



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 08/15/2002	
PROJ ID : P005319		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name : Health li	Project Costs (US\$M)	29.9	25.5
Country : Jordan	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	20.0	20.0
Sector(s) : Board: HE - Health (81%), Central government administration (19%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	0	0
L/C Number : L3574			
	Board Approval (FY)		1
Partners involved :	Closing Date		
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
Ronald G. Ridker	Helen Abadzi	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
The project was designed to enhance the health status of the population through (a) qualitative improvements in primary and hospital services belonging to the Ministry of Health, and (b) reform of Ministry of Health organization, management, finances and planning capacity.			
b. Components			
Original components included: (1) service upgrading (US\$5.4m), (2) facilities improvement (US\$15.7m), (3) organization and management improvement (US\$2.2m), (4) financing and cost recovery (US\$ 1.2m), and (5) long term planning (US\$0.5m).			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
Just after signing and before effectiveness, the objectives were revised to add upgrading of the Jordan University hospital and creation of a General Services and Stores Department in the Ministry of Health. At the mid-term review in 1998, components 4, 5, the subcomponent on "Ministry of Health Organization" in component 3, and IEC development in component 1 were all dropped. While the overall budget remained the same, allocation to different components was changed to reflect these revisions. The legal document was not amended and a formal restructuring requiring Board approval was not undertaken despite these substantial changes.			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
Data on performance indicators were inadequate to assess impacts on service quality and health status. Services in the primary health care facilities as well as in hospitals belonging to the Ministry of Health and Jordan University marginally improved, possibly as a consequence of the training and equipment provided; but nearly all the training was of short duration and covered small numbers of staff. None of the institutional or organizational objectives, nor any of the activities under the components dropped at mid-term review were achieved.			
4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:			
Training, technical assistance, equipment purchases and planned infrastructure upgrading activities were completed. This probably resulted in some improvements in service delivery. Maintenance workshops established in each hospital helped staff better respond to maintenance requests and, according to a 1998 survey, response time to maintenance requests was reduced.			
5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):			
The project was poorly prepared. There was no good analytical sector work available at the time with the consequence that project's scope was unrealistically ambitious and complex given the institutional capacity of the government. There were no training indicators, no criteria for selecting staff for training and no identification of expected training impact. Institutional and organizational objectives do not appear to have been achieved. For example, there is no evidence that the Ministry of Health is better organized or managed as a result of this project.			

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome :	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Institutional Dev .:	Modest	Modest	
Sustainability :	Likely	Likely	
Bank Performance :	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	

Quality of ICR :	Satisfactory
-------------------------	--------------

NOTE: ICR rating values flagged with '*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:
The project reconfirms the importance of lessons from previous projects, for example, that to improve service quality, the focus must be more on staff training than on expanding/upgrading facilities. It also reconfirms the importance of adequate preparation and concrete signs of government and ministry commitment, including an adequately staffed PIU, prior to implementation. Lessons during project implementation include the need to focus on development objectives, outcomes, sustainability and evaluation early in project life.

8. Assessment Recommended? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:
The ICR is of good quality: in particular, it is complete, well organized, frank, and provides some explanation for each of the conclusions reached.