



<b>1. Project Data:</b>		<b>Date Posted :</b> 10/25/2004	
<b>PROJ ID:</b> P044614		<b>Appraisal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Project Name:</b> Schools Rehabilitation	<b>Project Costs (US\$M)</b>	130.00	129.97
<b>Country:</b> Romania	<b>Loan/Credit (US\$M)</b>	70.00	
<b>Sector(s):</b> Board: ED - Secondary education (33%), Primary education (33%), Pre-primary education (32%), Central government administration (2%)	<b>Cofinancing (US\$M)</b>	13.80	13.80
<b>L/C Number:</b> L4213			
	<b>Board Approval (FY)</b>		98
<b>Partners involved :</b> Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB)	<b>Closing Date</b>	01/31/2003	01/31/2004

<b>Prepared by :</b>	<b>Reviewed by :</b>	<b>Group Manager :</b>	<b>Group:</b>
Helen Abadzi	John R. Heath	Alain A. Barbu	OEDSG

**2. Project Objectives and Components**

**a. Objectives**

This project supported Romania ' s efforts to rehabilitate schools up to the safety standards and pedagogic norms established by the Ministry of Education in accordance with the Education Reform Project . The objectives were to: (a) restore school buildings in imminent danger of collapse, and mitigate the educational disadvantages to students occupying such schools; and (b) improve the Ministry of Education ' s institutional capacity at the national and district levels to plan, develop, and maintain the public educational physical plant .

**b. Components**

Components were: (a) rehabilitating, upgrading, and furnishing kindergarten, primary, and secondary schools in 41 districts (US\$103.24 million); and (b)) strengthening the sectoral capacity of the education ministry, at both the national and county levels, to plan, implement, and manage the government ' s school investment and rehabilitation program; and to manage and maintain the public educational physical plant ( US\$3.25 million).

**c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates**

The project was completed after an extension of 12 months; US\$0.16 million were cancelled. Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB) cofinanced US\$13.8 million.

**3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:**

Both objectives were fully achieved .

**Rehabilitation of pre -university school buildings** . About 1200 buildings were rehabilitated and furnished, meeting an initial goal and surpassing the project target of 900. About 36% of buildings with problems were completely replaced.

**Institutional capacity to manage school buildings** . The facilities maintenance component was carried out satisfactorily; school designs were developed and approved, and a sustainability action plan was put in place . Staff were trained and acquired experience in handling large numbers of buildings; the implementation unit administered a total of 674 contracts. A draft school maintenance handbook was developed .

**4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:**

The rehabilitated buildings serve about 260,000 students; 86% were located in rural areas, many of them poor and earthquake-prone. It enabled instruction in schools that were closed or could not function properly due to damage . It helped the government acquire knowledge, methods, building standards, and technical expertise in managing civil works. Beneficiaries expressed overall satisfaction with the investments . The continuity of staff, combined with a strong presence of staff from the field and proactive country managers, led to good borrower and stakeholder relationships.

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

Ministry salaries for competent professionals were unattractive, and NGO employment was used as a means to pay slightly better rates. Initially community and teacher participation in project -related decisions was limited, since there

was little tradition in this respect. Implementation delays resulted due to differences in procurement rules between the Bank and the government, and local authorities had limited funds for maintenance. There were some reports of unsuitable buildings or local-level corruption, including property-rights disagreements and uncertainties inherent in Romania's transition to a market economy.

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
<b>Outcome:</b>	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	
<b>Institutional Dev.:</b>	Substantial	Substantial	
<b>Sustainability:</b>	Likely	Likely	
<b>Bank Performance:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Borrower Perf.:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Quality of ICR:</b>		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:**

- Stand-alone educational infrastructure projects make sense in countries that have a large number of buildings in condition of disrepair.
  - Differences in procurement methods used by donors and governments often create confusion and delays.
- Differences are compounded when multiple donors participate in a project, each expecting use of their own criteria. Procurement harmonization must be dealt with early on in project design.

**8. Assessment Recommended?**  Yes  No

**9. Comments on Quality of ICR:**

The ICR is detailed and well-reasoned.