The Aceh Nias Reconstruction Program
Manila, 7-8 December 2009
By Eddy Purwanto / former BRR Aceh-Nias COO
ULEE LHEU PORT IN BANDA ACEH

BEFORE

AFTER
This mosque is the only standing structure left.

January 2003 - Pre-disaster

29 December 2004 – 3 days post-disaster

ACEH BESAR – Pre-disaster, post-disaster, to early 2007
BRIDGE AND ROAD
EMERGENCY RELIEF STAGE
( 1–3 MONTHS )

ALLEVIATE SUFFERING ...

STRATEGY: EFFECTIVENESS
EMERGENCY RELIEF WAS SUCCESSFUL, THANKS TO GREAT SUPPORTS FROM BOTH NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORTS.

**National support**
- 5,465 Volunteers
- 124 Medical team
- 11,800 Paramedical personnel
- 493 Heavy equipments
- 6,000 Military personnel

**International support**
- 34 Countries
- 16,000 Personnel
- 117 Medical team
- 9 Mother ship
- 1 Floating hospital
- 14 War ship
- 31 Aircraft
- 82 Helicopter

**Biggest non-military operation in the last 50 years**
RELIEF EFFORT WITH NO DEATH FROM STARVATION OR DISEASE
ACEH AS 4th POOREST PROVINCE IN INDONESIA, BEFORE TSUNAMI
AND A CONFLICT RIDDEN AREA
Conflict sensitivity in recovery operation
... REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION STAGE / INVESTMENTS (4-36 MONTHS)

INCREASE COPING ABILITY and
HOW COMMUNITY ADAPT TO CHANGE
SPENDING & RECOVERY ARE NOT ALL ....

STRATEGY: EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT
BRR A ONE-STOP SHOP FOR REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION

“...we will rebuild Aceh and Nias. And we will rebuild it back better.”

Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono
The President of Republic of Indonesia

Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency (BRR) Aceh and Nias

- Established 16 April 2006 through Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 2/2005 and ratified by Law No. 10/2005
- Three governing bodies:
  - Advisory Board
  - Supervisory Board
  - Executing Agency

Executing Agency of BRR
The mission

- Restore livelihoods and strengthen communities
  - Coordinated
  - Community-driven
  - Highest professional standards
- Facilitate and coordinate all players
  - Government
  - Local, national, and international institutions
- Coordinate and implement government projects
RANdatabase: Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

1. Project Registration
   Project Description, Budget, Location, Key Performance Indicator, Donor & Partner, etc.

2. Project Approval
   Analyze project visibility & project output, avoid duplication, best practice.

3. Project Progress
   Update recent progress.

4. Dissemination
   Reports & Publication.

Recovery Aceh Nias Database
http://rand.brr.go.id
IMPROVED SERVICE DELIVERY & MANAGEMENT STANDARDS, ENSURING GENDER EQUITY as A BREAKTHROUGH INITIATIVES “TO ACCELERATE & BUILD BACK BETTER”

**Fast track project approval**

- Acceleration of projects implementation in very early stage of the reconstruction by conducting the fast track project approval workshops
- Project concept note as documentation of all off-budget projects, i.e., proposal, monitoring, progress report, etc.

**Integrated team (tim terpadu)**

- Unit under BRR representing various government institutions that acts as a “one stop shop”
  - Tax exemption processing
  - Import document processing
  - Visa/work permit, etc.

**BRR Trust Fund mechanism**

- On-budget funding mechanism for multi-years projects that enables continuous progress across government budget calendar for housing, infrastructure, public service facility, and land acquisition

**Gender policy**

- Implementation of joint land-titling – first in the country
- Gender equality mainstreaming in all development sectors
MORE THAN ~12,500 PROJECTS INVOLVED

Implement & coordinate
Government budget
- ~5000 projects

Coordinate
Donor ~ 49 countries
- ~1500 projects

NGO ~ 600 organizations
- ~6000 projects

Reconstruction actors
Local govt (dinas) NGOs Contractor Supplier Consultant
RECONSTRUCTION STARTED IN MID-2005 WITH COMMUNITIES PARTICIPATE IN THE OVERALL EFFORTS...

Village planning ~ community participation at its best
COMMUNITIES DECIDE IF THEIR AREA WILL BE REBUILT with LAND CONSOLIDATION (better planned urban centers and increased access to basic facilities) or KEPT AS IT WAS.
After Reconstruction ....
## REHABILITATION and RECONSTRUCTION in ACEH & NIAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Damages / Needs</th>
<th>Progress (1st Quarter 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Houses</strong></td>
<td>139,000 units</td>
<td>139,203 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Land</strong></td>
<td>60,000 ha</td>
<td>103,341 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roads</strong></td>
<td>3,000 km</td>
<td>3,058 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Port</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport/airstrip</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>2,500 died</td>
<td>38,981 trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools Fac</strong></td>
<td>2,006 units</td>
<td>1,488 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Fac</strong></td>
<td>127 units</td>
<td>1,047 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Fac</strong></td>
<td>3,183 units</td>
<td>3,192 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALANG, ACEH JAYA – August 2005 to June 2007
More than 133,000 houses built.
New Settlements equipped with EVACUATION ROADS & ESCAPE BUILDING
Disaster Preparedness & Community Awareness
REGULAR / NORMAL DEVELOPMENT STAGE
( MORE THAN 3 YEARS )

REDUCE POVERTY
or
POVERTY PATTERN CHANGE

STRATEGY: EFFICIENCY
PORTS BUILD and REHABILITATED
Needs to improve Export
Community based Bridge Reconstruction at Works
**THE LOCAL ECONOMY IS BEGINNING TO THRIVE ONCE MORE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish Ponds Rehabilitated (Ha)</td>
<td>8,085</td>
<td>9,601</td>
<td>17,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEs Supported (unit/pax)</td>
<td>41,774</td>
<td>153,173</td>
<td>194,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Finance Institutions assisted (unit))</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Markets rehabilitated (unit)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMALL AND MEDIUM BUSINESSES ARE GETTING BACK ON THEIR FEET WITH CAPITAL FROM MICROFINANCE INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fish Ponds Rehabilitated (Ha)</th>
<th>SMEs Supported (unit/pax)</th>
<th>Micro Finance Institutions assisted (unit)</th>
<th>Traditional Markets rehabilitated (unit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,085</td>
<td>9,601</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,601</td>
<td>153,173</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,686</td>
<td>194,947</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE LIVELIHOOD OF THOSE ON THE FRINGES OF LEUSER NATIONAL PARK ARE IMPROVING WITHOUT DAMAGING THE NATURAL ECOSYSTEM
1st HARVEST in ACEH BESAR (2006)
BACK TO SCHOOL WHILE SCHOOLS FAC BUILD
NEARLY 40 THOUSAND TEACHERS HAVE BEEN TRAINED, SOME IN JAWA, WHILE STUDENTS RECEIVE PRACTICAL, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
HEALTH FACILITIES PROVIDES SERVICES TO THOSE IN NEED
MEDICAL TRAININGS TO OPERATES HEALTH FACILITIES ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jumlah Pelatihan Tenaga Medis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT
STRENGTHENING CAPACITY PROVIDES THE FOUNDATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
Geospatial Data & Information System Services

**Geo-Portal:** operates by AGDC (Bappeda) and Gov Aceh MIS team

**Data Comm Network in 23 Kab/Kota** operates by Bid. Telematika Dishub (BPDE)
Geographical Information System (GIS)

For accurate GIS-based assets!

For all kind of assets (not only housing)
FINANCING THE RECONSTRUCTION IN ACEH & NIAS

GOI allocates: US$ 2.1 Billions, NGO US$ 2.2 Billions and Donors US$ 2.4 Billions.

93% level commitment
### CONTINUATION OF DONORS SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT IN ACEH AND NIAS

#### CONTINUATION of ECONOMIC DEVT PROGRAM
- **EDFF (Aceh)** : US$ 50 Millions
- **NLEDP (Nias)** : US$ 20 Millions

#### CONTINUATION CAPACITY BUILDING and DRR PROGRAM
- **AGTP (Aceh)** : US$ 4.06 Millions
- **DRR (Aceh)** : US$ 9.87 Millions
- **NITP (Nias)** : US$ 3.89 Millions

*From MDF Remaining Funds*
LESSONS LEARNED FROM BUILDING BACK ACEH-NIAS BETTER

1. A single agency to lead
2. Investment in coordination mechanisms
3. Reform with systemic approach
4. Community engagement
5. Maintenance of the culture of urgency
... DRR PREPAREDNESS

COMPREHENSIVE RISK REDUCTION MODEL

STRATEGY: BUILDING CULTURE OF SAFETY
### Earthquake Data - Indonesia (1900-2004)

- **Earthquake > 7 scale Richter**: 212 times
- **Deep Sea**: 182 (86%)
- **Shallow sea**: 53 (72%)
- **Tsunami Generated**: 86 (40%)

**GUSIAKOV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Tsunami</th>
<th>Total of Disaster</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcano Explosion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Central Java**

**NAD-NIAS**

December, 26th 2004

**Country with Line of Fire**

**Earthquake Distribution Map (Indonesia)**
DRR Framework

POLICY (Institutional)
- Provincial Organization
- DRR policy framework
- DRR Master Plan & Local Action Plan

NON STRUCTURAL (Community Awareness)
- Education and Training
- Research & Development
- Technology alternatives
- CBDRM
- Culture identification
- Emergency Response
- Evacuation Drills
- Mitigation Plan
- Best practices

STRUCTURAL
- Seismic monitoring (*seismograph, accelerograph*)
- Sea level monitoring (*Buoy, tide gauge, GPS*)
- Serene, Escape Route, Escape Building, escape hill, escape sign
- Shoreline and Coastal protection (*dikes, vegetation, natural mangrove, silvofishery*)
- Village Planning

Safe Environment
Comparison between ADB ETESP vs MDF (multi donors)
Status: October 2009
### Pledges, Contribution Received, Committed, Disbursed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>Pledges</th>
<th>Cash Received</th>
<th>Allocated to Projects</th>
<th>Disbursed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Commission*</td>
<td>268.49</td>
<td>174.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Netherlands</td>
<td>171.60</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of United Kingdom*</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Canada</td>
<td>24.21</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Sweden</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Norway</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Denmark</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Germany</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Belgium</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Finland</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of United States</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of New Zealand</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Ireland</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>681.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>511.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>595.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>384.86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Partner Agencies and Executing Agencies (budget & disbursements)

### On-Budget Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Disb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of Aceh Land Administration System Project</td>
<td>RALAS</td>
<td>BPN</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Recovery Through The Kecamatan Development Project (KDP)</td>
<td>KDP</td>
<td>MoHA</td>
<td>64.70</td>
<td>64.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Recovery Through The Urban Poverty Program (UPP)</td>
<td>UPP</td>
<td>MoPW</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>17.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Settlement Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Project for NAD and Nias</td>
<td>REKOMPAK</td>
<td>MoPW</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>84.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Reconstruction Enabling Program</td>
<td>IREP</td>
<td>BRR</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>17.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Reconstruction Enabling Financing Facility</td>
<td>IRFF</td>
<td>BRR</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>36.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nias Kecamatan-Based Recovery and Planning Project</td>
<td>KRRP</td>
<td>MoHA</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Poor and Disadvantaged Areas</td>
<td>SPADA</td>
<td>KPDT</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh - Economic Development Financing Facility</td>
<td>EDFF</td>
<td>KPDT</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jumlah</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>438.91</td>
<td>259.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Off-Budget Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Disb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamno-Calang Road Maintenance Project</td>
<td>LAMNO-CALANG</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support for Badan Rehabilitasi and Reconstruction (BRR) NAD-Nias</td>
<td>TA BRR</td>
<td>UNDP/BRR</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>22.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami Recovery Waste Management Programme (TRWMP)</td>
<td>WASTE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>UNDP/Dinas</td>
<td>39.40</td>
<td>24.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Strengthen the Role and Capacity of CSOs in the Recovery of Aceh</td>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building for Local Resource-based Rural Roads</td>
<td>ILO ROADS</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Delivery and Logistics Program</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>25.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami Recovery Ports Redevelopment Programme (TRPRP)</td>
<td>PORTS</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Forest and Environment Project</td>
<td>AFEP</td>
<td>LIF/FFI</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banda Aceh Flood Mitigation Project</td>
<td>FLOOD MITIGATION</td>
<td>Muslim Aid</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Reduction Risk-Aceh</td>
<td>DRR ACEH</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Government Transformation Programme</td>
<td>AGTP</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jumlah</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151.77</td>
<td>125.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Allocation to Projects**

|                |                |      | 590.68 | 384.87 |

*As of June 30, 2009, Source: World Bank*
MDF Projects Status

Source: MDF
## Comparison of Managed Projects/Funds by Multilateral Donors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>DONORS</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Committed Funds</th>
<th>Disbursed Funds</th>
<th>% Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>World Bank as Partner Agency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>498,42</td>
<td>262,47</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNDP as Partner Agency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>132,17</td>
<td>108,42</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADB as Partner Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IFC as Partner Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MDF Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ADB Alone</td>
<td>12 Sectors/6600 Projects</td>
<td>289,6</td>
<td>257,1</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential and actual Main achievements of MDF programme approach

• a) Unity and coherence
• b) Justified mutual confidence
• c) Covering areas, such as security, emergency proc.d, logistics & com. efficiently in these, the MDF set up and early progress contributed strongly.
• d) Agreeing a similar approach common to donors,
• e) Help in offsetting miss-targeted approaches
• f) Streamlining admin, fiduciary oversight & monitoring
• g) Minimising inter-donor competition & maximising coop. in these the MDF was less successful.
• h) Rapid mob. of a vast array of resources and parallel initiatives needs a roadmap to start from, they are going to be needed often
The Grant Details

- Grant Number: 0002-INO(SF)
- Grant Agreement: Special Operations - Asian Tsunami Fund (ATF): Earthquake & Tsunami Emergency Support Project
- Grant Amount: USD 294.5 million
- Executing Agency: BAPPENAS → BRR → BAPPENAS (April 1, 2009)
- Impl. Agencies: 14 institutions
- Project scope: 12 sectors
- Agreement Date: April 29th, 2005
- Effective Date: July 28th, 2005
- Completion Date: June 30th, 2008 (original)
- Closing Date: December 31st, 2008 (original)

Extension

- Completion Date: December 31st, 2009
- Closing Date: April 30th, 2010
The ADB ETESP Projects

- The biggest single-package grant
- Multi-sector projects
- Involving 14 implementing agencies
- With Off-Budget scheme
- With more than 6600 project packages/contracts

---

**FUNDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATF</td>
<td>290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>294.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CONTRACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Pkgs</th>
<th>Disb.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Desc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ON-BUDGET</td>
<td>6,511</td>
<td>16,231</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Government Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFF-BUDGET</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>9,479</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>ADB Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,632</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ADB ETESP Disbursements Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Allocation USD (000)</th>
<th>Contracts USD (000)</th>
<th>% of Allocation</th>
<th>Utilization USD (000)</th>
<th>% of Contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>31.67</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>103.82%</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>96.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>98.31%</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>94.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro and Small Enterprises</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.62%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.99%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>104.95%</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>95.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>93.76%</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>93.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Water Supply</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>89.71%</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>87.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>73.57</td>
<td>72.85</td>
<td>99.02%</td>
<td>60.95</td>
<td>83.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>102.61%</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>97.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>97.77%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.75%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Bridges</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>36.51</td>
<td>93.62%</td>
<td>30.28</td>
<td>82.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>101.56%</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>98.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiduciary Oversight</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>90.97%</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>88.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>294.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>289.59</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>257.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.30%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Commitment = 98%
- Disbursement = 87%
Experience of MDF compared to ADB approaches:

1. Project selection
   a. without a roadmap we argued with ADB then we settled down to selecting and designing initiatives together; experience and adaptation flowed in both directions. The approach was fast, productive, produced broadly acclaimed results and made entry into rapid procurement much easier.
   b. in early phases the MDF-WB partnership had a good start in identifying projects; but the processes progressively stiffened and slowed. Delays were exacerbated by delays in the procurement process for the consultants that would help with project design and procurement. BRR had to proceed and was well into selection and in many cases implementation on a wide programme before MDF consultant resources could be brought to bear to review projects that had passed local selection rather than engage in a strategic planning and selection process..

2. Procurement
   a. ADB’s post review process contributed to greater self reliance in the combined agency-consultant procurement teams and to speedier process.
   b. ADB’s 2 envelopes/2 stages process is imperfect at finding the absolute optimum provider of complex services; that can be improved;
   c. but it is much faster and easier to safeguard in most applications than the more complex adjudicating process required under the MDF-WB procedure.
   d. UNDP procedure is perhaps simpler again. It is useful to have in the toolkit especially for rapid deployments but only where the fee structure will attract interest from suitable firms or individuals. It has not always been possible to attract the most capable and best value leaders and firms it also takes the procurement outside of the government system for short term advantages and places an expensive control overhead with UNDP rather than in the permanent skilled agencies where it belongs.
   e. UNDP’s oversight structure is well suited to smaller semi-autonomous initiatives but is not so well placed to deal with large complex ventures that require long term and expert client agency engagement.
3. Implementation, adjustment & responsiveness, and problem solving:

- **a.** Hard to compare, but depend so much more on the contractors or consultants. In the Aceh situation, this was very demanding on both.

- **b.** What we could observe however was that if there was a systematic difference, it was in the ability and speed for the consultants and contractors to respond to change circumstances and evolving problems, or opportunities and for the recipients and ADB to respond along with them. In a more admin oriented system that would been difficult and overhead nightmare. We have repeatedly applauded the ADB in this area. We felt WE and ADB were aligned towards effective achievement and would mutually exert ourselves to that goal.

- **c.** ADB used a combination of top ADB staffs with a strong internalised consultants. This was far more adaptive to placing & if necessary reorganising expertise to get the this job done than by staffing mainly from internal ADB.

- **d.** In a more admin oriented environment, with remote level decisions making: every aspect of problem solving & adaptation more difficult and conditions of accountability beyond getting the job done, load all with a distracting overhead. The more admin approach has not benefits in quality (even the routine activities) & detracts from quality where initiative, adaptation & innovation are needed. It is to be avoided & has left a bad impression on the LGs.

- **e.** The ADB "post review process" is sometimes pointed at as a source of risk. Indeed it is. There is a strong risk to project managers if they don’t do things well and concurrently document them well. And there is a slightly increased risk of poor choice in procurement leading to ineligible.
MDF Approach vs ADB Alone

Is an MDF approach or an independent approach more attractive for future ADB involvement in emergency and reconstruction programmes or other complicated multi sector multi agency initiatives?

The answer is mixed:

* ADB alone for efficient impact achievement

* Membership of MDF to have visible stakeholder commitment to cross programme coherence and coordination
The **best** Role of ADB in ETESP:

( ADB achieved by 2006, an early start in forward planning in parallel to the immediate reconstruction projects )

- 1. **2006** - **2009 Capacity Building**: Fisheries, agriculture, education, irrigation and community contracting

- 2. **2006-2009** sub district spatial planning progressive coverage of all the tsunami impacted areas

- 3. **2007** engagement with LGs, leading within days to LG led, strategies, and project preparation and appraisal,

- 4. **2008-2009** working with province managers to develop systems for infrastructure condition & service management, and for forest monitoring

*re-application of TAs to those ends in the time scale dictated by need not administrative convention.*
Lessons learned and to be re-learned:

- Close working relations between ADB and BRR programme managers
- Mutually agree valuable directions, engaged in the specifics
- Direct involvement with focus on speed and quality of the mass of routine works
- Positive involvement in problem solving: Rigor in support of momentum, not inertia.
- Relationships extended through embedded TA and enriched dialogue
- Contrasting programmes:
  - In the interests of efficiency objectives set early and the projects followed that tangent
  - Administration slowed program and projects to a crawl, then depth of accomplishment sacrificed to compensate,
  - Resulting in the opposite of the goals of rigor and without the benefit of speed or adaptability.
Strategy for future Rehab. and Reconstr.

• a. Shorten learning curves, road maps in place, proceed by exceptions and adapt rapidly.

• b. Remain engaged in evaluating what to do better as we go along

• c. Put the mass of programmes directly under the entity that has skills, motivation and resources to execute them

• d. Use of agents and cross agency programmes with a view to providing a forum for coherence and for transfers of resources

• e. Then use simple trust fund procedures, focus donor engagement on quality and facilitating

• f. Start the capacity development and the long term planning at the beginning; the roadmaps can facilitate

• g. Manage CB areas with broad engagement and evolution – very productive overheads to invest in
• h. Need to be engaged in coherent programme management with the government and other donors

• i. Attempts to dominate by any party are totally counterproductive.

• j. Be better informed listeners: restrain the rush to decisions

• k. Use small executive to keep coordination tight; supported by in-depth expertise that bridges across programme aspects.

• l. Test our decision response on feedback; avoid being efficient at creating new problems and miss-targeted initiatives.

• m. Be generous in the time and understanding for cooperating with donors and stakeholders.

• n. The prize for competition between managers, donors and recipient agencies is very shallow and temporary. We need to avoid that being a cost to the recipient communities.
10 Management Lessons for Host Governments
Coordinating Post-Disaster Reconstruction

1. Quickly establish a Coordinating Agency with Adequate power
2. Appoint strong, experienced leadership team to gain full support of other Govt Agencies & Donors Community
3. Maintain “crisis mindset” through entire Reconstruction effort
4. Build a strong implementation capability for the coordinating agency to fill Reconstruction gap
5. First meet Basic Needs, fill Supply Chain gaps, build a coordination War Room, and involve Affected Communities in Reconstruction
6. “Build Back Better” at every opportunity
7. Utilize key partner agencies to play supporting coordinating role
8. Manage Beneficiary and Donor expectations about Pace and Progress
9. Ensure integrity and accountability of funds to gain Donor confidence and support
10. Mix Diplomacy, Authority, and Flexibility to ensure Funding Flows meet actual Needs.
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