



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 06/26/2002									
PROJ ID: P073538		Appraisal	Actual								
Project Name: Emergency Response Program	Project Costs (US\$M)	12.0	11.61								
Country: West Bank & Gaza	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	12.0	11.61								
Sector(s): General education sector (23%), Health (23%), General water sanitation and flood protection sec (23%), Roads and highways (23%), Other social services (8%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)										
L/C Number:											
	Board Approval (FY)		01								
Partners involved :	Closing Date	03/31/2001	08/31/2001								
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Prepared by :</td> <td>Reviewed by :</td> <td>Group Manager :</td> <td>Group:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>John English</td> <td>Soniya Carvalho</td> <td>Alain A. Barbu</td> <td>OEDST</td> </tr> </table>				Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:	John English	Soniya Carvalho	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:								
John English	Soniya Carvalho	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST								
2. Project Objectives and Components a. Objectives <p>The project was a grant funded emergency operation . Its objective was to provide funding for emergency employment generation programs in the West Bank and Gaza (WBG) to target unemployed workers through labor intensive activities over a three to four month period .</p> b. Components <p>The grant provided funds for operations through two types of agencies :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Local Government Units (LGUs)</i>. This included investment in physical infrastructure such as roads, water supply and sanitation and in local infrastructure such as schools and health centers (US\$ 10.41 million). • <i>Local NGOs</i>. The project provided grants to NGOs to implement similar small scale infrastructure projects in Gaza and the West Bank (US\$1.0 million). • <i>Operating costs</i>. Incremental operating costs and consulting fees for the Palestinian Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction (PECDAR) (US\$ 0.31 million). <p>The project made use of Bank administered Holst Fund as the instrument for transferring the project's grant funds to the participating LGUs and NGOs through PECDAR. The Holst Fund was established in 1994 as a means of covering start-up and short term expenditures of the emerging Palestinian administration .</p> c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates <p>The initial grant was US\$ 12 million. By closing, US\$ 11.61 had been drawn down. The closing date was delayed mainly because of border closure and internal closures within WBG and extended import procedures between Gaza and Israel. These delayed the arrival of building materials, and also hampered arrangements for payments to contractors.</p>											
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives: <p>The project generated over 246,000 person-days of employment over a period of eight months and resulted in the provision of infrastructure for needed local services, particularly in education, health, water supply and sanitation, and roads. The labor content of the project was 28%, and the cost per person-day of work was \$47.2. The ICR reports that this is lower than the average for similar projects funded by other donors in WBG since 1989.</p>											
4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts: <p><i>Local Government Units</i>. A total of 209 sub-projects were implemented. These included: the rehabilitation of about 70 km of roads, 18 km of fences and 2 km of retaining walls; the construction of about 60 km of sidewalks; laying about 29 km of sewerage pipes; and construction of 204 classrooms and about 160 classrooms and clinics.</p> <p><i>Local NGOs</i>. A total of 33 sub-projects were implemented, including planting of about 32,000 seedlings and trees, rehabilitation of about 504 donums (about 50 Ha) of land and 67 km of rural roads; and construction of 41 wells.</p>											
5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):											

Data are not available on key issues, e.g. the profile of beneficiaries, quality of infrastructure built, or the amount of income transferred to the poor. Under the circumstances, it is not possible to know what the significant shortcomings were.

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Institutional Dev .:	Substantial	Modest	No evidence is presented that the project made a significant contribution to the Territories' ability to effectively use human or other resources.
Sustainability :	Likely	Non-evaluable	The ongoing security and political situation in WBG, which was the reason for this emergency operation in the first place, creates such a high degree of uncertainty around future events that a balanced judgement is not feasible. It is not clear if adequate mechanisms were in place for ensuring operation and maintenance.
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:

Quick implementation of emergency community projects requires decentralized, streamlined implementation procedures. Simplified procurement methods and disbursement procedures can be a major factor in speeding up project implementation.

8. Assessment Recommended? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The project comprised an emergency grant for immediate financing of labor intensive sub -projects in order to create paid employment for those who had lost employment in Israel after the abrupt border closure in fall 2000. There was no appraisal report and only a brief cover President's Memorandum with a proposal to transfer US\$ 12 million from the Holst fund, to be administered for this purpose. Thus, there was no documentation on targets, activity descriptions, etc. to provide a systematic basis for an ICR. In consequence, the ICR is limited in scope, but does cover the main issues related to the use of the funds provided. In that context it is rated as satisfactory.