

Jordan: Pro poor infrastructure projects

Ex post evaluation report

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| OECD sector | 43030 – Urban development and management | |
| BMZ project ID | 1997 65 702 | |
| Project executing agency | Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDC) | |
| Consultant | CES/IGP/Jordanian Consulting Eng. Co | |
| Year of ex post evaluation report | 2007 | |
| | Programme appraisal (planned) | Ex post evaluation report (actual) |
| Start of implementation | Q1 1998 | Q4 1998 |
| Period of implementation | 3 years | 4 years |
| Investment cost | EUR 12.8 million | EUR 16.3 million |
| Counterpart contribution | EUR 2.6 million | EUR 3.5 million |
| Financing, of which FC funds | EUR 10.2 million | EUR 12.8 million |
| Other institutions / donors involved | None | None |
| Performance rating | 2 | |
| Relevance | 2 | |
| Effectiveness | 2 | |
| • Efficiency | 3 | |
| • Overarching developmental impact | 2 | |
| • Sustainability | 2 | |

Brief description, overall objective and project objectives with indicators

The project is part of the "Community Infrastructure Program" (CIP), which was subject to appraisal by the World Bank in 1997 and itself is part of the more comprehensive Social Productivity Programme (SPP). The CIP Programme was aimed at providing finance for social and economic infrastructure measures in order to improve the living conditions of the Palestinian refugees living in 13 refugee camps and 14 squatter settlements. The FC project was implemented as a parallel financing facility of the CIP project and comprised the financing of economic and social infrastructure measures in the context of an open programme conducted in four refugee camps (Souf, Al Hussein, Al Wihdat, Hittin) and in two squatter settlements (AL-Lwziyek und Safh Al-Nuzha).

The programme objective was the provision and use of social and economic infrastructure facilities in four refugee camps and two squatter settlements. Indicators of the achievement of the programme objective are: a) three years after the infrastructure facilities have been put into operation they are still maintained in good condition and are used appropriately; sufficient teaching staff is available at the two schools; social activities and programmes are conducted for the inhabitants at the community centre and the offers are well accepted by the inhabitants.

The overall objective of the programme is to improve the living conditions of the population in the settlements in the programme area. A separate indicator to measure the achievement of the overall objective was not defined at the time of project appraisal.

Project design / major deviations from the original project planning and their main causes

The construction and rehabilitation measures conducted in the refugee camps and squatter settlements covered (1) water pipe networks - 120,000 m, 11,000 house connections, (2) roads (including drainage facilities - about 450,000 sqm, (3) two school buildings and one community building, one health station and one nursery, (4) sewer pipes - about 5,000 m and 2,000 house connections and (5) electrical installations (street lighting). The first two items accounted for just over and just under one third of the project costs and social infrastructure buildings for roughly 15%. In general, the project comprised measures that are of fundamental importance for any community.

The project was implemented in coordination with the competent Jordanian authorities and in line with their plans for the operation of the infrastructure facilities. The Jordanian authorities also participated in the acceptance of construction works. The individual components were planned and designed so as to ensure that costs for the technical solutions were kept to a minimum. Though the project was carried out as an open programme, the measures implemented largely met the expectations set at project appraisal. The expenses for rehabilitating and expanding the drinking water supply in the Hittin refugee camp were substantially higher than had been estimated. Here an elevated tank (28 m in height), a water reservoir (4,000 m³) and a pumping station had to be provided in addition.

As had been planned, the programme was developed in an intensive dialogue with the inhabitants of the settlement areas. The Community Improvement Committees (CIC), which represent the interests of the inhabitants of the refugee camps, played a central role. The procedure to have the inhabitants participate in the programme was implemented by consultants, whose assignment was financed from FC funds. High preference was given to improving the road network, rain water disposal and improvements in the water supply and sewage elimination. In line with the different preferences and depending on the respective site, the measures implemented differed substantially. Due to the participatory approach it was possible to achieve an active participation of the target group in the project implementation.

A substantial deviation from the original planning occurred with regard to the calculated programme cost. There are two reasons for this: On the one hand higher costs were incurred in the Hittin refugee camp due to substantially higher expenses for the rehabilitation of the drinking water supply and the construction and purchase of supplementary facilities and on the other hand, costs increased due to the appreciation of the Jordanian dinar against the DEM / the EUR.

Key results of the impact analysis and performance rating

The water supply, waste water disposal and surface water drainage facilities rehabilitated or provided and the large-scale repair of roads at all six sites are in a satisfactory condition. Losses declined substantially by 25 to 35% at the three settlement areas where the water supply facilities were rehabilitated or newly constructed. The supply quality has improved significantly. Practically all households have not been connected to the central system. The same goes for sewage disposal. While prior to the start of the project the water supply had often been interrupted for weeks, the supply is today regular, reliable and sufficient. However, as is usual all over the country, there is no continuous supply but household water reservoirs are filled and cover the supply for the next few days. The water quality has been improved substantially and national standards, that comply with WHO requirements, are met. According to reports from the

water supply authorities and information from the inhabitants, water-induced diseases are much less frequent, however no precise data is available on this. Consumption per capita and day rose from 60 to about 100 litres. Due to the measures implemented in the areas of surface water drainage and sewage disposal, it was possible to eliminate or at least reduce the frequent overflow of sewage tanks in the densely populated areas as well as flooding in the event of heavy rainfall. The two schools, the community centre, the health station and the nursery that had been constructed are utilised intensively and according to purpose. To give an example: The school in the Al-Nuzha squatter area has 20 classrooms and more than 635 pupils, who are instructed by 29 teachers. The figures for the school in Lawzeyeh are comparable. This means that the schools are operating near the capacity limit. Schooling is compulsory in Jordan. This also applies to the inhabitants of the refugee camps and the Palestinian population and is complied with. On average 70 patients are supplied by four doctors in the health stations. In addition, pregnant women receive advice. The doctors pay regular visits to the schools teaching children on health matters and carrying out vaccination campaigns, etc.

The project has potential to improve gender equality. No specific measures were carried out in this respect and no corresponding impacts were noticed. The projects did not pursue the goal of improving the environment. Even though we have not obtained any precise data on the share of poor people at the project sites, we assume that the share of poor people is significantly higher in the refugee camps and the squatter settlements than in the country as a whole (14 %). We estimate the share to be over 30%. The target group benefits directly from the social infrastructure provided in the framework of the project. Due to the involvement of the target group in the project design, which had been part of the project concept (the participation of the CICs), the project helped to improve the participatory development.

We rate the developmental effectiveness of the project as follows:

Relevance: The insufficient equipment of the Palestinian refugee camps and squatter settlements with basic economic and social infrastructure facilities was one developmentally relevant core problem looked at during the project appraisal. The impact hypothesis by which the living conditions of the population in the refugee camps and squatter settlements are to be improved by providing finance for economic and social infrastructure facilities is plausible. Given the local framework conditions, the project design was adequate; in consequence, after the measures were terminated the responsible project executing agencies were in the position to operate the infrastructure facilities provided without any problems worth mentioning. As a part of the Community Infrastructure Programme the FC measures were coordinated in a reasonable manner with the contributions rendered by the partner country and the World Bank as lead donor. We therefore rate the effectiveness of the project as good (sub-rating 2).

Effectiveness: The project objective was to achieve an appropriate utilisation of the provided social and economic infrastructure facilities. Even though no quantitative indicators were defined for the achievement of objectives the information available on the improved supply of water (regular supplies, reduced losses, better water quality), the utilisation of the schools and the improved transport situation suggest that the project objectives were reached. Since no alternative infrastructure facilities are available in the camps in these areas, the population living there would not have benefited from an improved supply without the project. We therefore rate the effectiveness of the project as good (sub-rating 2).

Efficiency: In the framework of the project planning several alternatives had been compared, whereby the preference was on solutions that keep costs to a minimum while at the same time ensuring a minimum of supply. We consider the specific investment costs to be adequate (production efficiency). Analyses conducted by the World Bank on the programme as a whole have shown that the unit costs in the area of road con-

struction were up to 25% lower than usual in Jordan. However, with regard to the allocation efficiency it has to be mentioned that in the area of water supply and sewage disposal, which accounts for roughly one-third of FC funds provided, tariffs are at level that only covers 68% of the full costs of the project executing agency, the Water Authority of Jordan. Operating costs were covered at 133%. Taking into account the use of funds in the different sectors, we assess the project efficiency as satisfactory (sub-rating 3).

Overarching developmental impact: The overall objective of the project was to contribute to improving the living conditions of the population in the programme areas. Given the high connection rate of almost 100%, the clearly increased per-capita consumption of water (from 60 to 100 l/day) and the improved supply reliability, the project made an important contribution to improving the supply situation in the water sector, which had shown deficits at the time of the project appraisal. No quantitative information is available on the other project components (schools, health stations, road infrastructure). Interviews with members of the target group have revealed the high satisfaction (90 %) of the target group with the measures implemented. This is an indication that the overall objective was achieved to a substantial degree. We rate the overarching developmental impacts of the project as good (sub-rating 2).

Sustainability: At the time of the final inspection, which means after four years of operation, the financed infrastructure facilities were in a good condition. As regards the infrastructure facilities, for which no user fees are charged (schools, roads, health stations), there is the risk that the operation might not be ensured during their entire economic and technical lifetime; this risk is mainly influenced by the amount of funds allocated by the Jordanian state to the different operators of the facilities. Due to the substantial increase in budget funds provided to the Ministry of Education it seems plausible to assume that in the future, too, sufficient funds will be allocated for the operation and maintenance of schools (especially for teachers). The same goes for the allocation of funds to the Department of Palestinian Affairs, which is responsible for the maintenance of roads in the refugee camps. As regards the individual project components in the area of water supply and sewage disposal, the fees charged are not sufficient to cover full costs. Up to now, however, financial deficits incurred by the Water Authority of Jordan have regularly been offset by allocations from the state budget. Thus, we consider the risks for the operation of the infrastructure facilities financed under the FC project as still acceptable. Overall, given the comparatively acceptable performance of the operators of the facilities, we assume that the maintenance of the infrastructure facilities financed from FC funds is ensured at an appropriate level, and that even in the event of a deterioration the developmental impacts will remain clearly positive (sub-rating 2).

We rate the developmental effectiveness of the project as good (rating 2).

General conclusions and recommendations

In order to be able to better assess the impacts of projects aimed at improving the living conditions of disadvantaged sections of the urban population a baseline survey should be conducted at representative sites in the context of the project appraisal (even in the event of an open programme) and on this basis quantitative indicators should be formulated for the achievement of the objectives.

Notes on the methods used to evaluate project success (project rating)

Projects are evaluated on a six-point scale, the criteria being relevance, effectiveness, “overarching developmental impact” and efficiency. The ratings are also used to arrive at a final assessment of a project’s overall developmental efficacy. The scale is as follows:

- 1 Very good result that clearly exceeds expectations
- 2 Good result, fully in line with expectations and without any significant shortcoming
- 3 Satisfactory result – project falls short of expectations but the positive results dominate
- 4 Unsatisfactory result – significantly below expectations, with negative results dominating despite discernible positive results
- 5 Clearly inadequate result – despite some positive partial results, the negative results clearly dominate
- 6 The project has no impact or the situation has actually deteriorated

A rating of 1 to 3 is a positive assessment and indicates a successful project while a rating of 4 to 6 is a negative assessment and indicates an unsuccessful project.

Sustainability is evaluated according to the following four-point scale:

Sustainability level 1 (very good sustainability): The developmental efficacy of the project (positive to date) is very likely to continue undiminished or even increase.

Sustainability level 2 (good sustainability): The developmental efficacy of the project (positive to date) is very likely to decline only minimally but remain positive overall. (This is what can normally be expected.)

Sustainability level 3 (satisfactory sustainability): The developmental efficacy of the project (positive to date) is very likely to decline significantly but remain positive overall. This rating is also assigned if the sustainability of a project is considered inadequate up to the time of the ex post evaluation but is very likely to evolve positively so that the project will ultimately achieve positive developmental efficacy.

Sustainability level 4 (inadequate sustainability): The developmental efficacy of the project is inadequate up to the time of the ex post evaluation and an improvement is very unlikely. This rating is also assigned if the sustainability that has been positively evaluated to date is very likely to deteriorate severely and no longer meet the level 3 criteria.

The overall rating on the six-point scale is compiled from a weighting of all five individual criteria as appropriate to the project in question. A rating of 1 to 3 indicates a “successful” project while a rating of 4 to 6 indicates an “unsuccessful” project. In using (with a project-specific weighting) the five key factors to form an overall rating, it should be noted that a project can generally only be considered developmentally “successful” if the achievement of the project objective (“effectiveness”), the impact on the overall objective (“overarching developmental impact”) and the sustainability are considered at least “satisfactory” (rating 3).