



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 04/06/2004	
PROJ ID: P036061		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name: Port Access & Management	Project Costs (US\$M)	145.60	146.06
Country: Poland	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	67.00	67.00
Sector(s): Board: TR - Roads and highways (80%), Ports waterways and shipping (18%), Central government administration (2%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)		
L/C Number: L4080			
	Board Approval (FY)		97
Partners involved :	Closing Date	06/30/2002	06/30/2003
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
Peter Nigel Freeman	Alice C. Galenson	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
(i) To update the legal and administrative framework of the three main ports .			
(ii) To improve accesses to the three main seaports - both from the sea and the hinterland .			
b. Components			
(i) To provide technical assistance for port management reform and re -structuring. (US\$ 1.5m)			
(ii) To develop priority infrastructure to improve access to the three main ports (US\$ 125.3m roads, US\$ 5.0m maritime and US\$ 13.8m coastal protection)			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
There was no significant deviation in overall project costs, but delays in the availability of local government counterpart financing due to administrative delays extended the project completion date by one year . Technical assistance financing was reduced from US\$ 1.5m to US\$ 0.33m after 1.5 years of implementation on the grounds that this objective was being substantially achieved and the remaining funds could more usefully be deployed in the investment component.			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
<u>Updating the legal and administrative framework of the ports.</u>			
This objective was largely achieved . The three port authorities are now acting as port landlords and there has been significant restructuring of relevant Ministries . A new port law has been drafted with a revised regulatory framework that has changed the mindsets of both central and local government . This has already resulted in a lowering of costs through more competition. However, it was probably a mistake to terminate the technical assistance at an early stage as the fine tuning of the relationships between the various players could have been defined more precisely and various issues related to working arrangements resolved .			
<u>Improve accesses to the three main seaports.</u>			
Objective achieved. All investments were successfully completed on budget by project closure and where appropriate the infrastructure was successfully transferred to the municipalities responsible for operations and maintenance. The maritime safety systems were successfully introduced and the environmental measures were implemented highly successfully.			
4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new regulatory framework was set up and institutional restructuring enabled the establishment of landlord port authorities. • In addition to the new Port Law a new system of port assets management was introduced . • Access to the ports was significantly improved . An average ERR of 25% was estimated; this was higher than at appraisal using latest data. The quality of works was also very good . • Port access from the sea was improved and various maritime safety measures introduced . 			

- Environmental mitigation measures in Wolin National Park and breakwaters at Wisla Smiala are considered a good example of "best practice" by the Bank environmental cluster.

5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):

- Greater use could have been made of technical assistance funds to clarify institutional implementation issues and provide port authorities with appropriate tools to manage port areas under the new legislation .The stakeholder workshop criticized the decision to redeploy some of the originally allocated funds .
- Lack of improvement in inter-ministry coordination was identified as a shortcoming . The need to establish an inter-disciplinary policy coordinating unit would probably have resolved this issue .

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

- In projects involving substantial institutional restructuring, efforts at appraisal to set up significant policy dialogue with the Borrower are likely to lead to highly positive outcomes .
- Requests to scale down technical assistance that is part of the initial project design should be considered very carefully before a decision is made .

8. Assessment Recommended? Yes No

Why? Good example of successful port restructuring project . Also environmental best practice examples . An assessment could yield some useful lessons .

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR is concise and well-prepared.