



# Evaluation Summary



International  
Labour  
Office

Evaluation Unit

## Investment Budget Execution Support for Rural Infrastructure Development and Employment Generation (TIM Works)

### Quick Facts

**Countries:** *Timor-Leste*

**Final Evaluation:** *March 2012*

**Mode of Evaluation:** *Independent*

**Technical Area:** *EMP/INVEST Labour Based Appropriate Technology*

**Evaluation Management:** *Pamornrat Pringsulaka (Regional Office For Asia and the Pacific)*

**Evaluation Team:** *Martin Sergeant, Casimero des Reis*

**Project Start:** *July 2008*

**Project End:** *February 2012*

**Project Code:** *TIM/08/50/NOR, TIM/08/51/EEC, TIM/08/52/IRL, TIM/10/50/AUS*

**Donor:** *Norway (US\$2,499,452), EEC (US\$2,322,307) Ireland (US\$1,311,712), Australia (US\$3,224,737), Timor-Leste (US\$ 2,758,500) and RBSA (US\$196,508).*

**Keywords:** *Infrastructure, Labour Based Appropriate Technology*

communities through rural development and employment generation. It aimed to achieve this through the construction, rehabilitation and maintenance of rural infrastructure using labour based appropriate technology (LBAT). The capital component, capacity building, and technical assistance received external funding whilst Government of Timor-Leste (GoTL) provided much of the labour cost of the project.

The project covered nine districts and was managed by an ILO team working through the Secretariat of State for Vocational Training and Employment (SEFOPE).

### Present situation of project

The project has now been completed.

### Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide an independent assessment of the TIM Works Project with regards to the relevance, validity of the Project design, efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the Project implementation approaches, sustainability, gender equality promotion, monitoring and evaluation, knowledge sharing and learning environment.

The scope of the evaluation was an examination of the TIM Works Project in terms of its progress, adjustments in implementation arrangements, partnerships, achievements, challenges, good practices, and lessons learned.

### Background & Context

#### Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The project had as its purpose the generation of employment, the reduction of poverty, economic growth and peace building. The immediate objective was "Livelihood improvement and social stability in rural

The primary clients of the evaluation are SEFOPE, ILO, and the Project's four donors.

### **Methodology of evaluation**

The methodology of the evaluation included a document review and meetings in Dili with officials and others. Visits were made to some of the completed roads and discussions held with the communities and beneficiaries. No major limitations were encountered.

## **Main Findings & Conclusions**

The TIM Works project reflects the priorities of the government as set out in GoTL's Strategic Development Plan 2011 to 2030. The project also meets the evolving country policies of the UN and ILO as set out in the UNDAF and DWCP respectively.

The strategic elements of the project were achievable although only with more time and money than was originally included. The intervention logic was realistic and it was possible to complete slightly more than the 300km of road rehabilitation included in the original logical framework indicators. The initial estimate of \$15,000/km was unrealistically low.

Stakeholder interests were integrated effectively in the project. Relations with the communities were managed well. The target for the training of SEFOPE staff was exceeded with a total of fifty being trained compared with a target of thirty.

There will be further scaling up of the project but this will be as part of the forthcoming AusAid Roads for Development (R4D) and EC Enhancing Rural Access (ERA) projects.

The project goal was "To contribute to economic development and poverty reduction by spurring growth in the infrastructure sector." The immediate objective was "Livelihood improvement and social stability in rural communities through rural development and employment generation."

Using the indicators included in the latest version of the logical framework both goal and immediate objective have been met.

A total of 304km of roads has been rehabilitated and 2,150km of roads has been maintained. The quality of road works is good. Roads of this nature require regular maintenance and the project is undertaking maintenance on project and other roads to a good standard. The project had environmental guidelines and an environmental checklist for road works.

The initial target for workdays was 1,037,000 with 30% women and 40% young people. The final figure was 1,370,000 with 27% women and 44% young people. Attempts were made to boost the percentage of women but without success. By the end of the project 32,500 beneficiaries had worked on the roads and earned a total of \$3 million.

The Mid Term Review (MTR) was generally positive and the project team responded effectively to the recommendations made by the reviewer. The project reported against the logical framework and there was no separate monitoring and evaluation process.

Partnership arrangements worked well. The principal partnership was between ILO and SEFOPE. Links with communities and donors also worked well. Having four donors plus ILO RBSA and GoTL funds led to additional administrative work in managing the budget lines.

The project was cost effective and achieved an average cost for rehabilitation of \$22,000/km. Successor projects are expected to cost \$40,000/km and \$50,000/km so that TIM Works is seen to have kept costs to a minimum.

The physical outputs are believed to have been sustainable because arrangements have been made for maintenance through the successor R4D project. R4D will maintain TIM Works and other roads whilst building the capacity of MoI to undertake maintenance itself. SEFOPE

will continue to receive substantial funding each year to carry out routine and periodic maintenance on rural roads and has the capacity to continue the work. The sustainability of the capacity building undertaken with contractors will depend to a large extent on whether or not they have contracts to work on.

The project is seen to have been effective by donors and this has led to successor projects that will continue the role of TIM Works into the future. ILO must continue with its involvement in the successor projects.

## Recommendations & Lessons Learned

### Main recommendations and follow-up

The main recommendations are as follows:

1. Future time estimates must be realistic and based on experience in the same country if at all possible. (Action ILO).
2. Future cost estimates must be realistic and must reflect the situation in country. (Action ILO).
3. Future projects must include at least a portion of work to be constructed using private sector contractors rather than force account. (Action ILO).
4. GoTL must change its financial procedures so that funds are available at the start of the financial year. (Action GoTL).
5. All partnerships with government departments must be clearly identified at the beginning of projects. (Action ILO and GoTL).
6. Sufficient numbers of vibrating rollers for compaction must be bought at the start of a project. (Action ILO).
7. Contracting firms must be screened before they are admitted into a training programme. (Action ILO)
8. SEFOPE staff working on the project must be employed on annual contracts. (Action GoTL)
9. On future multi-donor projects agreement with the donors should be reached to provide only one set of

reports rather than separate sets for each donor. (Action ILO and donors)

10 – Any future capacity building programmes should work with and through the institution it aims to build. (Action GoTL, ILO and donors).

### Important lessons learned

The original eighteen-month project duration was much too short.

The initial costing was unrealistic. It was based on experience in other countries and failed to take account of the need for additional costs, in the mountainous areas of Timor-Leste.

Assumptions on the availability of local compaction equipment (vibrating rollers) for hire were overly optimistic.

It was difficult to get villages to cooperate with one another where they were both working on one road.

Assumptions on working days available were shown to be overly optimistic and construction work was delayed by wet weather.

Funding from GoTL tended to be delayed at the start of the financial year.

Contracting firms need be screened before they are accepted into a training programme.

Working within an institution such as SEFOPE was useful and contributed to the positive outcome.

Ongoing continuous training also contributed to a good outcome. This included training for SEFOPE as well as the community contractors, the regular contractors and the communities.

The use of training and trial contracts was a good way to develop contractors. The trial contracts gave an incentive to the contractors to attend the training.