.	
9.2	15:45 - 16:50	<b>Sub-Group A:</b> Formulate country specific strategies to address three priority gaps.	<b>Group B:</b> For each country review and define the targets, the message, and the media.	
9.3	16:20 - 16:50	<b>Group A Plenary:</b> Report back on Research gapes to grand plenary.	<b>Group B Plenary:</b> Report back on the country matrices. Select one country matrix for presentation to grand plenary.	
<b>End of working groups and reconvene in the Grand Plenary</b>				

Item	Time	Description	Facilitator
10	16:50 – 17:10	Report back to Grand Plenary by Group A representative.	Dr. Prof. Saman Bandara, Moratowa University Sri Lanka
	17:10 – 17:30	Report back to Grand Plenary by Group B representative.	
10	17:30 - 17:50	Open Discussion	SEACAP
11	17:55 - 18:00	Identification of key topics for discussion during Day 2.	H.E. Sous Kong
12	18:00	Reception  Background Film SEACAP 11 Rural road maintenance training in Vietnam.	H.E. Sous Kong
13	19:00	Dinner	SEACAP

<b>Thursday 15 June - DAY 2: Morning Session</b>			
Item	Time	Description	Facilitator
14	09:00 - 09:10	Opening of session. Organization of discussions.	H.E. Sous Kong, Secretary of State, MRD
15	09:10 - 10:15	Discussions on key topics.	
16	10:15 - 10:45	Coffee/Tea/Networking	
17	10:45 - 11:15	Movie shows: Vietnam TV: Story about rural roads for sustainable development. Introduction by VTV representative. Mr. Ho Chi Cuong.	SEACAP
18	11:15 - 12:15	Discussion of films and related topics.	
19	12:15 - 12:30	Summing up and closing of meeting.	H.E. Sous Kong, Secretary of State, MRD
20	12:30 - 14:00	Lunch	SEACAP

## 7. SPEECH AND PRESENTATIONS

### 7.1 OPENING ADDRESS



Figure 1: Opening session

The participants stood for the Cambodian National Anthem after which H.E. Suos Kong, Secretary of State of the Ministry Rural Development and Chairman of CNCTP, was invited to deliver the opening address of the meeting. Key notes of his speech were:

*Good Morning Excellencies, Distinguished International and National Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen,*

First of all let me express my heartfelt gratitude to all Excellencies, Honoured Guests for coming, many of you have travelled great distances to attend the SEACAP Practitioners Meeting (SPM). There are representatives from Afghanistan, Bhutan, Laos, Sri Lanka and Vietnam, as well as consultants from several other countries. On behalf of my Ministry I welcome you all.

I wish to thank DFID/SEACAP for the honour of bringing the SPM to Cambodia. I very much appreciated the hard work contributed by the organizing committee. I am very pleased that the committee consists of representatives from the Ministry of Rural Development, the Cambodian National Community of Transport Practitioners (CNCTP), and of course SEACAP management.

*Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,*

The Royal Government of Cambodia has assigned to The Ministry of Public Works and Transport, the responsibility of the national, secondary national and provincial roads, and to the Ministry of Rural Development the responsibility for the rural roads.

Both Ministries share the common objective to improve community access to social and economic opportunities for rural Cambodians. In so doing, we wish to achieve two results:

*First*, a reduction in rural poverty; and

*Second*, an expansion of our national economy, by more fully integrating the local rural economies.

Both Ministries are working towards this objective under the overall policy framework as set out by Samdech Prime Minister Hun Sen and articulated in The Cambodian Rectangular Strategy.

The investment in rural access and rural transport infrastructure will represent the major portion of our investment in rural development. These investments will often be financed through the international development banks in the form of loans - loans that eventually must be repaid.

These investments are well justified because an efficient rural transport system is a necessary pre-condition for the social and economic development of the rural areas of the country where many of our less well off people are found. We need to facilitate the movement of people, goods and information if we are to achieve our goals for national development. For our farmers to produce surpluses we need to make sure that they are able to move their surpluses to markets at competitive costs in a timely way in all seasons. Please remember that goods only have value to the extent that they can be easily and cheaply moved.

*Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,*

I would like to share with you, some of my reflections on the subject of rural access and SEACAP.

Rural access and rural transport is an issue of national importance, in terms of the value of the physical assets, the magnitude of the investments, and the potential contribution to national development. Therefore our government must develop policies and strategies to guide and to give coherence to developing and managing rural access. These policies and strategies are more than just technical in nature; they have important political aspects as well. I believe developing these policies provides opportunities to strengthen democratic processes and the inclusion of marginalized people. These policies must lead to programmes and practices that are relevant to the real needs of the communities.

Over the past several years, our government and several donors have invested a substantial amount of resources towards improving rural roads and community access. While we have successes, we must also admit there are areas where we would like to have much better results for the amount of money spent.

An example of an area of success is the expansion of Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning, commonly known as IRAP, to several provinces. We see this as a very important tool in planning and developing rural access on rational criteria, with good local input.

On the other hand the principle area of concern for us is the problem of the sustainability of the investments in the rural roads. We are in an unaffordable cycle of re-building rural roads, using the roads and watching them deteriorate, and once again re-building them. We have not been able so far to overcome the maintenance challenge. It is imperative that we break out of this wasteful cycle.

In my view this is where the SEACAP programme is important to us. We need to keep investing in the improvement of rural access; however, we must ensure that the performance of these investments is much better in the future. But to do so, we need to also invest in the knowledge base from which decisions and practice can flow. Surprisingly, international good practice has not been well defined for rural access and rural transport infrastructure. This needs to be done, at the same time, as we need to proceed to develop our own good practice here for our unique Cambodian conditions.

Again, I state that we need to invest in the knowledge base for rural and community access. We need SEACAP to continue and expand its support towards this goal. While much can be learned from experiences in other countries, we need to make sure that the technical and managerial knowledge is well developed specifically for our country. It should be understood that we are only at the starting point of this process, and that there is much more work ahead, for which we will need the support from DFID/SEACAP.

*Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,*

If I may be permitted to turn your attention to the programme before we start the meeting. First, I wish to stress that we have arranged this SPM to provide an opportunity for extensive interaction and participation. This meeting is for us SEACAP practitioners and it is up to us to interact, share our views and make it a success.

We hope that the SPM outcome will ensure:

- An understanding of the progress of SEACAP and its projects; and
- A vision of where SEACAP can contribute to the community access programs in each of our countries.

This morning's session is planned to:

- Refresh our understanding of the purpose of SEACAP;
- Report on the progress made in the three countries where SEACAP projects are and have been carried out.
- To review the impacts of the SEACAP projects which have been completed.

This afternoon, we will break into two groups. One group will focus on research and knowledge for rural access. The other group will focus on the challenge of dissemination and mainstreaming the outcomes of the SEACAP projects into national and international practice. Both groups will:

- Define the common understanding of their respective topic.
- Develop country specific strategies and approaches.
- Report back the findings to the plenary.

At the end of the working session we will identify subjects that either, require more discussion, or new topics that are of common interest. These topics will be then taken up tomorrow morning.

Tonight I have the pleasure of inviting you all to a reception here at the hotel, at 18:00hrs. Following the reception, please join in the SEACAP dinner, again here in the hotel at 19:00hrs.

As I mentioned, tomorrow we will begin the day by following up with the topic or topics identified at the end of today's session. Then it will be show time. We will view two films that were produced last year in collaboration with SEACAP. Thereafter we will sum up the discussions and close the program.

I wish to thank the presenters and facilitators in advance for their inputs to the SPM. I realize that you are all very busy and this is an extra burden upon you.

Finally, I wish Excellencies, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen; a successful meeting and I declare the SPM open.

*Thank you!*

## **7.2 OVERVIEW ON SEACAP**

Following the opening address, Mr. David Salter (DFID/SEACAP) presented an overview of the SEACAP programme. Keynotes of his presentation were:

“Thank you to H.E Sous Kong for the introduction and for hosting this meeting.

I want to thank the participants also on behalf of DFID-SEACAP for attending, especially the people from Afghanistan and from Bhutan, travelling from the farthest locations to this meeting.

I just want to thank you the organizers, the CNCTP for their efforts and I would like to encourage everyone to participate and take control of this meeting so that we can get the maximum output from it.

I should remind myself as I remind others that are native English speakers, to please speak a little slowly because not everyone will be able keep up with us if we speak with our natural cadence.

I would like to say that SEACAP is a work in progress; we need to evolve and improve the SEACAP vision and this is where your inputs will help us to do that. I hope that everyone will leave with some clear ideas as to where their country should go, what kind of support you should look to SEACAP for, and what are the priorities. So I hope when leaving this meeting, we will have some clear ideas and then we can take these up and develop the programme together that take into account your priorities.

As mentioned, I am working with the SEACAP programme and my presentation today will look at what are the current problems in the sector. What is SEACAP, the SEACAP process, framework for success, overview on the progress and achievement so far, and some key challenges.

I think in many countries, if we are honest, rural road access always come up as the top priority, but there are always limited resources to be successful. These are financial, institutional, human resources and there are other issues. But this often results in poor investment choices, wrong technology being used, assets are not being manageable, access is un-sustainable and finally waste through poor access. This is what we need to overcome; the cycle that H.E Sous Kong has mentioned: building, rebuilding, and rebuilding.

Here is an example that we have all seen before (image – see presentation), how you get the kids to their schools or the women to the market or the men to their jobs, under these poor road conditions. We have also started to look a little bit at disaster impact on rural access. We know that in many situations the rural access is already in poor condition and it is already ineffective whether there is an earthquake or tsunami. But at the same time these assets are needed to get to the victims of these disasters. To provide access for emergency response, relief operations, refugee repatriation, resettlement integration and ultimately for

resettlement and for reconstruction and development. This is another aspect of rural access that is very important.

Here an example of being cut off (image-presentation). Here is an example of being really cut off where this road has been basically closed for about quarter of a century; thirty years of a situation where every bridge was blown up, the road is mined. It is clear that no maintenance has been carried out for decades. But there is large population at the end of that road. So here is an example of a man made disaster where people suffered because of poor rural access. I encourage you to look at this issue from different of angles.

In the sector now we have identified a number of constraints. These include:-

**Inadequate investment**, in other words, a lot of programmes are spending money on rural access but there is very little *investment* to match that. To make sure that investments are spent well. There is the difference between spending money and investing in the sector and improving the knowledge gap.

**The availability of international guidelines**, which should be the standard for us.

The number of **qualified researchers and consultants** we haven't included in the development of the capacity. We have not defined what "qualified" means. What makes one person qualified to talk about rural access, whereas another person is not qualified?

We can all think of projects where the **technical planning, design and monitoring** are inadequate. For many of us, in particular international participants, we don't appreciate sufficiently the national procedural, cultural and capacity framework .

And finally, we have **institutional inertia** which determines that procedures have been done in a certain way for many years and they continue to be done that way because they have been done for so many years.

So, **what is SEACAP?** It is a poverty targeted transport initiative to improve rural access sustainably provide knowledge for affordable and maintainable access for poor people through rural road transport research, dissemination and uptake. SEACAP has 24 projects in various stages of preparation and completion in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. We also have extensive uptake by the UN programme in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka as outcomes of SEACAP. We also have permission to go ahead with the project in Sri Lanka which will be developing with our friends from Sri Lanka in the coming weeks and months. SEACAP is beginning to create opportunity for pro-poor growth through poverty reduction by improving access sustainability and affordability, by helping countries to make good technical and managerial decisions.

The SEACAP approach is to get the fundamentals right. We are talking about infrastructure, we are talking about hardware; you have to put in the right assets. That is the very starting point. We have to expand the existing knowledge base, the need to add value to existing programmes and this is the key point; that we must tackle the remaining weak points i.e. dissemination and mainstreaming.

We are looking at nothing new, it is merely proven technology that many of the senior engineers when they were students at the road site were doing. Sometimes our great-grand-fathers were applying the same kind of technology. But somehow we did not mainstream, we have forgotten them, we were offered other kinds of ideas. In China for example, here we see labour is putting down cut stone and of course this is the labour-based aspect of this technology.

The core concept in SEACAP is maximizing input of local resources; which are materials, labour, enterprise and ingenuity which ensures affordability. It is maintainable based upon life cycle costing with realistic maintenance assumptions. These are very basic ideas, but this is the starting principle. You can go to more sophisticated ideas but this is where we start. Often when we are looking at costing, we make very wild assumptions about what

maintenance will follow on. However we are almost always proven wrong. We hope this will lead to appropriate technology choice and implementation strategy, for example spot improvements which are something that Mike James and others are looking at very much now, and also with an idea to promote ownership and equity in the investment programme.

Here (image presentation) is an example in Afghanistan where they have brought in a mobile crusher and they are taking a marginal material, crushing that stone, making it into a good material for the construction of roads. So that is an example, it is a very simple approach and there is nothing difficult to understand about this.

Here (image presentation) is the UNOPS in Sri Lanka for the tsunami reconstruction. They use the remains of the rubble left from the tsunami which is a waste product. They take this rubble, they crush it for a sub-base and this makes a very strong road when they carry out the reconstruction. And here (image presentation) we can see a picture of the sub-base going in, it is a very strong sub-base using the materials which otherwise have no economic use.

So the SEACAP process is to identify needs, research and to compile knowledge. We need to make recommendations accordingly, disseminate information, mainstream, and not only to mainstream the missing links, but mainstream into the road authorities, the academic institutions, training and mentoring to the practicing engineers, to donor projects, to small and medium enterprises. Again I stress that the mainstreaming is often the point where we have lost the plot in so many programme in the past.

The framework for success is to be demand driven, through the key players. We need to secure political support for whatever we do in order to be successful and achieve mainstreaming.

Addressing the progress and achievement to date; we have raised the awareness of local resource-based possibilities.. We have been able to integrate into the national programme, for example in Vietnam; the SEACAP is helping with the Rural Transport II and soon Rural Transport III Programmes. We have exposed as inappropriate the current assumptions and practices with regard to gravel surfacing use and we will hear more about this from Dr. Jasper Cook about SEACAP 4.

But that is not enough; we have to demonstrate alternatives, which also Dr. Cook will tell us a little bit of the experiences of this study. We have provided practical support for a national and international knowledge forum and we can include today's event that is just one of those. We also have the knowledge produced which will be posted on the various websites. Therefore getting the outcomes available for the people who may wish to use it. Is necessary. More outputs include new gravel surfacing guidelines for South-East Asia, surfacing demonstration trials with partner funding; whether the World Bank and the ADB, uptake of surfacing work in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka, and into the World Bank Guidelines, (new alternative road surfaces guideline), and into the Interim Rural Road Standards in Cambodia.

So achievement has been considerable. Those of you that attended the PIARC Seminar last year witnessed that was a big event. Also the TV documentaries which we will be watching tomorrow morning, both from Vietnamese Television and from the BBC World Service.

There has been a huge programme of rural road maintenance training, which Dr. Houn will inform us about later this morning and a number of studies and initiatives looking at different aspects related to rural access, particularly in Vietnam where the programme has the largest components so far. In Vietnam the rural road surfacing experiences have proceeded thus; some years ago surfacing trials were initiated in the Pouk District of northern

Cambodia. These trials were a success and the Vietnamese who visited the site considered the relevance for Vietnam and became interested in the possibility of similar trials. The World Bank provided capital and the initiative benefited from SEACAP technical support

The SEACAP programme has grown over the years to become a larger programme of trials, particularly in Vietnam, however the programme will be implemented into the third national programme of rural transport. The programme budget for the next phase will be over US\$100 million

Key challenges that I envisage are that we need to get the engineering right, if we don't have that right, nothing else that we do will work. We need for the future of SEACAP to look more at planning and social considerations, we need to influence national programmes, principally by looking at standards and approaches and we need to also have the international guidelines and good practices which are related to the Global Transport Knowledge Partnership which is emerging as a new programme.

So finally just to reflect; more often that not local resources are the resources that we have, the more we can make use of them, the more successful our programme can be.

I thank you very much for your attention.”

*Note: Details of David Salter's PowerPoint presentation is provided in Appendix A-1.*

### **7.3 SUMMARY OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME AND PROGRESS TO DATE**

This session was facilitated by Mr M.B.S. Fernando (Chairman, RDA, Ministry of Highways, Sri Lanka).

Before the start of the presentation on the summary and progress to date of the SEACAP programmes in each of the three countries currently concerned, Chairman Fernando provided a brief overview on the condition of roads and rural access within Sri Lanka.

The keynotes of his synopsis were:

“Sri Lanka is a very small country with a very high density of roads; as high as 1.5 Km per square Km which is among the highest in the world. The country has about 100,000 Km length of road of which only about 11,000 Km is considered as national highway and the rest are secondary and tertiary roads. 90% of the minor roads are in a very poor state and although we have a very good network to provide access practically to everywhere in the country, however, the mobility has been very poor for the last fifteen to twenty years. This is because we have not been able to maintain those roads that we have constructed with a huge investment.

So we now have to manage the assets in place for the last fifteen to twenty years, with the means of technology that can be use for rural roads, where the investment can be returned and with a low maintenance cost, so that the roads can be used by the poor for a long period of time.

Sri Lanka has about half of its population living below the poverty line and the government has given very high priority for the development of the rural road networks. A special programme was launched last year called “the Road Development for Rural Roads” and we have also started a very large programme of development of rural roads and most

technology that has been used in the past are being reused to see whether those technologies can provide sustainable solutions to the development of rural roads.

After his briefing on the situation in Sri Lanka, Chairman Fernando invited Dr. Nguyen Van Nhan, Director of Department of Science & Technology and Chairman of the Rural Road Surfacing Trials Steering Committee, Ministry of Transport, to provide the summary of the SEACAP programme within Vietnam and the progress to date. Dr. Nguyen addressed the participants in Vietnamese and it was translated into English by the translator.

*Note: Details of his address in English and Vietnamese are given in Appendix A-2.*

Following Dr. Nguyen address, H.E. Suos Kong, Secretary of State of the Ministry of Rural Development Cambodia was invited to present the summary and to date progress of the SEACAP programme in Cambodia.

*Note: Details of his PowerPoint presentation is given in Appendix A-3.*

Mr. Somnuk Metakul, Deputy Director, Department of Local Roads, MCTPC – Lao PDR, was then invited to present a summary and up to date progress of the SEACAP programme in Lao PDR.

*Note: Details of his PowerPoint presentation is given in Appendix A-4.*

#### **7.4 IMPACT OF COMPLETED SEACAP PROJECTS**

This session was facilitated by Mr. Botong, Deputy Director General, Local Road Division, MCTPC, Lao PDR.

There were three presenters, addressing the participants with regard to completed SEACAP projects in Vietnam and Cambodia. Those presentations were:

- **Dr. Jasper Cook** from Intech-TRL who presented the outcomes and impact of the **SEACAP 1** on Rural Road Surfacing Trials programmes (RRST-I and RRST-II) and **SEACAP 4** on Rural Road Gravel Assessment Programme (RRGAP). *Details of his PowerPoint presentation are given by Appendix A-5.*
- **Dr. Do Huan**, Managing Director EDUCONS Co. Ltd., who presented the achievements and lessons learnt from **SEACAP 11** on the National Training Programme on Rural Road Management in Vietnam. *Details of his PowerPoint presentation are given by Appendix A-6.*
- **Mr. Heng Kackada** from Intech Cambodia who presented the outcome and impact of **SEACAP 2** on the Cambodia Transport Mainstreaming Partnership and **SEACAP 8** on the Cambodia Low Cost Surfacing Trials Phase II. *Details of his PowerPoint presentation are given in Appendix A-7.*

After the presentation of all three presenters, the session then went into discussions and there were exchanges of comments, questions and answers.

Key Notes of the discussions were as follows:

**Question from Dr. Farhad Ahmed to Dr. Jasper Cook:** “You have said in your presentation that you have calculated life cycle costs for those alternative trial pavements. Have you done

any deterioration modelling? or how do you know in one year or in one and a half years, maintenance should be done and cost over life cycle cost of these surfaces?

**Answer from Dr. Jasper Cook:** *“What I said was that we have set up the cost model, and obviously, it since it is only just over a year after construction completion and it will only be later that the actual maintenance costs will be available. Relationships for this model are still being formulated and what will be set up is a monitoring model to compare the whole life cost of unsealed roads, sealed roads, concrete roads. But as yet we are still inputting information. We have got this model set up with some initial construction and first year costs. We haven’t yet reached the complete solution. That will come out of the project continuation when we get monitoring data in from maintenance over the next two to three years, and then we can refine the model.”*

**Question from Dr. Farhad Ahmed to Dr. Jasper Cook:** “What is the sort of linkage with the Pouk Trials, in Cambodia? Do you have any sort of overlapping or any lessons learned from there or vice versa?”

**Answer from Dr. Jasper Cook:** “Yes, we took two or three ideas from the Pouk Trials to use them in Vietnam and there has been some cross fertilisation in the specifications for the design of the armoured laterite and the design of the bamboo reinforcement concrete. In fact since we have had the same project manager for both project we keep close contact between the two trials.

**Question from Sri Lanka delegation to any presenters:** “It would be better if you can discuss something on institutional set ups for example, aspects of these roads regarding rehabilitation and maintenance. Have they been undertaken by rural agencies or by a branch of the nation’s agents?”

**Answer from Dr. Jasper Cook:** *“There are people here from the Vietnam delegation who probably knows more about the official set up of these. But as I understand it for rural roads the majority are essentially under district direction as regards maintenance although the routine works are actually carried out at the commune level. Certainly routine maintenance is undertaken at commune level.”*

**Question from Sri Lanka delegation to Dr. Do Huan on SEACAP 11:** “How do you organise training at various levels? And how is the administrative structure and management of road networks in Vietnam?”

**Answer from Dr. Do Huan:** *“In SEACAP 11, we try to use both the central government system and the commune level system. For example for training programmes dedicated to the community, we ask the Ministry of Transport to cooperate with us to inform and encourage the local government to support our programme and this is one of the channels. The other channels are through community organisations like women’s organisation or youth organisations to support our programme.”*

**Additional answer from Dr. Cook:** *“Actually all roads in Vietnam are under the umbrella of the Ministry of Transport, included in which is the Vietnam Road Authority, that looks after roads down to about provincial level. After that are the Provinces and Communes.”*

**Additional answer from Mrs. Doan Thi Phin from the Ministry of Transport, Vietnam:** *“I would like to clarify about road maintenance in Vietnam. We have the Vietnamese Road Administration which is in charge mainly for national roads. The PDOT which means Provincial Department of Transport is in charge for provincial roads, district roads and commune roads. The role of PDOT supports some provincial roads and district roads. The district-roads and commune-roads are mainly under the responsibility of the District.”*

**Question from Mrs. Habib FUKHRAJ, delegation from Afghanistan, to Mr. Heng Kackada on SEACAP-8:** “In his presentation, he explained from his experiences regarding the single or double bituminous surface treatment, he advised that for narrow roads we

should use kerb-stones to avoid edges being broken on the pavement. If the budget is limited and we cannot afford the kerb-stone, can we use an earth shoulder?

**Answer from Dr. Kackada, Research Engineer SEACAP-8:** *“The problem that we were facing at Pouk Trials is typically related to the many houses located along the trials road. Some of the local residents have cars and small trucks which require access to their homes, it is this crossing for their parking that causes damage to the edge of the pavement. For most of the surfaced roads where the carriageway is paved it is thus more durable for the shoulders to be mostly built from compacted gravel, also found at The Pouk Trials. If the road carriageway is narrow, sometimes vehicles drive on the shoulder and the shoulder will wear quicker than its adjacent edge of pavement which then causes a step or difference in level between the edge of the pavement and shoulder, which usually leads to the edge becoming broken. Depending on local availability and cost; the kerb can be placed in these at risk locations and made of large stone blocks from the river or stone quarried or it can be simply a concrete block.”*

After questions and answers, Mr. Botong, the facilitator of this session said a few words of thanks to the organisers, to presenters as well as to all the delegates. The meeting then broke for lunch.

## 8. WORKING GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND OUTCOME

After lunch, the participants were divided into two different groups. Group A and Group B. Participants were free to choose the group that they were most interested in.

The subject of discussion for Group A was to find out the Gaps of Current Research and Knowledge related to Rural Access, while the Group B was to identify Challenges for Dissemination and Mainstreaming of SEACAP.

### 8.1 OUTCOME OF GROUP A

This group was facilitated by Dr. Maisy Viengvilay, Director of Planning and Technical Division of the Department of Roads, MCTPC, Lao PDR and Dr. Jasper Cook.

This Group started with a short presentation by Dr. Cook that provided an overview on the issues of knowledge gap and research needs. This presentation suggested some possible topics for consideration and proposed that each country group should identify a “wish list” of research activities. After the presentation, participants from each country discussed among themselves in order to identify knowledge gaps that the country wishes to conduct research on. From that “wish” list, each country had to prioritise and cut down those wishes to their three top priorities.

After individual countries had identified the three top priorities of research and knowledge gaps, the group then looked at those gaps and attempted to compile them under a general area of research and decide how to best conduct that research.

Those general areas of further research needed and identified by the country delegates within group were, in order of priority, as follows

- **Maintenance and funding issues:** Maintenance and funding and other related issues were identified as key issues. Most countries that participated in this group expressed their concern about the knowledge gap regarding the issues of maintenance. The group also recommended that investigations on maintenance

programme and funding issues should be implemented as a research project and not purely as the implementation of a maintenance project.

- **Traffic patterns and overloading:** was another common topic that was identified as needing to be addressed. A design guideline to deal with traffic patterns and overloading environment and risk is needed.
- **Whole-life cost comparisons:** A number of research gaps that were identified in and around the issue of whole-life costing. The research should lead to development of an appropriate model of whole-life cost comparison.
- **Actual rural community benefits and other associated topics** were other important points identified. The research should lead to development of an appropriate way to quantify the actual community benefits and other impacts from rural road investment.
- Lastly, a knowledge gap that was identified was **appropriate institutional strengthening and monitoring**. The research should aim to define a suitable regime to carry out this in a sustainable way.

*More details of the Group A presentation to the grand plenary is found in Appendix A-8.*

## 8.2 OUTCOME OF GROUP B

Group B's task was to identify "Challenges for Dissemination and Mainstreaming of SEACAP's knowledge and experiences." Dr. Do Huan and Mike James facilitated this group.

This Group started with two presentations of on going projects related to the development of a transport strategy for Cambodia and Vietnam and various discussions on them. The two presentations were:

- Cambodian rural road strategic plan of SEACAP 6 by Dr. Farhad Ahmed from ITT/OPM. *Details of his PowerPoint presentation is given in Appendix A-9.*
- Updating the Rural Transport Development Strategy in Vietnam by Dr. Doan Thi Phin, Deputy Director of Transport Development and Strategy Institute, Ministry of Transport of Vietnam. *Details of his PowerPoint presentation is given in Appendix A-10.*

Group B went on to the presentation and discussion of dissemination and mainstreaming and to find out how to develop a dissemination matrix for each country. This was quite a difficult and complex process and the time available was not sufficient for the group to complete this exercise. The group recommended that there should be an ongoing going process for SEACAP's Management to manage this in the coming months within each individual country.

The Group presented to the grand plenary by Mike James from Roughton International about what they were trying to achieve with the dissemination strategy and to relate how far they progressed within the working group session. The Key notes of the Group B presentation were:

The group found that the two key points to the SEACAP programme were:

- Provide existing and new knowledge to local government, donors and communities on which to base decisions on rural transport.
- Improved knowledge will allow all stakeholders to make informed decisions on the most appropriate ways of providing sustainable access.

However, the question is, "how to achieve these objectives?". We all know that traditional practices are not working to provide a sustainable transport solution. SEACAP is introducing new ideas and technology for sustainable access.

There has been a lot of research in the past. But these initiatives have not been effective because research projects have come to an end and reports have been produced, but they have not been implemented or mainstreamed. So we have to think how we can get this message across. We therefore have to implement a dissemination strategy.

One example in Lao PDR was shown where we started to look at dissemination. How can we address this problem? How can we identify the stakeholders and the means to disseminate information? In Lao PDR, on the practitioners' side, we have the MPTC, provincial offices, the consultants, the contractors, the communities and the institutions. These are all important stakeholders.

The means for dissemination identified were typically websites, library databases, workshops, training, and newsletters. These are a very general way of getting information to practitioners in Lao PDR. Within our international communities, we've got regional organizations, donors, SEACAP, PIARC, IFG, gTKP, and we are both providing and receiving information through events and seminars such as this one and of course the internet. These are a way of dissemination and gaining knowledge that we think is appropriate that we are developing for Lao PDR.

These help us to let people know what is happening on the project, let people know what works, what is available and what is appropriate.

However, dissemination alone is not enough. We can inform people, nonetheless, as we have mentioned this morning, decision makers are often afraid of adopting new ideas. There is a risk involved. If they promote something and it does not work, they are responsible. We have to try to remove that risk and we do that through mainstreaming our activities. Get them to become standard practices, so people do not have to make a special case for a sustainable solution. In Lao PDR, we have looked at how we can do that for SEACAP 17 with research into paving options similar those in Vietnam and Cambodia.

The process we are all going through is a very simple one. Once we complete the trials, we will produce pavement design guidelines, specifications and selection criteria. We will present these to the Department of Roads. They have a SEACAP coordination committee; they will review and approve them, make recommendations for adoption of these guidelines as standard practice. Based on their recommendations, the guidelines will be incorporated into the Ministry Standard Design Guidelines. There will no longer be special project related options. They are the Ministry standard documents. That is a very important step. At the same time we discussed these aspects with the donors, we let them see what we are doing; we get agreement from them to incorporate these new ideas into the project documents. Because, I have seen in the past, if the project document says there will be so many kilometres of rural roads and this is the budget, it is very difficult to say let us do some better pavements; because those pavements cost more to the project and reduce the number of kilometres and the donors are not in favour of this. We therefore have to incorporate these ideas into the project document, the idea in the document, the costs are included in the budget, this new idea can be incorporated into the project. So once we have that standards adopted by the Ministry, we will distribute the new guidelines to the provincial offices. That will become standard practice for them to use and they don't need special permission. We also issue documents to the project consultant so that they've got the design guidelines and they in turn will incorporate the ideas into their project document. This is how we intend to mainstream the SEACAP 17 pavements into the Standard of the Ministry.

The Main purpose of our session was to development the dissemination matrix;

- How can we target the stakeholder?
- What is the message and how can we get to them?
- What do they want to hear?

The question is what do we need to do?

We need to target the key stakeholders at all levels: senior politicians, ministers, the government officials, line departments, provinces, the consultants, the contractors and the communities. They must all understand what we are trying to do. What the benefits are to them and to the country. We need to get that message through to them. We need to identify stakeholders and get the message through to them and the message will be different at each level. They all have got different ideas and different agendas there is a different message for each of them. This will help them to make changes through their own activities and through their own agendas.

To start this process, David Salter developed a general matrix whereby we can identify the stakeholder, the media and how we do this. How we are able to tackle dissemination? We have various stakeholders with their personal agenda; we have a message we want to deliver. How do we know we've got through to them and different types of media?

This is a general matrix. We've got the public sector, academic institutions, the private sector which are consultants and contractors, the general public, the communities, the donors and professional institutions. These are all stakeholders that we are trying to focus on .

Look at a bid in more detail with reference to the stakeholders: in the public sector: the highest officer is the Prime Minister. This is very important person and he needs to understand what we are doing. Various ministers of the cabinet particularly of those Ministries of Finance, Labour, Roads, Rural Development, Senior line ministry's officials, Provincial management and technical staff, Provincial and local government. At the academic level, we should look at the engineering university faculty to get this information into the courses. The students, the graduates, the transport economists they also have a part to play in all of this because project economists are a very important part of project design.

In the private sector, we should look at contractors; the owner, the technical staff, the international consultant and the local consultant. They need to understand what we are doing with these ideas which are part of our responsibility. What are the benefits?, and these are even of benefit to themselves if they understand the technology and they have the chance to secure the work, they will also help us to implement this strategy.

How therefore is it possible to get the message across? We have to identify personal agendas. All these stakeholders have different agendas. The senior politicians, the ministers they are interested in the national economy also poverty alleviation in general. As you see in the strategy they are interested in their election, they have to make sure that any politics they implement is popular. So there are all these issues. If we know the agenda, then we need to think what message that we need to give them and that will help them in their agenda and also serve our purposes in promoting our activities. We also need indicators that show they have received the message and they understand it. As politicians, they issue policy statements, they make speeches, we have to hear what they say and whether they are accepting our message. Therefore these are all important aspect of the matrix.

Regarding the media: There are many ways to get through to people and to the media which relate to different people. The following are listed:

**Government circulars;** if our concepts are included in them, senior officials read them. Newspapers; we all have newspapers they are widely read.

**Newsletters;** SEACAP 17 has newsletters, SEACAP now produces a newsletter for wider distribution.

**TV, Radio;**

**The internet;** which is of growing importance but as yet is not available to everyone.

**University courses;** also in some countries evening courses. We should also target the academic institutions to include our ideas in their courses. It is important that future practitioners learn about this technology at a very early stage in their training. There are scientific and technical publications but not everyone has access to them. Also Professional organisations that some countries have, however others do not. But these are very important in the dissemination and it is the same with technical organisations. Workshops and seminars: as in this meeting there are many people exchanging ideas. The advisors to ministers, consultants and people from the line departments, who hear these ideas can promote them if they understand the concepts.

**Project activities;** when we have on going works, many people visit the project, politicians from the government departments or the consultants, we can let them see what we are doing and what the benefits are. All means of dissemination of information and good practice should be instigated.

There is a general issue, for example for the Prime Minister; he is interested in re-election. So any policy that is introduced and requires approval must be popular, if we talk about rural access and poverty alleviation these are very popular issues. He might be interested in what we are doing because it helps the personal agenda and his national status, they can be seen to be helping the rural communities. We have to think about these issues. These are not the answers, these are just ideas that we come up with. So if we know the agenda, what are the messages that we want to get to the Prime Minister? And some of the ideas we came up with are "**Job creation**"; we are looking at labour-based methods, we've therefore got job creation which can also benefit the small and medium enterprises. "**National assets**" we provide sustainable options, we improve the national assets. There are always foreign experts and foreign exchanges, if we use the local resources we can thus reduce the foreign exchange burden. These are all important messages to the Prime Minister and Senior Politicians.

The indicator, how do we know we get the message across? The Prime Minister makes speeches, he issues statements, and he approves policies. We can see by his actions whether we are getting through to them, if he even mentions these relevant issues, we will know that we have got the message across.

Then we have to look at the media, and it is different for everybody. So we look at the Prime Minister, for example, he receives information from his cabinet. So we have to make sure that cabinet know these issues then they can advise him. He reads the newspaper; any article in the newspapers will get through to him. He doesn't read newsletters, if we send him newsletters, he has no time to read them. He will watch television, might listen into the radio when he is in the car going from home to office. So any items on the TV or Radio will get through to him. We can therefore use them as the media.

University courses, scientific publications, they will not get through to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has advisors and if we get the message to these advisors they might in turn get through to the Prime Minister. When he goes around the country visiting provinces, he might visit our project. A project which has relevant activities could be an important way of getting through to him.

If we look at the matrix, every line, every stakeholder, has a personal agenda, we have the message that we want to get to those stakeholders, we have different indicators, and different means of getting the message through to them.

In the working groups, we started to look at this matrix for each country. We broke up into country groups; then we started work. However it was very difficult; some of the people were unable to make a decision to determine whether this is the prime minister's agenda or this is the minister's agenda. It needs more work, it needs more consultation and David will progress this in the coming months. But this is the general outline of the dissemination strategy in what we were working towards.

*Note: Details of Group B PowerPoint Presentation is given in Appendix A-11.*

### 8.3 QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

After the two reporters had presented, there were twenty minutes of discussion.

**Comment from Mike James:** "It has been a very interesting workshop and we have all been interested in the discussions and we have learnt a lot today about what is going on and what needs to be done. But this is only the start, particularly with the whole process, the idea of deciding on the way forward, what is needed? What should we do? We should not just walk away from this and think that was a good workshop."

**Comment from David Salter:** "I hope that what comes out of today are foundations for future interventions. Now we can report this back to the decision makers and DFID, we can start to make a case that these are the things that are important. It gives us direction and how we can develop the programme in the future. So this lays the foundations for how we go forward with SEACAP, at least that is how I am looking at it and of course all of you want to consult with the people back home and make sure that we are all in agreement. But for me these are good ideas that SEACAP can go forward within these countries."

**Comment from Chairman Fernando from Sri Lanka participant:** "SEACAP should be projected to other countries especially third-world countries as an organisation that provides advice and guidance; may be a new organisation that give us guidance on rural development. Just as in the government, we start to recognise institutions like the World Bank or ABD. In order to achieve this I think we should start publicising maybe at least newsletters which should go to the hand of politicians so that they regulate their institutions to look forward as an end target of the SEACAP programme. I have found that many of these things will end up like other programmes; we call it the soda pop syndrome. It should not happen to SEACAP. I think the most influential people should be our target. Especially in rural road funding programmes, we need to go deep into concerned people like the politicians, Prime Minister and the President. That should be a strategy that has to be worked out by SEACAP".

**David** responded to Chairman Fernando: "This is a very important part of dissemination and mainstreaming and is the central theme. So often with other programmes or projects that we got the thickness of the pavement down to the millimetre, and that was the end. But in fact that was the beginning. So I do agree that we need to really focus on dissemination strategy, we need to keep the people who are financing this programme in DFID aware too. The other thing is that all the countries, Sri Lanka and so many others have looked at all these issues before. This isn't the "first time round the block" on looking at pavements, looking at slope stability, looking at maintenance programmes. You all know your problems and now we must decide how can we generate the knowledge and dissemination to meet these challenges? I think we are looking at it from a knowledge point of view; a little bit different from other programme approaches."

**Ugyen Chewang from Kingdom Bhutan:** "My only concern is why SEACAP does not extend to other countries in the southeast region and have more dissemination and policies as well as technical dialogue involving different countries within these regions. This would help us enormously for example; such a workshop and seminar by electronic transmission so the question maybe somewhere in Bhutan, the problem maybe somewhere in Bangladesh, and the answer maybe somewhere here in Cambodia. I think what we are

stressing that it is hard to find the answer in Bhutan but we could easily get it here. So such interaction could very meaningful and I only pray that the SEACAP will continue with such a conference and publish meaningful proceedings for everyone not only within the SEACAP region but for others to learn from the experiences of SEACAP. I hope that SEACAP will continue with this work for the immense benefit of the millennium development goal of the UNDP, as such one of these is poverty reduction. I think that whichever region we belong, we have a very common goal and it is targeted toward poverty reduction and we all know in the southeast region, one of the main causes of poverty is lack of access. We are in fact doing one of the greatest jobs in the poverty reduction area. Finally I would like to thank SEACAP for their endeavour in helping poverty reduction.”

**David Salter:** “I think in SEACAP we should be rather modest. This is a new programme, it is only a couple years old and I don’t think that anybody around this table who has seen the programme during this last two, three or four years looks like the sort of soda pop analogy that was made. I would say SEACAP is not really a success yet. We may show some good progress but we also had some situations, which haven’t been addressed optimally. I think again, I need your help and you are far more important in this to keep DFID aware that it is worthwhile to invest in the sector. Every body else has been spending money but nobody is investing and this is the “last show”. So if we loose DFID’s interest the sector will be in big trouble. So you have the most powerful voices when you say to DFID this is what we really want to do, this is really useful and keep it going. And indeed I would like to see a consolidation of some of the progress, for example in Vietnam we have made progress but we still have several steps to go before we can say it is a complete success in my own view.”

**Somnuk Metakul:** “There are two main things that I would like to say. Firstly, the purpose of this visit is that we would like to study or to learn the organisation or support or the set up of the SEACAP committee in Cambodia and in Vietnam so that they can implement the SEACAP projects successfully or effectively or in the sustainable manner because as you might know in Lao PDR we started from scratch. From my presentation this morning you can see the big gap in running SEACAP 17 for example. So we must try to minimize these sort of things, we need good examples regarding the running of the SEACAP project in Vietnam and in Cambodia and may be it would be possible to adopt these ideas if they are suitable for Laos circumstances. Secondly regarding the number of SEACAP projects; you can see there are actually 24 SEACAP projects and Laos so far has four and thus we need to try to catch up. We will try to have a brainstorming session, and try to come up with proposals to date I have 7 to 8 topics that I would like to propose or present but we need to talk among ourselves first then we can mention this in detail or in an official way to DFID.”

**David Salter:** “If I understand correctly, Laos delegations are interested in the Project Cycle, how those projects were executed? In which case I guess Vietnam has the most experience and maybe we could ask the Vietnamese colleagues to give you a run through on how that works.”

**Somnuk Metakul:** “From my understanding, there are different ways of running the projects. It differs from project to project. For example in Laos, for SEACAP 17 this is under the Department of Roads, we have four or five Divisions. This project is directed to the rural roads, therefore the Local Road Division takes care of this project. However SEACAP 17 also addresses study and research and the construction of Trial Pavements, so the planning and technical division has to be involved with this project too. Furthermore, this project is implemented at provincial level and thus the Provinces have to contribute as well. So this project has three Government Agents involved. Another example of SEACAP 21, it is going to be implemented on national roads therefore the National Road Division will take care this project. The SEACAP management is different from project to project. We would like to see

how SEACAP is implemented in Cambodia and in Vietnam?” We would like to learn from the two countries so that we can set up a SEACAP Coordination Committees in Laos that maybe will work or not, but at least we could start from something based on lessons learnt from our neighbours”

**David Salter:** “In the past, SEACAP projects happened for different reasons at different times and in different ways. For the country, if you want to, for example, go through development of the project, the classical way for the project was: Project concept, project document, these kind of steps were not always taken in the past of SEACAP. It was often that a set of TOR’s were developed, and a contract with the consultant was procured, and then was implemented. It works OK in some circumstances, and in another circumstance it hasn’t worked very well or very efficiently. What about the subject being “how would you like SEACAP to coordinate with the countries?”, “how should SEACAP coordinate its activities with the countries?” With that it maybe also more meaningful with other people. Is that right?”

**Somnuk Metakul** “Yes you are right. And on top of one thing that we need to keep in mind is that SEACAP sometimes each project has another party like the World Bank or ADB that needs to take into account the preparation or coordination among donors and ministries.”

**David Salter:**” would the subject by “how SEACAP should interact with the access programme to add value in those countries?” This is the way that you would like to see SEACAP interact with you in the future?

**H.E. Suos Kong:** “I don’t know about the institutional arrangements in Vietnam which has only one Ministry of Transport who is responsible for the business of roads. But Cambodia has two ministries involved with roads affairs and those are the Ministry of Public Works and Transport and Ministry of Rural Development, and the Cambodian Institute of Technology who educates and trains our engineers. We therefore set out a steering committee which included all three important institutions.”

**Heng Kackada** added more comments about SEACAP’s steering committee in Cambodia: “In Cambodia, the consultants who work for SEACAP projects have more freedom if compared to the other two neighbouring countries. This steering committee has only three persons; one Secretary of State from the Ministry of Rural Development, one Under-secretary of State from the Ministry of Public Works and a Deputy Director of the Cambodia Institute of Technology. The committee is very small and its role is to coordinate or facilitate administrative issues. They leave the technical issues to the project consultants and depend on the projects scope and objective, the SEACAP consultants need to collaborate and set up a consultative or working group that compose of officials from technical departments and other development agencies or other non-SEACAP projects.”

In Cambodia, the decision is more likely to be in the hands of SEACAP’s consultants and SEACAP Management.

**David Salter:** “Are there any other ideas apart from Somnuk’s idea on developing protocols for how we interact in different countries. Standardize SEACAP interacting protocol could be a subject for discussion tomorrow. Are there any other people who would like to discuss this?”

**Somnuk Metakul** “One thing, from the discussion that we have, there are two levels that we need to learn from our neighbouring counties of Vietnam and Cambodia. This is the practitioners’ meeting. We need strong high level political support. Without that these sort of initiatives cannot be moved forward.”

**David Salter:** "I can advise that the ADB has agreed to host in October a high level meeting from the various countries participating in SEACAP. During its transport forum schedule for October this year and they have agreed to host a special meeting of the SEACAP's decision makers. So this would be the high level people who interact with the ADB, this is also our chance to reach those high level people, not that we don't have high level people right now. But we could reach those people who the ADB will invite especially for that conference in October 2006."

**Dr. Do Huan:** "May I suggest one topic for tomorrow. From the working group outcome, I can see some countries have the same knowledge gap. So the topic for tomorrow is "how to find the way or mechanism and procedures and project so that we can cooperate to solve the problem we face together?" From the Group A report, each country has spent time and resources sometimes to solve the same problem. Why can we not set up a mechanism among neighbouring countries to solve those knowledge gaps together and as a result we would possibly save money."

**Heng Kackada:** "I think what Dr. Do Huan means is a regional working group maybe useful. SEACAP is now involved in three countries Cambodia, Lao and Vietnam and would possibly extend to Sri Lanka in the future. SEACAP has now set up a steering committee at national level where research is coordinated and to share knowledge. But there is no contact among the countries. In my view small groups are more efficient. In such a big meeting, many people come, some are concentrating during the meeting, some others are less participatory. Therefore a small group of people who are committed and have a real interest in the SEACAP activities could be more efficient. If we have a regional working group, all the knowledge gaps identified from this meeting might be discussed also the need to allocate research topics and resources in order to avoid duplication should be addressed."

**Delegation from Sri Lanka:** "I think what we are looking for is some kind of networking. I would like to propose to start with the SEACAP organization prepares a database of those who are participating in these meeting and distribute among us that may be the start of the network. Then we can formulate individual hubs for different countries in order that by this set of connections the transformation of knowledge can be carried out within that network."

**Delegation from Sri Lanka:** "Yes it is important because from the group discussion, we identified there are a lot of differences between the countries. So many SEACAP projects were set up in Vietnam, Lao and Cambodia. Unfortunately, Sri Lanka has no SEACAP project yet. We share experiences in this meeting but we have to wait for the next meeting to exchange our experiences again. Therefore there should be some mechanism to collect the experiences from different countries and to all neighbouring countries. I think SEACAP should think of using some mechanism through a website or some other means which would be important for us."

**David Salter:** "If we could agreed that tomorrow we would look at two issues; one issue is interaction for SEACAP to develop projects and the other is how we develop networking."

**Delegation from Sri Lanka:** "It is better if we can discuss something on the meaning of poor concept of access or accessibility. It is better if we can define this concept further because there is also some sort of negative aspect of access also. Sometimes access can lead to migration or linkage to further poverty. Therefore it is important to define the concept of the poor context."

**David Salter:** "There are accepted definitions of access and rural access that we could review. But may be we could hold at those three issues: review the definition of access and

what that means, talk about how SEACAP interacts with different countries, and talk about how we could better network so all parties would be satisfied.”

The meeting of day one was concluded and it was agreed on three topics for discussion during the morning session of the following day. The three topics for further discussion were:

- Review the definition of access and what that means.
- How should SEACAP interact with different countries?
- How we could better network?

## 9. DISCUSSION ON THE THREE IDENTIFIED TOPICS

Day 2 meeting was opened by H.E. Suos Kong. After he gave a briefing on the achievement of day 1, he invited Mme Doan Thi Phin to present on the Viet Nam Country Update Programme.

After Dr. Phin’s presentation, the meeting started discussions on the three topics that had been agreed on Day 1.

### 9.1 DISCUSSION ON THE DEFINITION OF ACCESS AND RURAL ACCESS

This session was chaired by H.E. Suos Kong. Participants were invited to start the discussion.

**David Salter:** “Just to pick up where we were yesterday, one of the concerns was what do we mean by access? I think it is useful to go to the Oxford English Dictionary and just to find out what access means? There are a number of references as a noun or verb or an adjective and I guess we probably use all of the definitions when it comes to access. Way of approach or entry, right of opportunity to reach or use or visit and access of anger which I hope we don’t have that meaning today. As a verb, commuting to gain access or as an exit. Adjective: reachable, obtainable or easy to understand.

I think in each country situation the rural access and community access will have a slightly different implication, for example in Cambodia we call rural inaccessibility where poor people are isolated and living in a rural community where rural areas are quite far from the main transport networks. On the other hand in a country like Sri Lanka, which I think has a high density of rural road networks in Asia (at least about 1.54Km per square kilometre), it is very high. You have community access and you don’t have a comparison in Cambodia for example very rural areas, I know that there exists places in Sri Lanka but in comparison it is more a community access issue rather than an isolated rural kind of access. I guess we talk about either community or rural access, we talk about people’s ability to approach or reach or use social-economical opportunity. I think this is what we are really talking about, improving that capacity.”

There were no other comments and the session moved to discuss the second topic.

### 9.2 DISCUSSION HOW SHOULD SEACAP INTERACT WITH DIFFERENT COUNTRIES?

**David Salter:** “I think from the Laos team, the cooperation framework, how that should best be arranged was raised. We just heard from colleagues from Vietnam who have a very unique situation, which I haven’t seen, in other countries where they have PMU and you

heard about the MOT. So they adapted their relationship. I think it is completely inappropriate for SEACAP to tell a country how they should relate to us. I think that is entirely the business of the country on how they would like to be related to by a programme like ours. I would see three different possibilities that could be used: the steering committee was used in Vietnam and I guess it is quite effective. There is also the possibility that the project is assigned to an appropriate Department and in the normal course of the Department's duties, where the programme will be implemented within the Department. And the third option, Government could appoint individuals to relate to us. So all of these things are worth considering but there should be an internal discussion for individual countries on how they wish to relate. Further to that, in terms of developing projects and project cycles, I think things have been all over the map in the past with the SEACAP programme. I am not saying that they weren't justified and it is not a criticism, but it was done in an ad hoc way. Probably now we should streamline it, to adopt a more normal development kind of approach. I think the first thing that we should do if we have made contact that we have for example today with people from Afghanistan and Bhutan, is to have an initial frank exchange of views, constraints etc.. Then we have a sensitivity in what both sides are thinking, what are the needs from both sides, we have consultation, we understand each other, what are our constraints, what are your constraints, and then we have the sensitive process. Then assuming that there is some recognition that SEACAP can actually be of help to you, there is a request for support. That will trigger the next stage as I would see it. Finally the next stage after the request for support, if we would come together, is to develop a concept. And the concept paper, both sides review it, look at it and then more consultation and agreement. From that concept paper, once we get it approved, we develop the project document. Again the project document being an iterative process, we have consultation and finally we agree on the project document that defines the scale and scope of the project.

After that there is the procurement of services. As it stands now, and there was some sensitivity about this in the past, but as it stands now DFID may keep this responsibility. In other words, once we agree on the scale and scope of the services it is the requirement of DFID that the procurement of services to support is done through DFID's process. This is unlike for example where a country has a bank's loan when the country carries out direct procurement.

Then we have the implementation of the project where we jointly monitor using whatever monitoring mechanism be it steering committee, department or individual. Then we have the project completed, we assess what has been accomplished, we have consultation and then we may go back to a new request for support or we are finished. It may be that a project implementation highlights the need for further work. So the consultation might say yes we have got this far and we might need to do a little bit more so let us go back to request for more support and we continue or perhaps we end it.

So this is how I would see we could interact in developing a project in each country.

Is there anyone who has a question or comment? "

**Mike James:** "My concern is the third option that you focus on an individual. As we have seen in Laos PDR, we have several projects coming up and with individuals it might be too heavy a responsibility, compared to the size of the organisation. Further, usually government employees already have quite a heavy workload and to take on SEACAP coordination is an extra burden. However if it is related to that particular person's main duty in Lao PDR within one division it is ok. But if it starts involving another division then it becomes quite difficult to coordinate between both SEACAP or with the other divisions. I think we need to look at that more clearly. We might not be able to appoint one individual for each country."

**Clarification from David Salter:** “These are options that the countries can choose. I think it is the Department or the Chief of Department and so on to decide how they want to relate to SEACAP. But I can imagine for example maybe in Sri Lanka they assign all these responsibilities to individuals. It will be different from country to country. But these are the options that your superiors or your colleagues can choose and decide what is best. The steering committee has a number of advantages but there are disadvantages too. So each option has advantages and disadvantages which depend on the local circumstances.”

**Mike James:** “Yes I agree with that, but what they have to be aware of is all the people involved. It is very easy to give responsibility to one person so you are responsible to do every thing, it can always happen.

**David Salter:** “But SEACAP does not give any responsibility, it is the government who will decide who is responsible. This is an internal government decision. If they ask for advice, we can give them advice. But we want to be clear that we won’t tell them how to run their department or their staff. We hear in Vietnam that the steering committee works quite well. They can consider what they would like to do in that way.”

**Somnuk Metakul:** “From the presentation, the steering committee has been set up for implementing the SEACAP 1, is that not correct? And what about SEACAP 2 and the others?

We have 30 SEACAP projects, do we need to have individual steering committees for each project?”

**David Salter:** “I understand it is not always the case. You have for some projects like SEACAP 22 which did not have a steering committee. Even in one country, different projects, they have different mechanism for cooperation. In Vietnam they have all three options.”

**Jasper Cook:** “I have some comments. Firstly, SEACAP projects are predominantly research projects. In contrast there are standard projects where you for example are delivering 40 kms length of constructed roads and the project is finished with the completion of construction. In these cases there are no on-going elements that need to be kept alive, unlike a research programme. In research programmes there has to be A) a certain open-ended approach in the framework. B) They has to be a great deal of flexibility within interpreting the ToR because sometimes with research you are in a situation with completely different situations/conditions occur compared to what was initially envisaged. Flexibility has to be accommodated within the in the project and contract framework.

The second point;, we are very fortunate in Vietnam that all concerned have worked together as a team. I think in any successful research framework it is essential that people see themselves to be working together as a research body, including, as in our case, consultant, contractors and the Steering Committee. We don’t consider ourselves as individuals, but rather as a SEACAP team working towards getting research completed and mainstreamed. I believe that this is is an essential element no matter what model you choose, because of the essential nature of research projects., It has to be seen as a significant achievement that in Vietnam we have such an effective team set up, for the SEACAP projects..”

**Somnuk Metakul:** “One thing that we forget to mention is that in Laos for SEACAP 17 and 21, we need to have MoU signed. For example SEACAP 17, the first one that we had, we need to have a MoU signed between three parties and they are the Ministry, DFID and ADB.

What we are going to do and who is responsible for what? Therefore without a MoU in the Laos circumstance, we cannot move further. So from what I understand it is a little bit different from Vietnam. In Vietnam you don't need this MoU. . But for us without a MoU we can't move further. And on top of that for the MCTPC to be able to report up to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for better recognition or whatever, we need a documentation and concrete evidence. What is the situation in Cambodia?"

**David Salter:** "In Cambodia they have the same situation as Vietnam. There hasn't been a need for any formal MoU. So I think this is unique for Laos. Plus DFID and the Government of Cambodia and the Government of Vietnam already have formal agreements in place and I think this is where we have trouble in Laos in that DFID and the Laos Government don't have an established cooperation framework. But DFID does have the cooperation framework in Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and Bhutan?"

**Ugyen Chewang** from Bhutan: "I would like to seek some clarification. I have two points: Firstly what will be the time duration of your project cycle from the contact to the implementation of the programme? Secondly what is the policy of SEACAP on short term projects or immediate assistance requirements or work which would fill the gap within the present department?"

**David Salter:** "From what I observe, some of the SEACAP projects went very quickly. They were based upon replacement of the previous DFID research programme call Knowledge and Research (KaR) Programme. There was a seamless transition from this knowledge and research programme into the SEACAP. So that was just roll over and that was fairly quick. Programmes that have to be developed from the start take time in my observation and I would say 3 to 6 months or more. Because part of that process is time required to develop ideas together, but also time for the procurement process. DFID has a procurement procedure that has to be followed and it takes time. Unfortunately you cannot look at the DFID initiative as being a quick impact or a quick emergency response programme. The emphasis is on research and filling research gaps. I don't want to depress you but it will take sometime from the moment of contact. Maybe it can be accelerated but it does take time."

**Mrs. Tran Thi Minh Phuong:** "This is my personal point of view while managing the RT2 project, all the research works and the studies that were supported by SEACAP are very interesting and useful. This support is ongoing with World Bank financed projects. For the RT2 project we have received the governance inputs from DFID but my observation is that for some additional studies, such as SEACAP 1, the additional initiative has been very useful. The SEACAP 1 project and its extension, which supports the surfacing trials is very necessary and highly appreciated by the government and MOT itself. Dr. Nhan's Department has the ownership of this SEACAP 1 and its extension. But for others I must say that the degree of ownership is less from MOT, such as SEACAP 14, which is a study about the role of the private sector in rural transport, and SEACAP 15 community participation in the rural transport sector. These are good studies and it is something that RT2 is trying to support with respect to the private sector development in Vietnam. But the government doesn't seem to have ownership on these studies. What I would like to say is that if from the very start of the research, you have close consultation and ownership from the government side on the TOR, and on the criteria for the selection of the consultancy service, then the implementation of the study or research will result in more success. Because only on the government side do they know what they need and what they want and what is possible within the framework. If an agency would like to offer support for these projects, the suitability would depend on the

content and objective of the research. But in Vietnam, we have partnership of the donors and they meet every 6 months to discuss issues related to the transport sector, the future lending and technical assistance. It would be beneficial if SEACAP would have a representative to attend this type of meeting where SEACAP can participate. It would help to identify the gaps of research and study which are in urgent need from Vietnam or from MOT. So it would save a lot of time in identifying the need. Sometime if SEACAP consults at low level or at expert level, from different stakeholders there would be different voices. But if SEACAP participates in the transport group partnership meeting, then SEACAP will have an over all view of policies, and the needs from the government side. This is an official forum which I think would be very useful if SEACAP would attend.”

**David Salter:** “Yes, I think that the point of having this process is to develop the ownership. I consider it is entirely inappropriate that for example that someone who is isolated from the needs of a country writes the TOR and then presents them as though this must happen. So for sure that is why we need to change the approach. But I know it will take more time to achieve this. So the ownership issues takes time. But I think we achieved it in Laos lately with SEACAP 3, it took time but we were working through the government and we have good agreement on how we will go forward on that programme by following this process. I think the government is happier, giving time for them to comment, they are getting their sense of ownership, they have also an opportunity to express how and who they would like to implement this project which we will take account of. So I entirely agree.

You made a very good point about country coordination in the transport sector and I think at this moment in time it is difficult for SEACAP to have a proper technical representation in all of these things. Sometimes the meetings are called at short notice and one doesn't have a opportunity to attend. Certainly in my role I would try to attend such events and I fully take on board your point. I would point out too that within the internal SEACAP we need to evolve and have a greater technical capacity if we were are to serve different countries in an appropriate way. But there is a risk in that in building up another heavy programme full of staff and all the associated resources. As soon as there are more staff, then they need a driver and administrative support, so resources would go too much into the SEACAP administration. DFID would like to keep it fairly light but there is a trade off. And I think one of the positive things in Cambodia is the outcome of the SEACAP 2 in the Cambodian National Community of Transport Practitioners. They are trying to achieve the same effect to get the professionals and different stakeholders together.

**Somnuk Metakul:** “One point that I would like to raise more is that we do benefit from lessons learned from SEACAP 17 which is the first project in Laos. The Consultant comes to our office and some how MCTPC needs my department to assist the consultant to provide facility. For example the consultant needs long term Laos visas and work permits, but as the requirement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs they need to see the contract of the consultant. We don't have ourselves so that we cannot provide copies of the contract to the Ministry and as result they cannot provide the Visa and working permit. So it is difficult to facilitate from our side. So maybe DFID can consider providing us a copy of the contract and TOR so that we can help the consultant in a better way. If DFID have some confidential items, these can be removed before copying to us.”

**David Salter:** “This is something Crown Agents can check with DFID, because this is a contractual procedure. To be honest, I am not clear on what is confidential and what should be made available to the host government. I think the host government definitely has a right to know what is going on and what contracts are signed in their countries. So I just ask Crown Agents if they can please check back and find out what is the DFID requirement and how we can satisfy this legitimate request.”

### 9.3 DISCUSSION ON NETWORKING AMONGST SEACAP PRACTITIONERS

**David Salter:** “The other point that was raised from Day 1 was how we can network among the countries, among the people who have experiences. So it is a blank page and maybe we could just have some brainstorming points that we can put down. If anyone has ideas on this or any other suggestions or where they would like to go with this matter. I think someone was mentioning cost effectiveness of networking. I think we all agree we have seen for a few years people are flying here and there and it is appearing just as a series of international tourism events to some extent and we don't want to waste resources on that kind of thing. So how can we network effectively and I think this meeting is part of it. But I think there are other issues too. Do some people have some ideas on this?”

**Prof. Saman Bandara from Sri Lanka:** “The starting point of establishing a network is to have a user group, just say through the internet. We can maintain an e-mail group or user group to share experiences. So the resource requirement would be one place to host the resource group other than through the internet and email. But the only thing is that who will host that. My thinking is that whoever will be hosting that must keep it updated regularly at least once in two weeks so that the user group will keep interest and also to contact each other regarding knowledge points in those countries and get the information and circulate it among us. So when we keep doing this there may be certain situations requiring the need to have a meeting or a conference, but maybe once a year or once in two years, that will depend on the situation. But what is important is the sharing of the information and your experiences that you have in different countries because you can't fly here and there to see all these things. It is very expensive but somebody's project report or what is happening can be circulated among the user group without much of problem. So what will happen in my experience is that you know this user group starts with enthusiasm for some time thereafter few new knowledge points are presented and that is largely because of not updating the information. There is a responsibility for the knowledge point and that is hosting the website and they must update the information regularly. So it is important that SEACAP or somebody must monitor the network otherwise it is likely to be ineffective.

**David Salter:** “Thank you! A couple of ideas. I mean I share your concern that this is to get started of which I think the easy pop bottle that Chairman Fernando raised yesterday often happens. It rises up and then soon falls back due to gravity forces. But there is the IFG; doesn't the IFG have that possibility? Could we use an existing network that is already established or do we need to have one for SEACAP? Maybe the IFRDT or the IFG or the gTKP. I can follow up with that because the IFG has already spent a lot of its resources. They have a webpage and I think they have a way for us to have this inter-action. So maybe we can hook into something that is already there and then also has already an audience. Let's look at those things. I don't know if CNCTP have the capacity to do this yet?”

**H.E. Suos Kong:** “May I inform the participants about the user group. As an executive member of IFG and myself from Cambodia and Somnuk from Laos, we get a mandate from IFG to establish the National Committee of Practitioners. But it is up to each country, some countries call them NFG (National Focus Groups) but for Cambodia we call it the Cambodian Nation Community of Transport Practitioners because this term is used by the IFG for practitioners of Rural Road Engineering, which is limited to just the rural transport sector and that is why we adapted our forum to address the whole transport sector. So CNCTP is associated or linked to this network of IFG.

**Heng Kackada:** “SEACAP is an on going programme for the South-East Asia region. If you look at where IFG, IFRDT or gTKP are based, they are based in the UK and therefore their operational costs are high compared to running the same thing from a developing country. If

you compare the operating costs of those to CNCTP, I believe CNCTP is much lower cost. So SEACAP should consider strengthening local networks and build up their capacity so that it can become in the future self sustaining.”

**Participant from Sri Lanka:** “I fully agree with him and in addition to strengthen and use a local network will not only cut down the cost, but you have to have the local “flavour” with the needs of the region. Whoever hosts this network must have an understanding about the problems and what targets are interesting to the users. Because otherwise the information that is coming may not be that interesting and the group will lose interest. So I believe it should be maintained within the group”

**David Salter:** “Do I understand that the idea would perhaps be that we would agree for now using CNCTP that we could use as our route for interacting. It is up and running and established, may be it needs a few more dollars here and there to keep it rolling but would that be acceptable for now we could use CNCTP?”

**Mike Carr:** “I occasionally refer to a user group to search IT information and so this experience of the module is what people could think about. To be very frank I have no idea who on the planet I am talking to. What I do know is the site itself generally has a sponsor and they are paying an expert to review the questions. But he is not the person who answers. Sometimes you have long answers with a lot of people giving ideas. What matters is, there was somebody who would like to give an idea. So nobody ends up with one question with no answer at all. It means somewhere and someone is monitoring the questions posted. A lot of people are reading occasionally and thinking themselves they know a bit about that and they write there five to six lines and you can read these responses and get an idea. I am very surprised it doesn't cost very much at all. And as I said the one that I belong to I have no idea what part of the world they are working.”

**Prof. Saman Bandara from Sri Lanka:** “I don't think that we need to go to that extent for this moment having one person answer our questions. What is required is that if something is happening in Vietnam, that information comes from our contacts so that it can be distributed amongst everybody. If I have a specific problem, I can contact that individual. We don't need a designated person to start to help all these experts' opinions that can be done sometime later when the user group is strong and reaches maturity. Initially what we want is to share what is happening in each country. What are the causes and problem, what are the solutions? I think as a starting point we should start from that level.”

**David Salter:** “That also suggests that it is not a bad idea to keep the current websites maintained. For example in Vietnam, Dr. Huan's website on maintenance could be maintained, improved and kept alive. While the upper solution falls in to place somehow and perhaps there is still a use for the local website giving local information that won't get distributed otherwise.”

**Mrs. Tran Thi Minh Phuong:** “Forgive me about my ignorance about your website and networking, I think for us as donors when we co-finance the RT2 it seems to me very difficult when I ask Simon Lucas about guidelines of the SEACAP and DFID on the selection of a consultants. He doesn't seem to know what is the policy or guideline. I think it would be great if the procurement guideline for selecting consultancy service be published in the website so that we have access to it and know how long it will take. Also for the project cycle for instance how long it would take from identification of research or study and all the different steps that you highlighted so that it provides the people with the timeframe of each step that is required. You have the project cycle, the guidelines for selection of the consultant. Because it seems to us when we co-finance any projects with SEACAP, it is important for us that we have a clear

procedure in terms of time management and quality that we need to strictly follow so that we can maintain in a good and timely manner as well as quality control. Because for the RT2 project it will be closed very soon, but it seems there was a lot of delay in selecting the design and supervision consultant, but it was good that Intech-TRL accepted to work in the interests of the project without the contract being signed or without the TOR being not yet been finalised. That is one of the lessons and therefore we would like to have a timeframe in future so that we plan things accordingly.”

**David Salter:** “That is a very legitimate concern. I think the procurement issue from what I see is a fickle kind of process. In the procurement of DFID, there is a specialisation agency that does the procurement. So maybe there is a need to have some time indicators which I will suggest to DFID that it will provide, so that the partners would like to know the time indicator from this point to that point. This is a legitimate concern and it affects operation and implementation. So certainly I will raise this with DFID that what are the performance criteria for the procurement process.”

**Ms. Le Minh Nguyet:** “Crown Agents works as the contacting agent for all the SEACAP programme. In the case that Mrs. Phuong mentioned, that is for the SEACAP 1 procurement to select the consultant. In fact when the TOR is finalised and based on the request from DFID we start with the procurement like you see we issued the RFP with approval of DFID to request the proposal. This process will be conducted by technical agent and also by us for the financial proposal. The consultant who wins the tender will be approved by DFID as well. So that is the whole process of the procurement.

**Mrs. Phuong:** “I think it is better if we let Mrs. Doan Thi Phin contribute, who has gone through all these procurement processes at the meetings during the rural transport strategy project in Vietnam. I think that it would be better for the consulting firms as well as the DFID and Crown Agents who manage the SEACAP project if we have guidelines for the procurement of the SEACAP projects, and that they be published in the website so that every body can have access to the guidelines, know how they can follow the guidelines and know how SEACAP does their evaluation for instance. How to prepare the bid, how to prepare the technical proposal, how to prepare the financial proposal, what is the time required for each of these steps. All these things should be highlighted and stated very clearly on the website so that it would be easier for everyone.”

**Ms. Le Minh Nguyet:** “I think for this point we will discuss further with DFID and we think that your idea is very good because it will help us to improve the transparency and information sharing with government and also with the consultants.”

**Somnuk:** “For the procurement and other sort of things I believe that the ABB and World Bank they have the procurement guidelines and it is on their websites. I also believe that DFID has procurement guidelines. For example KFW, they also have their own guidelines and they are limited to German firms. I guess that DFID, ABD and World Bank procurement guidelines are similar in principle.”

## 10. SEACAP DOCUMENTATION FILM ON THE STORY ABOUT RURAL ROADS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

A SEACAP film about rural roads was projected in the grand plenary. Before starting the film Mr. Ho Chi Cuong from Viet Nam television has provided an introduction to this film.  
*Details of his speech are given in the Appendix A-12.*

There were some discussions after this film was projected. The Key Notes of those comments are as following:

**DC Dimal** from Bhutan: “Water causes problems in road construction and maintenance. This is a common problem for every body particularly during the monsoon season. Through this video we could see particularly earthen roads create a lot of problems and the surface becomes muddy and some are cut off. Also in Bhutan we do have such a problem and on top of that it is mostly hilly terrain, we have chronic landslide problems every monsoon season and it is a big challenge for the community and district or provincial authorities to even maintain the trunk roads to those communities. So I could see similar problems in this video and what are the actions taken by the authority or local community to tackle those problems?”

**Jasper Cook:** “The problem of instability in the highland areas has received some attention in the RT2 programme. An initial study has been undertaken and a proposal was made for the use of bio-engineering support for slopes. The method has received perhaps not enough attention so far. In the lower land area in any country, the pavement of the road is the major cost to build the road. As you move further up into the higher lands the balance of cost between the pavement and the earthworks is changed until you get to the high land area when the cost of cutting slopes exceeds the cost of the pavement. And that is sometimes forgotten in road programme. Perhaps we need to look at our pavements in the whole road corridor and its sustainability in high land regions in terms of not only bio-engineering but control or advisory control of the corridor in terms of agriculture within the corridor and protection up-slope in terms of the agricultural or deforestation within the corridor. These are items on the table for research and development in Vietnam at the moment.”

**Dr. Do Huan:** “As I know in Vietnam the problem about road construction and maintenance is not only a concern for rural roads, but all kinds of road network. Now we have some success to reduce land slide problems. The protection measures against land slides depend on local circumstances. I hope that with the on going research from SEACAP we would know more about how to appropriately build roads in hilly areas and protection against land slides.”

**David Salter:** “SEACAP does intend to provide support to steep slope stability issues. The proposed project has been deferred as the DFID package of future support to Vietnam is tied into the forthcoming RT3. I know that Simon Lucas is very keen to go ahead with addressing this very important identified problem and to try to find some way to support it. He also said that later this year when things are firmed up with RT3 and when we have the strategy released, we can have a workshop or a meeting together and take up on the knowledge we are learning from today and also from other specific projects in Vietnam. So I think the meeting will be around September to October this year.”

**Heng Kackada:** “I have just a few remarks from the video. At the very beginning of the film we have all seen a four wheel drive car that can not get through at a steep section of the road and yesterday Dr. Jasper Cook mentioned in his presentation about spot improvements. But in practice this approach has not been applied. If these short sections of the road can be treated, and it should not cost very much, cars can get through easily. In addition, if you look at the definition of various engineers of gravel and lateritic soils; they are different. But what I observe now in Cambodia is that any red colour soils are used to surface the road, but in fact most of those soils are not suitable nor conform to the engineering requirements at all. Furthermore gravel or laterite is not the only option that engineers should think about to provide access. We have engineered earth roads and it might be worthwhile if SEACAP could focus some attention towards research on engineered natural surfaced roads and find out how to appropriately use local materials even with some modification. Just an example; I observe in Cambodia especially along the Mekong River where the local soils are mostly

heavy clay. This type of soil when compacted and dry provides a very hard surface and even when it is raining, only one or two centimetres from the top is becoming soft and slippery and that makes the road inaccessible until the surface is dried out. So at this moment to provide all year round access in those areas, laterite surfacing is the only option applied and the material has to haul from a long distance. But there maybe cheaper solutions if they could consider modification of the local soils then that is where some further research could help.”

**David Salter:** “I think this is a good film and as engineers we rarely think of these things. This is a good example of the media making our work more exciting.”

**Participant from Sri Lanka:** “Sri Lanka’s main problem is the impassable conditions of many rural roads in the monsoon season. What I understood from Vietnam, is that there are many projects going concerning issues such as slope stability in mountainous areas and also trialing for the various surface options. But in this morning’s presentation it was apparent that the main concerns are the consultation procedure and administrative procedure and different steps of project development. What I need are solutions suitable Sri Lanka. We want to hear or to learn about are the real issues and problems and concerns for the phases during construction, especially regarding technical issues. It is again those types of negligence that you faced in Vietnam. What we want are the issues and lessons learnt, and constraints which were faced. Therefore is would be helpful for us if SEACAP can organise such kind of review data.”

**DC Dimal from Bhutan:** “Regarding the maintenance manual, I think it is very good idea to produce this short of thing. But I just want to know about the involvement of the stakeholders. What do they do especially those which are mentioned in the manual? Any guidelines which are produced should advise how the communes can actually organise themselves, the local level can organise the maintenance work. I just want further information about this maintenance manual.”

**Dr. Do Huon:** “The rainfall in Vietnam is quite heavy. The annual rain fall is around 2.5 to 4 metres. Under this level of rainfall any unpaved road suffers. Therefore we need to look at other alternatives such as bituminous surfacing or concrete pavement.”

**Dr. Phin:** “Vietnam has developed a manual on maintenance for rural roads for district and commune level. And now under the MOT supervision and support from SEACAP we have developed a draft maintenance hand book for use at the provincial level. This manual consists of main ideas and procedures for rural road maintenance. I hope soon that the final version maintenance of the hand book for provincial staff will be completed.”

A video clip made for BBC Earth Report programme did not arrive on time. However participants were recommended to watch this clip from the website below:

[http://www.handsontv.info/series7/05\\_taking\\_off\\_reports/report4.html](http://www.handsontv.info/series7/05_taking_off_reports/report4.html)

## 10. CLOSING REMARKS

This Closing remarks was addressed by H.E. Sous Kong, Secretary of State, Ministry of Rural Development.

Key notes of his speech are:

**Excellencies, Distinguished International and National Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen,**

We have come to the end of our programme now.

Please allow me again to express my heartfelt gratitude to all Excellencies, Honoured Guests for coming to this first SPM.

I wish to thank DFID/SEACAP for supporting this event.

I on behalf of everyone, wish to thank the CNCTP especially Heng Kackada for the hard work that was done to organize this SPM.

**Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,**

I would like to share with you, some of my reflections on the SPM.

First, I am very pleased with the extensive interaction and participation.

I believe that in general we have gained:

- An understanding of the progress of SEACAP and its projects; and
- A vision of where SEACAP can contribute to the community access programs in each of our countries.

We have:

- Refreshed our understanding of the purpose of SEACAP;
- Heard the reports on the progress made in the three countries where SEACAP projects are and have been carried out.
- Reviewed the impacts of the SEACAP projects that have been completed.

Through the group work we have developed country specific strategies and approaches for research priorities and for disseminating and mainstreaming the project outputs.

We enjoyed the VTV programs. They were very well done and are a very informative media to disseminate information about the importance of rural transport.

Unfortunately the BBC movie did not reach us in time. On the bright side it will be something to look forward to at our next SPM.

I wish to again thank the presenters and facilitators for their inputs to the SPM. We heard very interesting and relevant presentations and well managed sessions.

**Finally, I wish Excellencies, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen; this has been a successful meeting which I now declare closed.**

Thank you!

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX A: POWERPOINT PRESENTATIONS**

- **Appendix A1: Overview of SEACAP**
- **Appendix A2: Viet Nam Country Update Programme**
- **Appendix A3: Cambodia Country Update Programme**
- **Appendix A4: Lao PDR Country Update Programme**
- **Appendix A5: SEACAP 1 and SEACAP 4**
- **Appendix A6: SEACAP 11**
- **Appendix A7: SEACAP 2 and SEACAP 8**
- **Appendix A8: Outcomes of Group A discussion on Research and knowledge Gaps.**
- **Appendix A9: Cambodian rural roads strategic plan (SEACAP 6)**
- **Appendix A10: Updating the rural transport development strategy in Vietnam**
- **Appendix A11: Outcome of Group B discussion on dissemination and mainstreaming.**
- **Appendix A12: Introduction to SEACAP documentation film on the story about rural roads for sustainable development.**

### **APPENDIX B: DRAFT DISSEMINATION MATRIX**

### **APPENDIX C: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**