



ANNUAL REPORT 2011 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF SCHOOLS IN THE PALESTINIAN TERRITORIES PHASE II & PHASE III

PROJECT FORM 7 SUMMARY 8 2.1 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION 8 2.2 KEY ELEMENTS 8 2.3 KEY RISKS 8 2.4 KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS 8 3 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION 10 3.1.1 Evolution of the context 10 3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring 10 3.1.3 Execution Modalities 10 3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics 10 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 13 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.4.1 Indicators	ACRO	NYMS	5
2.1 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION 8 2.2 KEY ELEMENTS 8 2.3 KEY RISKS 8 2.4 KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS 8 3 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION 10 3.1 CONTEXT 10 3.1.1 Evolution of the context 10 3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring 10 3.1.3 Execution Modalities 10 3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics 10 3.2.1 Indicators 10 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 14	1 PR	OJECT FORM	7
2.2 KEY ELEMENTS 8 2.3 KEY RISKS 8 2.4 KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS 8 3 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION 10 3.1 CONTEXT 10 3.1.1 Evolution of the context 10 3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring 10 3.1.3 Execution Modalities 10 3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics 10 3.1.5 Indicators 10 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3	2 SU	MMARY	8
2.2 KEY ELEMENTS 8 2.3 KEY RISKS 8 2.4 KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS 8 3 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION 10 3.1 CONTEXT 10 3.1.1 Evolution of the context 10 3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring 10 3.1.3 Execution Modalities 10 3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics 10 3.1.5 Indicators 10 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3	2.1	ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION	8
2.3 KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS	2.2		
3 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION 10 3.1 CONTEXT 10 3.1.1 Evolution of the context 10 3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring 10 3.1.3 Execution Modalities 10 3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics 10 3.2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 11 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 17 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16	2.3		
3.1 CONTEXT 10 3.1.1 Evolution of the context 10 3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring 10 3.1.3 Execution Modalities 10 3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics 10 3.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 11 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 17 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execut	2.4	KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS	8
3.1.1 Evolution of the context 10 3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring 10 3.1.3 Execution Modalities 10 3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics 10 3.2.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 11 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 <th>3 AN</th> <th>ALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION</th> <th>. 10</th>	3 AN	ALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION	. 10
3.1.1 Evolution of the context 10 3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring 10 3.1.3 Execution Modalities 10 3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics 10 3.2.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 11 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 <td>3.1</td> <td>Context</td> <td>. 10</td>	3.1	Context	. 10
3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring	3.1		
3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics 10 3.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 11 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16	3.1	· ·	
3.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 11 3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3 RESULT 1 PHASE II: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED 13 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5.1 Indicators 18	3.1	.3 Execution Modalities	. 10
3.2.1 Indicators 11 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3 RESULT 1 PHASE II: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED 13 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution <td>3.1</td> <td>.4 Harmo-dynamics</td> <td>. 10</td>	3.1	.4 Harmo-dynamics	. 10
3.2.2 Analysis of progress made 11 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3 RESULT 1 PHASE II: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED 13 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendation	3.2	SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE	. 11
3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions 12 3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3 RESULT 1 PHASE II: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED 13 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY	3.2	.1 Indicators	. 11
3.2.4 Quality criteria 12 3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3 RESULT 1 PHASE II: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED 13 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED	3.2	.2 Analysis of progress made	. 11
3.2.5 Potential Impact 12 3.2.6 Recommendations 12 3.3 RESULT 1 PHASE II: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED 13 3.3.1 Indicators 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 1		T	
3.2.6 Recommendations. 12 3.3 RESULT 1 PHASE II: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED. 13 3.3.1 Indicators. 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities. 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made. 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions. 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria. 14 3.3.6 Budget execution. 14 3.3.7 Recommendations. 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED. 16 3.4.1 Indicators. 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities. 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made. 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions. 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria. 17 3.4.6 Budget execution. 17 3.4.7 Recommendations. 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED. 18 3.5.1 Indicators. 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of		~ ,	
3.3 RESULT 1 PHASE II: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED		T	
3.3.1 Indicators. 13 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities. 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made. 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions. 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria. 14 3.3.6 Budget execution. 14 3.3.7 Recommendations. 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED. 16 3.4.1 Indicators. 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities. 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made. 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions. 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria. 17 3.4.6 Budget execution. 17 3.4.7 Recommendations. 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED. 18 3.5.1 Indicators. 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities. 18			
3.3.2 Evaluation of activities 13 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18			
3.3.3 Analysis of progress made 13 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18			
3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions 13 3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
3.3.5 Quality criteria 14 3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18			
3.3.6 Budget execution 14 3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18		*	
3.3.7 Recommendations 14 3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18		\boldsymbol{z}	
3.4 RESULT 2 PHASE II: HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON PROJECT SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18		O	
SCHOOL PREMISES ARE OPTIMISED 16 3.4.1 Indicators 16 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18			
3.4.1 Indicators			
3.4.2 Evaluation of activities 16 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18			
3.4.3 Analysis of progress made 16 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18			
3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions 16 3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18		v	
3.4.5 Quality criteria 17 3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18			
3.4.6 Budget execution 17 3.4.7 Recommendations 17 3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED 18 3.5.1 Indicators 18 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities 18			
3.4.7Recommendations173.5RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES ANDENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED183.5.1Indicators183.5.2Evaluation of activities18		·= •	
3.5 RESULT 3 PHASE II: QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED			
ENVIRONMENT IS OPTIMISED183.5.1 Indicators183.5.2 Evaluation of activities18			. 1/
3.5.1Indicators			. 18
3.5.2 Evaluation of activities			
· ·			
		v	

	3.5.4	Risks and Assumptions	
	3.5.5	Quality criteria	
	3.5.6	Budget execution	
	3.5.7	Recommendations	
		SULT 4 PHASE II: THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL CONSTRUC	
		BILITATION IS SUPPORTED.	
	3.6.1	Indicators	
	3.6.2	Evaluation of activities	
	3.6.3	Analysis of progress made	
	3.6.4	Risks and Assumptions	
	3.6.5	Quality criteria	
	3.6.6	Budget execution	
	3.6.7	Recommendations	
		SULT 1 PHASE III: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED	
	3.7.1	Indicators	
	3.7.2	Evaluation of activities	
	3.7.3	Analysis of progress made	
	3.7.4	Risks and Assumptions	
	3.7.5	Quality criteria	
	3.7.6	Budget execution	
	3.7.7	Recommendations	
		SULT 2 PHASE III: STRENGTHENED CAPACITIES WITHIN	İ
	DGB 25		
	3.8.1	Indicators	
	3.8.2	Evaluation of activities	
	3.8.3	Analysis of progress made	
	3.8.4	Risks and Assumptions	
	3.8.5	Quality criteria	
	3.8.6	Budget execution	
	3.8.7	Recommendations	
		SULT 3 PHASE III: IMPROVED WORKING ENVIRONMENT	
	FOR DGI	B AND DGFA	
	3.9.1	Indicators	
	3.9.2	Evaluation of activities	
	3.9.3	Analysis of progress made	
	3.9.4	Risks and Assumptions	
	3.9.5	Quality criteria	
	3.9.6	Budget execution	
	3.9.7	Recommendations	28
4	TRANS	SVERSAL THEMES	29
	4.1 GE	ENDER	29
	4.2 EN	IVIRONMENT	29
5	DECIS	IONS TAKEN BY THE JLCB AND FOLLOW-UP	30
6	LESSO	ONS LEARNED	31

 DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report			!	ı

7	AN	NEXES	32
		LOGICAL FRAMEWORK	
		M&E ACTIVITIES	
	7.3	"BUDGET VERSUS CURRENT (Y - M)" REPORT	32
	7.4	BENEFICIARIES	32
	7.5	OPERATIONAL PLANNING Q1-2012	32

DOCUMENT
TYPE:
2011 Annual
Report
DOCUMENT TITLE:
DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC
DATE OF APPLICATION:
Q1_2012
VERSION:

Acronyms

BS Basic School
BTC Belgian Development Agency

CTD Central Tendering Department

DGD Directorate General of Development Cooperation
DGB Directorate General of Buildings (within MEHE)

DGE Directorates General of Education

DGFA Directorate General of Financial Affairs (within MEHE)

EUR Euro

GEEBD Guideline for Energy Efficient Building Design

GIS Geographical Information System

GOB Government of Belgium

GSD General Supply Department

ICP Indicative Cooperation Program

ILS Israeli Shekel (NIS)

ODA Official Development Assistance

O & M Operation and Maintenance

MEHE Ministry of Education and Higher Education

MOF Ministry of Finance

MOPAD Ministry of Planning and Administrative Development

MPWH Ministry of Public Works and Housing

PA Palestinian Authority

PEA Palestinian Energy Authority

PEERC Palestinian Energy and Environment Research Centre

PT Palestinian Territory

PMT Project Management Team

PSC Project Steering Committee

PV Photovoltaic

RR BTC Resident Representative

SA Specific Agreement

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	•			

SBSD School Buildings Service Department

SWAP Sector Wide Approach

TFF Technical and Financial File

TOR Terms of Reference

TVET Technical and Vocational Education and Training

	DOCUMENT TITLE : Annual report Schools II & III	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION: Q1_2012	VERSION:
--	--	----------------------	---------------------------------	----------

1 Project form

	-		
Project name	CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF SCHOOLS IN THE WEST BANK AND GAZA-PHASE II		
Project Code	PZA 08 022 11		
Location	Palestine Territories		
Budget	€ 10 Million		
Key persons	Fawaz Mujahed, Director DGB, MEHE		
Partner Institution	Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE)		
Date of Specific Agreement	31 December 2008		
Duration of Specific Agreement	30 December 2014		
Target groups	Students, teachers, Ministry of Education in Palestine		
Global Objective	"To improve the quality of primary and secondary education in the Palestinian Territories."		
Specific Objective	"To increase access to education in the Palestinian Territory through the construction of more cost-effective, child and environment friendly schools and to enhance the working environment of the MEHE"		
Results	RESULT NR.1 SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED RESULT NR.2 HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS ON THE CONCERNED SCHOOL PREMISES ARE PTIMISED. RESULT NR.3 QUALITY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT IS IMPROVED. RESULT NR.4 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION IS SUPPORTED.		

Project name	CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF SCHOOLS IN
•	THE WEST BANK AND GAZA-PHASE III
Project Code	PZA 10 026 11
Location	Palestine Territories
Budget	€ 7 Million
Key persons	Fawaz Mujahed, Director DGB, MEHE
Partner Institution	Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE)
Date of Specific Agreement	21 October 2010
Duration implementation	20 October 2014 (validity S.A. until 20 October 2015)
Target groups	Students, teachers, Ministry of Education in Palestine
Global Objective	"To promote the quality of primary and secondary
Clobal Objective	education in the Palestinian Territories."
	"To increase access to education in the Palestinian Territory
Specific Objective	through the construction of more cost-effective, child and
Specific Objective	environment friendly schools and to enhance the working
	environment of the MEHE"
	RESULT NR.1 Access to education is improved by building
	cost-efficient, child and environment friendly school facilities
	with furniture and equipment.
Results	RESULT NR.2 The capacities of DGB are strengthened.
ive suits	RESULT NR.3 The working environment of the DGB and
	the DGFA is improved through the construction of a cost-
	effective and environment friendly administrative building
	with furniture and equipment.
L	

2 Summary

2.1 Analysis of the intervention

Intervention logic	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Sustainability
Specific objective	В	Α	А
PII Result 1	А	Α	С
PII Result 2	А	Α	С
PII Result 3	A	Α	В
PII Result 4	С	С	С
PIII Result 1	В	В	С
PIII Result 2	С	С	С
PIII Result 3	A	А	С

Budget	Expenditure year 2011	Total expenditure up to 2011 (31/12/2011)	Balance of the budget	Execution rate
€ 10,970,568 PII	€ 3,492,560	€ 6,835,512	€ 4,135,146	62%
€ 7,000,000 PIII	€ 117,338	€ 117,338	€ 6,882,662	2%

2.2 Key elements

Financially the most important component in this project is the construction of 16 schools and one administration building, including equipment and furniture.

On the soft side the key components are the organisation of trainings and workshops and capacity building in general.

2.3 Key Risks

There are no major risks that can hinder the implementation of this project. In terms of sustainability the economic factor plays an important role in providing sufficient financial resources for salaries of teachers and maintenance of the buildings.

2.4 Key lessons learned and recommendations

The Directorate General for Buildings (DGB) is well organised and can

DOCUMENT TYPE: 2011 Annual Report	DOCUMENT TITLE : Annual report Schools II & III	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION: Q1_2012	VERSION:
--	--	----------------------	---------------------------------	----------

manage the construction of school buildings in a professional and efficient way.

Palestinian contractors, suppliers and consultants in the meantime have become more familiar with World Bank procedures on tendering. However it is useful to continue working on streamlining tendering and other procedures.

DOCUMENT TYPE: 2011 Annual Report	DOCUMENT TITLE : Annual report Schools II & III	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION : Q1_2012	VERSION:
--	--	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------

3 Analysis of the intervention

3.1 Context

3.1.1 Evolution of the context

The context remained status quo in 2011.

3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring

The anchorage at the DGB of MEHE is very appropriate as it is the main objective and task of the DGB to be in charge of school construction.

3.1.3 Execution Modalities

The project is executed in co-management, which is considered appropriate. There are sometimes delays when a non objection is required from the donor. The alternative would be passing through the Ministry of Finance which has its own disadvantages.

In terms of procurements World Bank procedures are followed. It would be easier for the contractors if Palestinian procedures could be followed but the related guidelines still needs to be drafted.

3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics

The MEHE has a 5 year strategic plan for the whole education sector, presently from 2008 to 2012. It will be evaluated at the end of 2012.

The ministry is harmonizing all inputs from local and external actors through yearly action plans.

DOCUMENT TYPE: 2011 Annual Report	DOCUMENT TITLE : Annual report Schools II & III	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION : Q1_2012	VERSION:
--	--	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------

3.2 Specific objective

3.2.1 Indicators

Specific objective Phase II: To increase access to education in the occupied Palestinian Territories through an improved infrastructure and the creation of a healthy and safe education environment.

Specific objective Phase III: To increase access to education in the Palestinian Territory through the construction of more costeffective, child and environment friendly schools and to enhance the working environment of the MEHE

Indicators Phase II	Baseline value	Progress year N-1	Progress year N	Target year N	End Target	Comments
School enrolment in the concerned villages and cities	6,980					Not all schools completed yet in 2011. (7 completed, 1 school added extra)
Total amount of students graduating in primary schools in the concerned villages and cities	6,118					To be checked later
Total amount of students graduating secondary schools in the concerned villages and cities	4,722					To be checked later
Indicators Phase III						
School enrolment in the concerned villages and cities	4,262				4,435	Not applicable yet
Total amount of students graduating in primary and secondary schools in the concerned villages and cities	3,886 P 3,033 S				4,123 P 3,213 S	Not applicable yet
One school and one administrative office built according to eco-friendly principles (location, energy, materials, equipment, water, ventilation, light)	0				1	Not applicable yet

3.2.2 Analysis of progress made

Phase II: In total 7 schools started operation so far (of which 4 in 2011). Three more schools will be completed in 2012. Presently only enrolment figures are available. Graduation figures come much later. Two more schools were included compared to the original target of 8 (Ithna and Balata). This will increase the expected outputs and outcome.

Phase III: All schools and admin building are still in design phase. Tendering for the 5 schools took more than 8 months. This was due to contractors' strikes (2 tenders) and the time required to address the comments of the lawyer in connection with other two procurement processes. This influenced progress in this project.

3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions

		Potential implication	าร	Risk
	Probability	·		Level
Risk (describe)	(score)	Describe	Score	(score)
General safety in the concerned villages and cities allows students to attend school	Low	Only in specific places it is a matter of concern: roadblocks, intimidations, etc.	Medium	А
Adequate teachers are available	Low	Enough teachers but not enough resources available.	Low	A
Construction costs and exchange rates remain relatively stable	Medium	This includes exchange rates (EUR/NIS), material and labor prices.	Medium	В

3.2.4 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
Effectiveness	А	More schools, higher enrolment
Efficiency	В	Resources are in general well used
Sustainability	А	Capacity (engineers, architects) already available regardless project
Relevance	А	

3.2.5 Potential Impact

A better infrastructure will certainly contribute to a higher enrolment as government's education policy highly encourages education. Present figures confirm this. A potential risk is the financial situation causing teachers not to be paid for their work.

3.2.6 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline
Phase II has been well managed and results in a positive balance. It is recommended to transfer this balance to Phase III in order to complete well the implementation of all activities in Phase III.	3.2.4	DGD, MEHE	End 2012

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	· ·			

3.3 Result 1 Phase II: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED

3.3.1 Indicators

Indicators	Baseline value	Progress 2010	Progress 2011	Target 2011	End Target	Comments	
Total amount of students attending school in concerned villages/cities	76,590						
Total amount of girls attending school in concerned villages/cities	39,369					only 7 schools of 10 started	
Amount of schools operating with shifts systems in concerned villages/cities	22					operation, 3 in Sep 2010, 4 in Sep 2011;	
Distance between home and school in concerned villages/cities	1015m						

3.3.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities	Pro		ress:		Comments (only if the
(See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Α	В	С	D	value is C or D)
1.1 Preparation of Tender documents for consultancy		Х			
and engineering					
1.2 Tendering and awarding service contract		Х			
1.3 Site surveys and elaboration of school design		Х			
1.4 Preparation of Tender documents for school		Х			
construction					
1.5 Tendering and awarding works contract		Х			
1.6 Construction of schools		Х			

3.3.3 Analysis of progress made

All Phase II schools will be completed before June 2012. Construction was either on schedule or ahead of schedule. Due to a budget surplus a tenth school was added to the program. Information on the indicators for 2010 and 2011 is not yet available and may not be relevant as not all schools started operation.

3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions

		Potential implication	าร	Risk
	Probability			Level
Risk (describe)	(score)	Describe	Score	(score)
	medium	Budget overshooting, and	medium	В

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	,			

Currency fluctuation: contract in EUR but contractors work in NIS		contingencies insufficient		
Lack of construction materials (some depend on import from Israeli market)	low	Higher prices and delays	high	В

3.3.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
Effectiveness	Α	
Efficiency	А	
Sustainability	С	External problem related to Palestinian economy

3.3.6 Budget execution

See Budget vs Actuals for Phase II on the next page. This overview covers the whole project and all Results of Phase II School Construction.

3.3.7 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline

Schools Construction II							
Amounts in EUR							
		Budget	Expences till end of year 2010	Expences till Dec. 2011	Total	Remaining Balance	Spent %
A To increase access to education in the Palestinian							
Territoriesthrough improved infrastructure and the creation of healthy and safe educational environment		10,249,765	3,270,068	3,446,605	6,716,673	3,533,092	66
01 Equitable access to school facilities is realised		9,029,075	3,093,538	3,164,586	6,258,124	2,770,951	69
01 Engineering & consultancy	COGEST	300,000	102,614	112,601	215,215	84,785	72
02 Construction Schools	COGEST	7,550,000	2,990,924	3,051,985	6,042,909	1,507,091	80
03 Contingencies construction schools (10%)	COGEST	1,179,075	0	0	0	1,179,075	0
02 Health and safety conditions on concerned school premises ar	e optimised	457,115	15,686	119,935	135,621	321,494	30
01 Equipment Schools	COGEST	414,650	15,686	111,736	127,422	287,228	31'
02 Training health and safety	COGEST	10,000	0	8,199	8,199	1,801	82
03 Contingencies equipment (10%)	COGEST	32,465	0	0	0	32,465	0
03 Quality of school facilities and environment is improved		528,075	145,144	121,154	266,298	261,777	50
01 Furnishing Schools	COGEST	486,100	145,144	121,154	266,298	219,802	55
02 Lay out of school premises	COGEST	0	0	0	0	0	
03 Hand-over schools	COGEST	8,000	0	0	0	8,000	0
04 Contingencies furnishing (10%)	COGEST	33,975	0	0	0	33,975	0'
04 Implementation support		235,500	15,700	40,930	56,630	178,870	24
01 Technical follow-up	REGIE	84,000	15,700	27,094	42,794	41,206	51'
02 National Technical Assistant	REGIE	100,000	0	13,836	13,836	86,164	14'
03 Training, seminar and/or Study Tour	COGEST	15,000	0	0	0	15,000	0
04 BTC Backstopping	REGIE	12,500	0	0	0	12,500	0
05 Study and consultancy fund	COGEST	24,000	0	0	0	24,000	0
X Reserve		358,893	1	0	1	358,892	0
01 Reserve		358,893	1	0	1	358,892	0'
01 Reserve BTC-mgt	REGIE	273,646	1	0	1	273,645	0'
02 Reserve Co-mgt	COGEST	85,247	0	0	0	85,247	0'
Z General Means		362,000	72,883	45,955	118,838	243,162	33'
01 Human Resources		234,000	26,859	36,431	63,290	170,710	27
01 Financial Officer	REGIE	114,000	1,766	8,593	10,359	103,641	9
02 Project Manager	COGEST	120,000	25,093	27,838	52,931	67,069	44
02 Operational Means		30,000	1,352	5,824	7,176	22,824	24
01 Miscallenious (office supplies, operational costs)	COGEST	18,000	981	5,520	6,501	11,499	36
02 Financial costs	COGEST	4,500	371	0	371	4,129	8
03 Legal Advisor	REGIE	7,500	0	304	304	7,196	4
03 Investments		58,000	40,687	0	40,687	17,313	70'
01 Vehicles	COGEST	50,000	40,687	0	40,687	9,313	81'
02 Office equipment	COGEST	8,000		0	0	8,000	0'
04 Follow-up and evaluation		40,000	3,985	3,700	7,685	32,315	19'
01 Audit	REGIE	12,000		3,700	7,685	4,315	64
02 Evaluation	REGIE	28,000	0		0	28,000	0
	REGIE	631,646	21,452	53,527	74,979	556,667	129
	COGEST	10,339,012			6,760,533	3,578,479	659
	TOTAL	10,970,658			6,835,512	4,135,146	

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	·			

3.4 Result 2 Phase II: Health and safety conditions on project school premises are optimised

3.4.1 Indicators

Indicators	Baseline value	Progress year N-1	Progress year N	Target year N	End Target	Comments
Amount of students per toilet	46.3					
Water consumption and amount of water	375.9					anly 7 ashable of 10 started
	m3/month					only 7 schools of 10 started operation, 3 in Sep 2010, 4 in
Number of access facilities in concerned schools	9.1					Sep 2011;
Attendance rates in concerned schools	97.55 %					

3.4.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities	Progress:		Comments (only if the		
(See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Α	В	С	D	value is C or D)
2.1 Preparation of Tender documents for school equipment		Х			
2.2 Tendering and awarding supply contracts		Х			
2.3 Equipping the schools		Х			
2.4 safety training in schools		Х			
2.5 Training in health and safety issues		Х			

3.4.3 Analysis of progress made

All schools will be completed before June 2012. This result mainly relates to the provision of toilets, lavatories, drinking water and related hygiene training.

3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions

See previous chapter.

DOCUMENT TYPE: 2011 Annual	DOCUMENT TITLE : Annual report Schools II & III	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION : Q1_2012	VERSION:
Report				

3.4.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
Effectiveness	А	
Efficiency	А	
Sustainability	С	External problem related to Palestinian economy

3.4.6 Budget execution

See Budget vs Actuals report earlier

3.4.7 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	İ
Report	· ·			i

3.5 Result 3 Phase II: Quality of school facilities and environment is optimised

3.5.1 Indicators

Indicators	Baseline value	Progress 2010	Progress 2011	Target 2011	End Target	Comments
Number of students per classroom in concerned villages/cities	30.83					
Number of students attending school in school buildings (instead of unsuitable rented buildings) in concerned villages/cities	13,335					only 7 schools of 10 started operation, 3 in Sep 2010, 4 i Sep 2011;
Number of side-events and non-school related activities and initiatives organised by community in concerned schools	15					

3.5.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities	Progress:		Comments (only if the		
(See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Α	В	С	D	value is C or D)
3.1 Preparation of Tender documents for school furnishings and equipment		Х			
3.2 Tendering and awarding supply contracts		Х			
3.3 Furnishing and equipping the schools		Х			
3.4 Lay out of school premises		Х			
3.5 Training in maintenance and environmental issues		?			Not yet

3.5.3 Analysis of progress made

All schools will be completed before June 2012. This result is mainly related to school furniture and the layout of the schools. Progress was as planned.

3.5.4 Risks and Assumptions

See previous chapter.

3.5.5 Quality criteria

DOCUMENT TYPE: 2011 Annual	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION :	VERSION:
Report	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	

Criteria	Score	Comments
Effectiveness	А	
Efficiency	А	
Sustainability	В	

3.5.6 Budget execution

See Budget vs Actuals report earlier

3.5.7 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	İ
Report	,			I

3.6 Result 4 Phase II: The implementation of school construction and rehabilitation is supported.

3.6.1 Indicators

Indicators	Baseline value	Progress 2010	Progress 2011	Target 2011	End Target	Comments
Project plans respect the Palestinian standards						No values in baseline
Studies and consultancies executed						
Trainings and seminars attended						

3.6.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities	Progress:			Comments (only if the	
(See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Α	В	С	D	value is C or D)
4.1 Technical follow-up		Х			
4.2 National Technical Assistant		Х			
4.3 Training, seminar and/or Study Tour			Х		Not yet used
4.4 BTC Backstopping		Х			
4.5 Study and consultancy fund			Х		Not yet used

3.6.3 Analysis of progress made

All schools will be completed before June 2012.

This result mainly deals with the improvement of design and technical quality of the schools, including environmental and energy efficiency concerns although this is also part of the Phase III results. No training or study tour has been planned so far and no specific studies related to the schools were done.

3.6.4 Risks and Assumptions

See previous chapter.

DOCUMENT TYPE: 2011 Annual	DOCUMENT TITLE : Annual report Schools II & III	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION : Q1_2012	VERSION:
Report				

3.6.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
Effectiveness	С	No initiatives are taken yet
Efficiency	С	Available financial resources are not used yet
Sustainability	С	Structure ok, but financial resources questionable

3.6.6 Budget execution

See Budget vs Actuals report earlier

3.6.7 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline
This result needs special attention during its last year or even after carrying over the budget to Phase III. Quality improvement studies and related trainings are needed for designers and DGB staff.	3.6.2 / 3.6.3	TA, MEHE staff	December 2012

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	·			

3.7 Result 1 Phase III: SCHOOL FACILITIES ARE INCREASED

3.7.1 Indicators

Indicators	Baseline value	Progress 2010	Progress 2011	Target 2011	End Target	Comments
o Total number of students attending school in concerned villages/cities with girls ratio	50,160 52.8%					
o Number of schools operating with shifts systems in concerned villages/cities	9					design and tendering phase
o Distance between home and school in concerned villages/cities	1,571 m					lasted to the end of 2011; constructions start in 2012;
o Number of students per classroom in concerned villages/cities	27					
o Number of students per toilet	47.6					

3.7.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities	Progress:		Comments (only if the		
(See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Α	В	С	D	value is C or D)
01 Baseline survey		Х			
02 Design and construction of cost efficient, environmental and child friendly schools			Х		Tender or design delays but manageable
03 Construction management					Later
04 Equipment and furnishing					Later

3.7.3 Analysis of progress made

All 5 'normal' schools were tendered in June 2011. The tendering process was delayed by either contractors' strikes, or the evaluation process, or addressing comments raised by the lawyer in connection with the advice on the BTC non objection. Delays are between 3 and 6 months.

The design of the environment friendly school was delayed due to the absence of a project manager, the late arrival of the TA and consequent delays in contacting an appropriate consultant. Delay is expected to be one year.

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	·			

Despite the delays construction works still can be completed in early 2013 for the 5 'normal' schools and early 2014 for the environment friendly school.

3.7.4 Risks and Assumptions

		Potential implication	าร	Risk
Risk (describe)	Probability (score)	Describe	Score	Level (score)
Currency fluctuation: contract in EUR but contractors work in NIS; contracts have a clause for exchange rate adjustments;	medium	Budget overshooting, and contingencies insufficient	medium	В
Lack of construction materials (some depend on import from Israeli market)	low	Higher prices and delays	high	В
Tendering and legal advice issues can cause delays	medium	Delays	low	Α

3.7.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
Effectiveness	В	
Efficiency	В	
Sustainability	С	Related to the availability of funds

3.7.6 Budget execution

See Budget vs Actuals report Phase III next page

3.7.7 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline
Earlier and faster recruitments (of PM and TA)		BTC, MEHE	-

Budget vs. Actua	200.				
Schools Construction III					
Amounts are in EUR					
Allounts are in Lor					
		Budget	Expenses till	Remaining	Spent
		_	Dec. 2011	Balance	%
A Increased access to education in PT trough schools construction and		6,320,000	7,136	6,312,864	00
enhanced working environment at MEHE					
01 Increased access to education		4,880,000	0	4,880,000	0'
01 Baseline survey	COGEST	10,000	0	10,000	09
02 Schools construction - 5 schools	COGEST	3,583,333	0	3,583,333	0%
03 One cost efficient, environmental & child friendly school	COGEST	716,667	0	716,667	0%
04 Construction management (site supervision)	COGEST	150,000	0	150,000	0%
05 Supply and installation of furniture & equipment	COGEST	420,000	0	420,000	0%
02 Strengthened capacities of DGB		240,000	7,136	232,864	39
01 Capacity development on environment & gender issues, procurement	COGEST	80,000	7,136	72,864	9%
02 Workshops & study tours	COGEST	30,000	0	30,000	0%
03 Advising on renewable energy including pilot activity	COGEST	70,000	0	70,000	0%
04 Improved participatory methodology through software for site selection	COGEST	50,000	0	50,000	0%
05 Communication on lessons learnt	COGEST	10,000	0	10,000	0%
03 Improved working environment for DGB and DGFA		1,200,000	0	1,200,000	0%
01 Construction management (site supervision)	COGEST	35,000	0	35,000	0%
02 Construction of cost effective & environmental friendly administrative office	COGEST	1,065,000	0	1,065,000	0%
03 Supply and installation of furniture & equipment	COGEST	100,000	0	100,000	0%
X Contingencies		205,860		201,364	2%
01 Contingencies		205,860	4,496	201,364	2%
01 Contingencies in Co management	COGEST	130,860	0	130,860	0%
02 Contingencies in BTC management	REGIE	75,000	4,496	70.504	6%
Z General means		474,140	,	368,434	22%
01 Personnel		370,200	75,785	294,415	20%
01 Int Technical Assistance	REGIE	150,000	73,697	76,303	49%
02 Project Manager	COGEST	120,000	0	120,000	0%
03 Financial Officer (part-time)	REGIE	24,000	286	23,714	19
04 National Technical Assistant - Infrastructure	COGEST	72,000	0	72,000	0%
05 Legal consultancy	REGIE	4,200	1,802	2,398	43%
02 Investment		27,000	27,016	-16	100°
01 Vehicle	REGIE	25,000	23,164	1,836	93%
02 IT	REGIE	2,000	3,852	-1,852	193%
03 Running costs		19,440	2,600	16,840	1337 13%
01 Office rental	COGEST	8,640	1,710	6,930	20%
02 Communication & operation costs	COGEST	7,200	890	6,310	129
03 Financial costs	COGEST	3,600		3,600	0%
04 Monitoring & evaluation		57,500	305	57,195	19
01 Evaluation	REGIE	30,000		29,725	19
02 Audit	REGIE	20,000	2.0	20,000	09
03 Backstopping	REGIE	7,500	v	7,470	09
	REGIE	337,700	107,602	230,098	329
		331,700	107,002	230,098	32
	COGEST	6,662,300	9,736	6,652,564	09

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	·			

3.8 Result 2 Phase III: STRENGTHENED CAPACITIES WITHIN DGB

3.8.1 Indicators

Indicators	Baseline value	Progress 2010	Progress 2011	Target 2011	End Target	Comments
Level of application of the Building Code and the sustainable principles	45%					
Efficient, transparent participatory methodology with clear set of weighted criteria for school sites selection in place.	Zero					
Policy in favour of women, disabled and specific groups applied within MEHE.						
Environmental concerns integrated within school design and operation and maintenance of the schools	70%					It is too early in the project to measure improvements in these
State of the art guideline integrating recommendations of Energy Efficient Building Code in place	75%					fields
Fiduciary risks taken into consideration within the different MEHE procedures						
Training programmes produced and used. Implemented training plans in place incorporating needs assessment and resource requirements.	Zero					

3.8.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities		Prog	ress:	Comments (only if the	
(See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Α	В	С	D	value is C or D)
01 Capacity development on environment & gender issues, procurement			х		In line with delays on school construction
02 Workshops & study tours			Х		
03 Advising on renewable energy including pilot activity			Х		
04 Improved participatory methodology through software for site selection			Х		
05 Communication on lessons learnt					Too early

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report				

3.8.3 Analysis of progress made

One training took place in Belgium. The training needs assessment still has to take place.

3.8.4 Risks and Assumptions

		Potential implication	ns	Risk
	Probability			Level
Risk (describe)	(score)	Describe	Score	(score)
Needs assessment shows few needs	low	Few trainings will happen	low	Α

3.8.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
Effectiveness	С	Not many trainings happened yet.
Efficiency	С	Needs assessment first needed.
Sustainability	С	Depends on availability of funds

3.8.6 Budget execution

See Budget vs Actuals report earlier

3.8.7 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	· ·			l.

3.9 Result 3 Phase III: IMPROVED WORKING ENVIRONMENT FOR DGB AND DGFA

3.9.1 Indicators

Indicators	Baseline value	Progress 2010	Progress 2011	Target 2011	End Target	Comments
Amount of m2 per employee increased	11.3 m2					
Administrative office respects sustainable principles	60%					design and tendering phase expected to be
Number of staff within both directorates increased.	73					completed by mi
Amount of electricity and diesel fuel consumed	105 Kwh/m2 12.8 l/m2					1

3.9.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities	Progress:		Comments (only if the		
(See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Α	В	С	D	value is C or D)
01 Construction management (site supervision)					Not yet
02 Construction of cost effective & environmental friendly administrative office					Not yet
03 Supply and installation of furniture & equipment					Not yet

3.9.3 Analysis of progress made

The design was finished with 3 months delay. More delay is expected because the cost estimation is over the available budget.

3.9.4 Risks and Assumptions

		Potential implication		Risk
Risk (describe)	Probability (score)	Describe		Level (score)
Currency fluctuation: contract in EUR but contractors work in NIS; contracts have price adjustments clauses;		Budget overshooting, and contingencies insufficient	medium	В
Lack of construction materials (some depend on import from Israeli market)	low	Higher prices and delays	high	В
Tendering and legal advice problems	medium	Delays	low	Α

	CUMENT TITLE : ual report Schools II & III	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION: Q1_2012	VERSION:
--	---	----------------------	---------------------------------	----------

3.9.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
Effectiveness	А	
Efficiency	А	
Sustainability	С	Financial instability might cause problems

3.9.6 Budget execution

See Budget vs Actuals report earlier

3.9.7 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline

DOCUMENT TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION :	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report				

4 Transversal Themes

(This chapter can be elaborated according to the categories mentioned in the guideline.)

4.1 Gender

We refer to the previous chapters.

In general there are a little more female students than male at the schools. With the exception for basic schools (grades 1 to 4) most of the schools are separated in boys schools and girls schools.

The school selection activity needs to take this into account.

4.2 Environment

The project stresses the importance of environment friendliness and energy efficiency throughout the project. This is shown in the designs of schools and the administrative building.

The attention points are reflected in the results in the previous chapters.

DOCUMENT TYPE: 2011 Annual Report	DOCUMENT TITLE : Annual report Schools II & III	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION : Q1_2012	VERSION:
--	--	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------

5 Decisions taken by the JLCB and follow-up

Decisions	Source	Actor	Time of decision	Status
PSC agrees in principle to invest in improvements to the acoustics of schools with a polycarbonate courtyard roof.	PSC Oct 2011	PMT	Oct 2011	First designs for Marah Rabah ready Feb 2012
PSC members agree with the purchase of a project car	PSC Jan 2012	PMT	Feb 2012	PMT is buying
PSC members agree to use the 'regie' contingency budget line to pay for increased legal advice expenses 30,000 EUR	PSC Jan 2012	PMT	Feb 2012	Budget is adjusted
PSC members agree the principle of merging the budgets of phases II and III	PSC Jan 2012	PMT	Feb 2012	Official letter is prepared for the merging
TA will submit a note on the delay in the design of Wadi Al Mughair school	PSC Jan 2012	AT	Feb 2012	Note has been submitted
PMT will draft an explanatory note on the increased cost of the Administration Building	PSC Jan 2012	PMT	Feb 2012	Letter has been sent from MEHE to BTC RR
Annual Report will be sent to PSC members by letter for approval, when it is available but before mid February 2012	PSC Jan 2012	PMT	Feb 2012	Annual Report was submitted to BTC RR on 16 Feb 2012; approvals of PSC members requested;

DOCUMENT				
TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	·			

6 Lessons Learned

Lessons learned	Target audience
The DGB has potential to manage school constructions efficiently.	BTC, DGD
Palestinian contractors, suppliers and consultants have become more familiar with World Bank procedures on tendering.	МЕНЕ, ВТС
It is useful to continue working on streamlining tendering (and other) procedures to facilitate and speed up the project activities.	МЕНЕ, ВТС

DOCUMENT TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION :	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III		Q1_2012	
Report	·			

7 Annexes

7.1 Logical framework

- No changes

7.2 M&E activities

- Baseline study for Phase III was made by the MEHE staff.
- Backstopping mission by Benoit Legrand in March 2011.

7.3 "Budget versus current (y - m)" Report

See in the text.

7.4 Beneficiaries

-

7.5 Operational planning Q1-2012

See next pages (for Phase II and Phase III).

DOCUMENT TYPE:	DOCUMENT TITLE :	DOCUMENT OWNER : BTC	DATE OF APPLICATION:	VERSION:
2011 Annual	Annual report Schools II & III	BOCOMENT OWNER : BTC	Q1_2012	VERSION.
Report	•		_	

		Finar	ncial Plar	nning yea	ar 2012							
Schools Construction II												
Amounts in EUR									2012			
AMOUNTS IN EUR			Expenses till	Expenses		Remaining	1		2012	1		Expecte
		Budget	end of year 2010	Jan till Dec 2011	Total	Balance end 2011	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Balance end 201
A To increase access to education in the Palestinian												
Territoriesthrough improved infrastructure and the creation of healthy and safe educational environment		10,249,765	2 274 222	2 446 605	6,717,838	2 524 027	871,750	566,750	485,750	6,750	4 024 000	1,600,9
			3,271,233	3,446,605		3,531,927				6,750	1,931,000	
01 Equitable access to school facilities is realised	COGEST	9,029,075 300,000	3,093,538 102,614	3,164,586 112,601	6,258,124 215,215	2,770,951 84,785	790,000 20,000	470,000 20,000	384,000 20,000	U	1,644,000 60,000	1,126,9
01 Engineering & consultancy	_									0	·	24,7
02 Construction Schools	COGEST	7,550,000	2,990,924	3,051,985	6,042,909	1,507,091	770,000	450,000	364,000	0	1,584,000	-76,9
03 Contingencies construction schools (10%)	COGEST	1,179,075	45.000	0	0	1,179,075	0	0	42.222	0	0	1,179,0
02 Health and safety conditions on concerned school premises ar		457,115	15,686	119,935	135,621	321,494	40,000	40,000	40,000	0	120,000	201,4
01 Equipment Schools	COGEST	414,650	15,686	111,736	127,422	287,228	40,000	40,000	40,000		120000	167,2
02 Training health and safety	COGEST	10,000	0	8,199	8,199	1,801	0	0	0	0	0	1,8
03 Contingencies equipment (10%)	COGEST	32,465	0	0	0	32,465	0	0	0	0	0	32,4
03 Quality of school facilities and environment is improved		528,075	145,144	121,154	266,298	261,777	35,000	50,000	50,000	0	135,000	126,7
01 Furnishing Schools	COGEST	486,100	145,144	121,154	266,298	219,802	35,000	50,000	50,000		135000	84,8
02 Lay out of school premises	COGEST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
03 Hand-over schools	COGEST	8,000	0	0	0	8,000	0	0	0	0	0	8,0
04 Contingencies furnishing (10%)	COGEST	33,975	0	0	0	33,975	0	0	0	0	0	33,9
04 Implementation support		235,500	16,865	40,930	57,795	177,705	6,750	6,750	11,750	6,750	32,000	145,7
01 Technical follow-up	REGIE	84,000	15,700	27,094	42,794	41,206					0	41,2
02 National Technical Assistant	REGIE	100,000	0	13,836	13,836	86,164	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	18,000	68,
03 Training, seminar and/or Study Tour	COGEST	15,000	0	0	0	15,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000	11,0
04 BTC Backstopping	REGIE	12,500	0	0	0	12,500	0	0	5,000	0	5,000	7,5
05 Study and consultancy fund	COGEST	24,000	1,165	0	1,165	22,835	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	5,000	17,8
(Reserve		358,893	1	0	1	358,892	10,000	0	0	0	10,000	348,8
01 Reserve		358,893	1	0	1	358,892	10,000	0	0	0	10,000	348,8
01 Reserve BTC-mgt	REGIE	273,646	1	0	1	273,645	10,000	0	0	0	10,000	263,6
02 Reserve Co-mgt	COGEST	85,247	0	0	0	85,247	0	0	0	0	0	85,2
General Means		362,000	71,718	45,955	117,673	244,327	13,170	11,670	20,170	13,485	40,495	203,8
01 Human Resources		234,000	25,694	36,431	62,125	171,875	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	15,200	156,6
01 Financial Officer	REGIE	114,000	1,766	8,593	10,359	103,641	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	9,200	94,4
02 Project Manager	COGEST	120,000	23,928	27,838	51,766	68,234	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	62,2
02 Operational Means		30,000	1,352	5,824	7,176	22,824	4,620	3,120	1,620	1,620	10,980	11,8
01 Miscallenious (office supplies, operational costs)	COGEST	18,000	981	5,520	6,501	11,499	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	6,000	5,4
02 Financial costs	COGEST	4,500	371	0,020	371	4,129	120	120	120	120	480	3,6
03 Legal Advisor	REGIE	7.500	0	304	304	7,196	3.000	1.500	n	0	4,500	2.6
03 Investments		58,000	40,687	0	40,687	17,313	250	250	250	250	1,000	16,3
01 Vehicles	COGEST	50,000	40,687	0	40,687	9,313	250	250	250	250	1,000	8,3
02 Office equipment	COGEST	8.000	0,007	0	10,007	8,000	200	200	200	200	0	8.0
04 Follow-up and evaluation	555251	40,000	3,985	3,700	7,685	32,315	0	0	10,000	3,315	13,315	19,0
01 Audit	REGIE	12,000	3,985	3,700	7,685	4,315	0	0	10,000	3,315	3,315	19,0
02 Evaluation	REGIE	28,000	3,865	3,700	0	28,000	0	0	10,000	3,315	10000	18,0
02 Evaluation	REGIE	631.646	21.452	53.527	74.979	556.667	19.800	8.300	21,800	10.115	60.015	496.6
	COGEST	10,339,012	3,321,500	3,439,033	6,760,533	3,578,479	19,800 875,120	570,120	484,120	10,115	1,921,480	1,656,9
ncy		10,339,012	3,342,952	3,439,033	6.835.512	4,135,146	894.920	578,420	505.920	20,235	1,921,480	

DOCUMENT
TYPE: DOCUMENT TITLE: DOCUMENT OWNER: BTC DATE OF APPLICATION: VERSION:
2011 Annual Report Schools II & III
Report Q1_2012

Schools Construction III										
							2012			i
Amounts are in EUR		Budget	Expenses till Dec. 2011	Remaining Balance	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total 2012	Balance
A Increased access to education in PT trough schools construction and enhanced working environment at MEHE		6,320,000	7,136	6,312,864	285,349	492,952	1,027,833	916,500	2,722,635	3,590,230
01 Increased access to education		4,880,000	0	4,880,000	284,349	300,952	838,333	725,000	2,148,635	2,731,360
01 Baseline survey	COGEST	10,000	0	10,000					0	10,00
02 Schools construction - 5 schools	COGEST	3,583,333	0	3,583,333	259,349	204,285	741,667	500,000	1,705,301	1,878,03
03 One cost efficient, environmental & child friendly school	COGEST	716,667	0	716,667		71,667	71,667	100,000	243,333	473,33
04 Construction management (site supervision)	COGEST	150,000	0	150,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	100,000	50,00
05 Supply and installation of furniture & equipment	COGEST	420,000	0	420,000				100,000	100,000	320,000
02 Strengthened capacities of DGB		240,000	7,136	232,864	1,000	12,000	9,500	11,500	34,000	198,864
01 Capacity development on environment & gender issues, procurement	COGEST	80,000	7,136	72,864	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	9,000	63,864
02 Workshops & study tours	COGEST	30,000	0	30,000		5,000		5,000	10,000	20,000
03 Advising on renewable energy including pilot activity	COGEST	70,000	0	70,000		1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000	67,000
04 Improved participatory methodology through softw are for site selection	COGEST	50,000	0	50,000	1,000	3,000	3,000		7,000	43,000
05 Communication on lessons learnt	COGEST	10,000	0	10,000			2,500	2,500	5,000	5,000
03 Improved working environment for DGB and DGFA		1,200,000	0	1,200,000	0	180,000	180,000	180,000	540,000	660,000
01 Construction management (site supervision)	COGEST	35,000	0	35,000		10,000	10,000	10,000	30,000	5,000
02 Construction of cost effective & environmental friendly administrative office	COGEST	1,065,000	0	1,065,000		170,000	170,000	150,000	490,000	575,000
03 Supply and installation of furniture & equipment	COGEST	100,000	0	100,000			·	20,000	20,000	80,000
X Contingencies		205,860	4,496	201,364	0	30,000	0	0	30,000	171,364
01 Contingencies		205,860	4,496	201,364	0	30,000	0	0	30,000	171,364
01 Contingencies in Co management	COGEST	130,860	0	130,860	0	30,000	0	0	30,000	100,860
02 Contingencies in BTC management	REGIE	75,000	4,496	70,504	0	0	0	0	0	70.50
Z General means		474,140	105,706	368,434	43,275	42,475	44,275	47,475	177,500	190,93
01 Personnel		370,200	75,785	294,415	41,300	39,000	41,300	39,000	160,600	133,81
01 Int Technical Assistance	REGIE	150,000	73,697	76.303	30.000	30,000	30,000	30,000	120.000	-43.69
02 Project Manager	COGEST	120,000	0	120,000	0	0	0	0	0	120,000
03 Financial Officer (part-time)	REGIE	24,000	286	23,714	2,300	0	2,300	0	4,600	19,114
04 National Technical Assistant - Infrastructure	COGEST	72,000	0	72,000	2,000	0	2,000	0	0	72,00
05 Legal consultancy	REGIE	4,200	1,802	2,398	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	36,000	-33,60
02 Investment		27,000	27,016	-16	1,600	600	600	600	3,400	-3,41
01 Vehicle	REGIE	25,000	23,164	1.836	600	600	600	600	2.400	-56
02 П	REGIE	2,000	3,852	-1.852	1.000	000	000	000	1,000	-2.85
03 Running costs		19,440	2,600	16,840	375	375	2,375	375	3,500	13,34
01 Office rental	COGEST	8,640	1,710	6.930	0	0	2,000	0	2.000	4.93
02 Communication & operation costs	COGEST	7,200	890	6,310	375	375	375	375	1,500	4,83
03 Financial costs	COGEST	3,600	0	3,600	0	0	0	3/5	1,500	3,60
04 Monitoring & evaluation		57,500	305	57,195	0	2,500	0	7,500	10,000	47,19
01 Evaluation	REGIE	30,000	275	29,725	0	0	0	0	0	29,72
02 Audit	REGIE	20,000	0	20,000	0	0	0	5,000	5,000	15,00
03 Backstopping	REGIE	7,500	30	7,470	0	2,500	0	2,500	5,000	2.47
5	REGIE	337,700	107,602	230,098	42,900	42,100	41,900	47,100	174.000	56,09
	COGEST	6.662.300	9,736	6,652,564	285,724	523,327	1,030,208	916.875	2,756,135	3,896,43
	TOTAL	7,000,000	117,338	6,882,662	328.624	565,427	1,030,208	916,875	2,756,135	