THE WEST BANK DATA PROJECT
JERUSALEM, P.O. Box 14319, TEL: 636768

مشروع الضفة والقطاع
القدس ص.ب ١٤٣١٩ تلفون ٦٣٦٧٦٨

פרויקט הגדה והרצועה
ירושלים, ת.ד. 14319 טל: 636768

PD-ABE-860

ISN=79669

ANE/TR/HR - 4725 N. S.
PVO AND WEST BANK GAZA LIBRARY

IX.20. U.S./Government Funded Projects
Working Paper No. 13

regards,
Meron

US GOVERNMENT FUNDED PROJECTS IN THE WEST BANK AND GAZA (1977 - 1983)

(Palestinian Sector)

by

Meron Benvenisti

Working Paper No. 13

© The West Bank Data Base Project, 1984

INTRODUCTION

US Government economic aid to the Palestinian community in the West Bank and Gaza has become in recent months a relatively important political issue. This renewed interest in a relatively modest, low-profile, ongoing US Activity was brought about by the special concern evinced by Secretary of State George Shultz, a concern that led to the formulation of a new US initiative--that of "improvement of the quality of life" of the Palestinians under occupation.

The objectives of that policy were defined recently by former Undersecretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger thus: "I cannot speak to you today about the Palestinian problem without mentioning the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza. Their well-being and desire for a greater voice in determining their own destiny must be another issue of moral concern for us, even as we continue to seek a negotiated solution to the status of the occupied territories. If the acceptance by the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza of a peaceful future is to be nurtured, they must be given a stake in that future by greater opportunities for economic development, fairer administrative practices and greater concern for the quality of their life."

Within the framework of this initiative, US officials visited Israel and the territories and the Israeli Coordinator of Activities in the administered territories visited Washington. Discussions and negotiations were conducted with Palestinian leaders in the territories and proposals were submitted.

"Improvement of the quality of life in the occupied territories" is an ambiguous phrase and open to contradictory interpretations. It may be interpreted as an attempt to help create a viable and independent Palestinian sector, through the development of infrastructure, expansion of a Palestinian

resource base, and income earning enterprises. The interpretation of "quality of life" as an attempt to strengthen the economic base of the Palestinian community, rather than the individual prosperity of its members, implies helping the Palestinians gain greater political independence and a larger measure of control over their future. In this respect, economic aid can be perceived as conforming with stated US positions, such at the Reagan initiative.

However, the same phrase may mean the very opposite. It may be interpreted as an admission of failure to achieve a comprehensive solution to the problem, and a sign that the US is abandoning the attempt to terminate Israeli dominion over the territories. The term "improvement of the quality of life" may convey the message that the US has basically accepted the 'faits accomplis' and is now joining Israel in a policy of pacification. Given the Israeli policy of permitting personal prosperity but forcibly restraining communal development, US aid may contribute to a policy of total economic and political integration. US economic aid, aimed at helping the Palestinians, may paradoxically facilitate Israeli settlement efforts. US funds, channeled into public works in the territories could thereby release Israeli budgets for Jewish settlements.

In view of these conflicting, alternative interpretations of the policy of "quality of life", the West Bank Data Base Project has attempted to analyze the role of the US government economic aid to the Palestinians in the territories and to assess, on the basis of ongoing projects financed by US AID funds, the contribution of the US to the community development or to the pacification alternative.

MODUS OPERANDI

US Government funds are dispensed through Private Voluntary Organizations (PVO). The program is termed "AID Voluntary Agency Grants" and the mandate is phrased officially thus: "[It is] the desire of Congress to support projects and expand insititutions in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza to help build the socio-economic underpinnings necessary to preserve peace." Allocation in 1976 was about US$ 2.5 million, in 1979--US$ 6.9 million and in 1983--US$ 6.5 million. The monies are distributed through six organizations: American Mideast Educational and Training Service (AMIDEAST), Community Development Foundation (CDF), American Near East Refugee Aid (ANERA), Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Holy Land Christian Mission (HCM) and Save the Children Fund. These organizations are supplemented by the Friends Service Committee, the Mennonites and other, smaller European voluntary groups.

Three PVOs deal with development projects, while the remainder are engaged in educational and charitable activities. These organizations are ANERA, CDF and CRS. The PVOs draw up detailed project proposals, based on applications from Palestinian groups and institutions. A basic requirement in development projects is the availability of matching funds to be secured by the Palestinains. These funds are generally forthcoming from the Jordanian authorities. The projects are submitted to AID in Washington, and when approval is obtained, the PVO submit their proposals to the Israeli authorities.

The official licensing authority is the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs through its coordinator of social welfare in the administered territories. However, the real policy decisions concerning development

projects are in the hands of the Ministry of Defense through its coordinator of government operations in Judea, Samaria and Gaza District. Only approved proposals may be implemented. Upon approval, PVO officials supervise the actual work until completion.

From this short description of the modus operandi, one can identify five factors contributing to the process of project initiation and implementation. These factors are: the Palestinian recipients who apply for funds and suggest projects; the PVO which solicit, draw up proposals and negotiate with all other bodies; the US Government, which supplies AID funds; the Jordanian Government, which supplies matching funds; the Israeli Government which approves the projects for implementation.

The pivotal role of the PVOs is clear, for they are the only factor maintaining contact with all other authorities and coordinating the process. The arbiter of the process are the Israeli authorities: projects cannot be implemented without their approval.

THE PASSIVE ROLE OF THE US GOVERNMENT

When analyzing the US Government economic role, it becomes apparent that the input of US official representatives in the process is minimal. Although the financial contribution of the US Government is crucial, US officials are seldom involved in negotiations with the Israeli authorities. The PVOs are left to their own devices, and usually cannot rely on US Government political clout.

It seems that the low-profile, passive and indirect role of US government officials concerning project implementation is deliberate, and intended to

reduce friction with the Israeli authorities on what is perceived as a secondary issue.

Consequently, the main factors influencing project implementation, and hence the character of US economic involvement are: the PVOs and the Israeli Government. The interplay between these two factors determine whether US Government funds are directed towards the community development alternative, or the pacification alternative. It may be argued that the outcome of PVO-Israel interaction is of no concern to the US Government, and that indirect US AID funding of projects does not imply any political responsibility for their consequences. However, neither the PVOs nor Israel are responsible for disbursing US public funds in accordance with a clear mandate from Congress. This responsibility rests with the US Government.

METHOD

This survey is an ex post facto survey. It is based solely on primary records of projects submitted by the PVOs and official Israeli responses. No attempt has been made to interview PVO officials or Israeli officials or request explanations, excepting information on the following questions: nature of the project, total budget, Agency contribution, local matching funds, status of the project (approved, not approved, pending), date of submission, date of reply. Classification of projects by economic branch and sub-branch and by development and maintenance budgets is our own. We attempted to understand motivations, policies and political constraints not through expressed intentions but rather through actions.

This is not a sample survey. The 358 projects analyzed are all the projects submitted by the three PVOs during the period 1977-1983 (except CRS development projects during 1977-79) and involve almost all US AID funds allocated to the West Bank and Gaza development projects during that period. The data compiled and processed enabled us to arrive at certain conclusions, which appear at the end of the survey. The comprehensive nature of the data, presented in the tables and stored in our retrieval system facilitate further research.

OVERALL APPROVAL RATE

Table 1 illustrates total PVO projects during the period under review. The budgets (AID funds and matching funds combined), approval rates and distribution of projects between 1977-83 do not indicate a clear pattern. The fluctuations cannot be explained by the available data. Although aapproval rate fluctuates over the years, the total approved budget (1977-83) is 54.1%, compared to 32.1% disapproved budget and 13.8% pending (less than 1 year). Average annual approved budget is US$ 5.1 million. If one assumes that the share of US funds in approved projects equals its average share in the total projects (Table 5), and reaches 43.7%, then the actual investmenet (1977-1983) of AID funds is approximately US$ 16 million, or US$ 2.3 million per annum.

PROJECTS BY ECONOMIC BRANCHES

Tables 2 and 3 illustrate the distribution of submitted projects and budgets by economic branches. These branches can be grouped into three categories:

1) Development and income-generating branches

2) Social, Educational and Charitable

3) Public Works

Agriculture and industry belong to the first category; education, social-community services, health and charity belong to the second category; drinking water, sewage, access roads and electricity belong to the third category.

Classification of the submitted projects by categories show the following pattern:

Category	Submitted Projects (%)	Submitted Budgets (%)
1) Ec. Development	33.8	45.8
2) Social, Educational	36.3	27.2
3) Public Works	29.9	27.0
Total	100.0	100.0

Given the nature of consumption-oriented public works (distribution grids for drinking water, sewage, distribution grids of electricity for domestic consumption, internal roads and access roads), we can determine from the above figures that one-third of the projects submitted and 45.8% of their estimated budgets are directed to economic development.

DIVISION OF LABOUR AMONG PVOs

Breakdown of budgets submitted by the three agencies show clearly the division of labour among them. While ANERA concentrates on development, CDF concentrates on public works and CRS on social-educational and charity projects.

Category	% of Budgets ANERA	CDF	CRS
1) Ec. Development	60.3	35.7	0.8
2) Social, Educational	~~36.3~~	17.5	81.3
3) Public Works	~~29.9~~	46.8	17.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

ANERA submitted 78.2% of the total budget for agricultural projects and 100% of the budget for industry, while CDF submitted 58% of the total budget for access and internal roads and CRS--46% of the total budget for educational projects.

There is also a marked difference between the size and cost of the projects submitted by the different agencies: ANERA submitted 34.4% of the projects, but they involved 60.4% of the total combined budget. CDF submitted 51.4% of the projects, but they amounted to only 25.8% of the total (combined) submitted budget.

TYPE OF INVESTMENT

Table 4 shows the breakdown of projects by type of investment. Ninety per cent of the total (combined) submitted budget is diverted to capital investment of all types: grids, classroom construction, equipment, clinics, etc. Ten per cent of the budget is directed to operational costs and maintenance.

Table 5 shows that, in general, the principle of 50% matching funds is maintained. 43.7% of the budgets submitted is US AID Funds. The share of the matching fund in the various branches is not uniform. As matching funds come

from Jordan and their disbursement depends on Jordanian Government decisions, one could conclude that the participation rate in the various branches is an indication of Jordanian priorities. However, it could very well be incidental with no special implications.

SUBMITTED AND APPROVED PROJECTS

Tables 6 and 8 compare submitted and approved projects. One may assume that the submitted projects represent PVO and Palestinian priorities, and the approved projects represent the Israeli authorities' policy vis-a-vis economic development in the territories. It is clear from both tables that the approval rate of branches belonging to the first category (economic development), i.e., Agriculture and Industry, is the lowest. Only 40% of projects in agriculture and 33.3% of projects in industry are approved, compared to a much higher approval rate in other categories. Table 8 shows that all projects belonging to the third category (Public Works), i.e., Drinking water, sewage, roads and electricity are favoured by the Israeli authorities--80.6% of the budget for roads, 91.1% for electricity and 88.4% for water is approved.

A comparison of projects and budgets submitted and approved by categories show the Israeli policy input and the resulting shift of emphasis from economic development to public works.

	PVO Intention Submitted		Israeli Reaction Actual Implementation	
Category	Projects(%)	Budgets(%)	Projects(%)	Budgets(%)
1) Ec. Development	33.8	45.8	22.7	29.4
2) Social, educational	36.3	27.2	36.1	26.6
3) Public Works	29.9	27.0	41.2	44.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Whereas PVO intention had been to invest 45.8% of their total budgets in economic development and 30% in public works, the Israeli authorities reversed the proportions--30% for economic development and 44% for public works.

APPROVAL RATE OF INDIVIDUAL PVOs

The reluctance of the Israeli authorities to approve projects aimed at economic development is also reflected in the varying approval rate of projects submitted by individual PVOs. We have seen above the division of labour among the agencies. It is logical that the approval rate of agencies specializing in projects favoured by the Israelis would enjoy a higher approval rate. Tables 9, 10, and 11 show clearly that this is precisely the case.

Category	AGENCY ANERA Budget %	ANERA Approval Rate %	CDF Budget %	CDF Approval Rate %	CRS Budget %	CRS Approval Rate %
1) Ec. Development	60.3	27.0	35.7	67.1	0.8	0.0
2) Soc., educational	36.3	14.9*	17.5	61.5	81.3	93.6
3) Public Works	29.9	93.3	46.8	83.7	17.9	79.6
Total	100.0	37.3	100.0	74.0	100.0	90.4

* Low approval rate caused by disapproval of one health project involving US$ 5,000,000.

The marked variation in approval rate is explained by the emphasis given by the different agencies to economic development projects. It also explains the tense relations, reported by various sources, existing between ANERA which emphasizes economic development projects (60.3%) and the Israeli authorities which are reluctant to allow such projects (40.6% disapproval rate).

Another method of determining Israeli priorities is by analyzing average time taken to reply to submitted projects. Table 12 shows average time of reply by branches. Although the pattern is not consistent, it is clear that projects in agriculture, industry, electricity and classroom construction require more than one year to obtain a reply. Table 13 shows average time of reply by these branches.

SUB-BRANCHES

Classification of projects by sub-branches is revealing. The low approval rate in agriculture (35.6%) is mainly caused by very low approval rate in two sub-branches: agricultural machinery and processing of agricultural produce.

The Israeli authorities turn down almost all projects that involve purchasing of tractors, bulldozers or any other earth-moving equipment. This policy may be attributed to an attempt to prevent Palestinians from reclaiming rough or stony ground otherwise claimed by the Israeli authorities as "state land" being "uncultivable".

A particularly low approval rate (15.3%) is found in projects connected with processing of agricultural produce such as dairies, hatcheries, etc. Apparently, processing of West Bank produce is viewed as direct competition with Israeli enterprises.

In industry, only one-third of projects related to industrial producing machinery are approved. Classroom construction and vocational training also do not rank high in the priorities of the Israeli authorities (32.8% and 36.9% approval rate). It is surprising that grants (defined in the tables as charity) to Palestinian institutions, involving sums that generally do not exceed US$ 5,000, are not favoured by the Israelis (approval rate of 36.2%), apparently because their activity is considered political.

CONCLUSION

1) Detailed analysis of 358 projects, involving a total budget of US$ 66 million, generated by AID funding, administered by Private Voluntary Agencies and submitted to the Israeli authorities, show that one-third of the submitted projects and 45.8% of the proposed budget were directed to economic development. Slightly more than one-third of the projects and 27.2% of the proposed budgets were directed to social, educational and charitable projects. Almost 30% of the projects and 27% of the budgets

were directed to consumption-oriented public works.

2) Israeli intervention caused a major shift in the allocation of projects and budgets. The Israeli authorities tend to disapprove development projects and encourage public works. Consequently, the share of consumption-related public works (drinking water, domestic electricity and internal roads) in the Projects actually implemented reach 44% (compared with 27% of the original program). The share of economic development-related budgets actually implemented is reduced from almost half of the original program to less than one-third.

3) Each US AID dollar allocated "to help build the socio-economic underpinnings necessary to preserve peace" is likely to be dispensed in the following fashion (original program compared with actual implementation, after Israeli intervention):

Type	Submitted Program	Implemented Program
Agriculture	43 cents	15.0 cents
Drinking Water Grid	21 cents	18.5 cents
Health	9 cents	1.0 cents
Education	8 cents	4.5 cents
Food Distribution	7 cents	6.5 cents
Roads	3 cents	2.5 cents
Soc. & Com. Services	3 cents	2.0 cents
Electricity domestic grid	3 cents	3.0 cents
Industry	3 cents	0.5 cents
Not used (disapproved)		32.0 cents
Pending (avg. 8 mos.)		14.0 cents
TOTAL	$1.00	$1.00

4) We could not verify the degree of coordination amongst the three agencies dealing with development projects, and the degree of allocation-planning by AID authorities in Washington. However, analyzing the program ex post

facto, the submitted projects and budgets seem to us balanced, except in three branches: Industry, agricultural-produce processing and credit facilities. The pattern emerging from surveying US economic aid program, through the PVOs, to the West Bank and Gaza during 1977-1983, could support the claims that a serious effort has been made to strengthen the economic base of the Palestinian community and that the "community development" alternative is pursued.

5) However, the program as it is actually implemented presents a different picture. Israeli intervention, through its approval and disapproval policy, alter the emphasis and use US economic aid in the territories to implement Israel's own economic policies of allowing only individual prosperity, and curbing communal economic development. These policies have been described by us elsewhere (The West Bank and Gaza, A Survey of Israeli Policies, AEI Washington DC, Chapter 2, April 1984).

These economic policies are an important component in controlling of a hostile population. Curbing development of a viable and independent Palestinian economic sector forces the Palestinians into dependence on Israel. Continued individual prosperity militates against effective communal organization and pursuit of communal goals. (Though it can be argued in the long run that a rise in individual prosperity produces the conditions for a rise in expectations and articulation of defined social and political objectives.) In short, the actual contribution of US aid to the territories, contrary to the original intention, helps to strenthen the "pacification alternative" pursued by Israel.

6) Moreover, the emphasis on consumption-oriented public works projects, revealed in Israeli approval policies, reduces the budgetary burden on the Israeli government. Classroom construction, internal roads, water and electricity grids are normally provided by governments (including military governments), or, at least financed by taxpayers' money. Directing US (and Jordanian) funds mainly to these projects enables Israel to free its own public funds for other purposes.

7) The survey illustrates empirically the conflicting perceptions of Israeli and US officials as to the interpretation of the phrase "quality of life" in the occupied territories. It also indicates that if it is left up to the PVOs and the Israeli authorities to resolve these conflicting interpretations, the Israeli conception will prevail.

Policymakers responsible for formulating the new US initiative of "improvement of the quality of life in the territories" should bear in mind that the test of their initiative is not in submitting programs and allocating funds, but rather in rigorously pursuing their original objectives and participating actively in their implementation.

TABLE 1

PVO PROJECTS, NUMBER, BUDGETS, YEARS AND STATUS
1977 - 1983

YEAR	NUMBER		BUDGET	%	APPROVED	%	DISAPPROVED	%	PENDING	%	%
1977	12	3.4	7,422.000	11.2	1,372,000	18.5	6,050,000	81.5	-	-	100.0
1978	17	4.7	4,933,500	7.4	2,999,500	60.8	1,934,000	39.2	-	-	100.0
1979	40	11.2	4,760,203	7.2	4,300,203	90.4	460,000	9.7	-	-	100.0
1980	76	21.2	11,937,947	17.9	7,303,113	61.2	4,634,834	38.8	-	-	100.0
1981	64	17.9	14,072,593	21.1	7,313,593	52.0	6,759,000	48.0	-	-	100.0
1982	42	11.7	3,363,974	5.1	2,844,974	84.6	519,000	15.4	-	-	100.0
1983	103	28.8	13,068,372	19.6	3,027,101	23.2	872,140	6.6	9,159,231	70.6	100.0
UNKNOWN 1977-83	4	1.1	6,983,929	10.5	6,823,929	97.7	160,000	2.3	-	-	100.0
TOTAL	358	100.0	66,542,518	100.0	35,984,413	54.1	21,388,974	32.1	9,159,231	13.8	100.0

Source: PVO primary data

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PVO PROJECTS (SUBMITTED)
BY BRANCH AND AGENCY
1977 – 1983

	TOTAL		ANERA				CDF				CRS*			
Branch	No. of Projects	%	No. of Projects	% of Branch	% of Total Projects	% of Agency Projects	No. of Projects	% of Branch	% of Total Projects	% of Agency Projects	No. of Projects	% of Branch	% of Total Projects	% of Agency Projects
Agriculture	115	32.1	43	37.4	12.0	35.0	70	60.9	19.6	38.0	2	1.7	0.6	3.9
Drinking Water Sewage	65	18.2	7	10.8	1.9	5.7	52	80.0	14.5	28.3	6	9.2	1.7	11.8
Education	45	12.6	26	57.8	7.3	21.1	8	17.8	2.2	4.4	11	24.4	3.1	21.6
Social and Comm. Service	44	12.3	10	22.3	2.8	8.1	27	61.4	7.5	14.7	7	16.0	2.0	13.7
Roads	32	8.9	–	–	–	–	16	50.0	4.5	8.7	16	50.0	4.5	31.4
Charity	27	7.5	27	100.0	7.5	22.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Health	14	3.9	1	7.1	0.3	0.8	10	71.4	2.8	5.4	3	21.4	0.8	5.9
Electricity	10	2.8	3	30.0	0.8	2.4	1	10.0	0.3	0.5	6	60.0	1.7	11.8
Industry	6	1.7	6	100.0	1.7	4.9	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Total	358	100.0	123	34.4	34.4	100.0	184	51.4	51.4	100.0	51	14.2	14.2	100.0

* only 1979–1983

Not including Food Distribution and Health-Education projects

Source: PVO primary data

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS (SUBMITTED)
BY BRANCH, AGENCY, NO. OF PROJECTS, TOTAL BUDGETS
IN US$
1977 - 1983

	TOTAL			ANERA			CDF			CRS		
Branch	US$	% of Branch	% of Total	US$	% of Branch	% of Agency Total	US$	% of Branch	% of Agency Total	US$	% of Branch	% of Agency
Agriculture	28,529,495	100.0	42.9	22,319,000	78.2	55.5	6,136,000	21.5	35.8	74,495	0.3	0.8
Water (Drinking) Sewage	13,888,816	100.0	20.9	6,734,000	48.5	16.8	6,810,000	49.0	39.7	344,816	2.5	3.8
Soc. & Comm. Services	2,058,278	100.0	3.1	60,000	2.9	0.1	1,549,000	75.3	9.0	449,278	21.8	4.9
Health	6,058,042	100.0	9.1	5,000,000	82.5	12.4	940,000	15.5	5.5	118,042	1.9	1.3
Education	5,295,487	100.0	8.0	2,379,000	44.9	5.9	510,000	9.6	3.0	2,406,487	45.4	26.2
Roads	2,078,883	100.0	3.1	-	-	-	1,201,000	57.8	7.0	977,883	52.2	9.6
Electricity	2,020,517	100.0	3.0	1,591,000	78.7	4.0	9,000	0.5	0.1	420,517	20.8	4.6
Industry	1,925,000	100.0	2.9	1,925,000	100	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Charity	188,000	100.0	0.3	188,000	100	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Food Distrib.	4,500,000	100.0	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,500,000	100	49.0
Total	66,542,518	100.0	100	40,196,000	60.4	100	17,155,000	25.8	100	9,191,518	13.8	100

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 6

PROJECTS APPROVED, DISAPPROVED AND PENDING
1977 - 1983, BY BRANCH (NUMBER OF PROJECTS)

	SUBMITTED			APPROVED			DISAPPROVED			PENDING*		
Branches	No.	%		No.	% of Submitted	% of Approved Projects	No.	% of Submitted	% of Disappr. Projects	No.	% of Submitted	% of Pending Projects
Agriculture	115	32.1	100	46	40.0	21.8	38	33.0	36.5	31	27.0	22.1
Water (Drinking) Sewage	65	18.2	100	53	81.5	25.1	9	13.9	8.7	3	4.6	7.0
Education	45	12.6	100	22	48.9	10.4	20	44.4	19.2	3	6.7	7.0
Roads	32	8.9	100	26	81.2	12.3	6	18.8	5.8	-	-	-
Soc. & Comm. Services	44	12.3	100	30	68.2	14.2	11	25.0	10.6	3	6.8	7.0
Electricity	10	2.8	100	8	80.0	3.8	1	10.0	1.0	1	10.0	2.3
Health	14	3.9	100	10	71.4	4.7	4	28.6	3.8	-	-	-
Industry	6	1.7	100	2	33.3	0.9	3	50.0	2.9	1	16.7	2.3
Charity	27	7.5	100	14	51.9	6.6	12	44.4	11.5	1	3.7	2.3
Total	358	100		211	58.9	100	104	29.0	100	43	12.0	100

*Average 8 months, if since 1982, classified as disapproved

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 4

PROJECTS SUBMITTED
BY BRANCH AND TYPE OF INVESTMENT
(CAPITAL/REGULAR*)

Branches	Total	Capital	%	Regular	%
Agriculture	28,529,495	28,529,495	100.0	-	0.0
Water (Drinking) Sewage	13,888,816	13,834,816	99.6	54,000	0.4
Health (Construction)	6,058,042	6,058,042	100.0	-	0.0
Education	5,295,487	3,462,858	65.4	1,832,629	34.6
Industry	1,925,000	1,925,000	100.0	-	0.0
Electricity	2,020,517	2,011,517	99.6	9,000	0.4
Soc. & Comm Services	2,058,278	1,998,278	97.1	60,000	2.9
Charity	188,000	-	0.0	188,000	100.0
Roads	2,078,883	2,078,883	100.0	-	0.0
Food Distrib.	4,500,000	-	0.0	4,500,000	100.0
Total	66,542,518	59,898,889	90.0	6,643,629	10.0

* Regular - Maintenance and grants for running expenses

Capital - Construction, equipment and infrastructure

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 5

PROJECTS BY SOURCE OF FUNDS AND BRANCH

Branch	Total	PVO	%	Local*	%
Agriculture	28,529,495	10,818,146	37.9	17,711,349	62.1
Water (Drinking) Sewage	13,888,816	4,999,928	36.0	8,888,888	64.0
Education	5,295,487	3,961,835	74.8	1,333,652	25.2
Industry	1,925,000	815,000	42.3	1,110,000	57.7
Health	6,958,042	840,886	13.9	5,217,156	86.2
Electricity	2,020,517	710,766	35.2	1,309,751	64.8
Soc. & Comm. Services	2,059,278	1,107,621	53.8	950,657	46.2
Charity	188,000	188,000	100.0	-	-
Roads	2,078,883	1,118,044	53.8	960,839	46.2
Food Dist.	4,500,000	4,500,000	100.0	-	-
Total	66,542,518	29,060,226	43.7	37,482,292	56.3

* Mainly funds originated in Jordan

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 7A

PROJECTS SUBMITTED, APPROVED AND DISAPPROVED
BY ECONOMIC SUB-BRANCH (NUMBER OF PROJECTS)

AGRICULTURE

	SUBMITTED			APPROVED			DISAPPROVED			PENDING		
Branches	No.	%		No.	% of Submitted	% of Approved Projects	No.	% of Submitted	% of Disappr. Projects	No.	% of Submitted	% of Pending Projects
Agriculture	115	100	100	46	40.0	100	38	33.0	100	31	27.0	100
Machinery Tractors, etc.	26	22.6	100	7	26.9	15.2	13	50.0	34.2	6	23.1	19.4
Livestock	3	2.6	100	2	66.6	4.3	1	33.3	2.6	-	-	-
Irrigation	3	2.6	100	1	33.3	2.2	2	66.6	5.3	-	-	-
Marketing	11	9.6	100	5	45.5	10.9	5	45.5	13.2	1	9.1	3.2
Processing	10	8.7	100	3	30.0	6.5	3	30.0	7.9	4	40.0	12.9
Credits	3	2.6	100	-	-	-	3	100	7.9	-	-	-
Land Dev.	59	51.0	100	28	47.5	60.9	11	18.6	28.9	20	33.9	64.5

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 7B

WATER

Branches	SUBMITTED No.	SUBMITTED %		APPROVED No.	APPROVED % of Submitted	APPROVED % of Approved Projects	DISAPPROVED No.	DISAPPROVED % of Submitted	DISAPPROVED % of Dissapr. Projects	PENDING No.	PENDING % of Submitted	PENDING % of Pending Projects
Water	65	100	100	53	81.5	100	9	12.3	100	3	6.2	100
Sewage	14	21.5	100	12	85.7	22.6	1	7.1	11.1	1	7.1	33.3
Drinking	46	70.8	100	37	80.4	70.0	8	17.4	88.9	1	2.2	33.3
Pipes	5	7.7	100	4	80.0	7.5	-	-	-	1	20.0	33.3

TABLE 7C

INDUSTRY

Branches	SUBMITTED No.	SUBMITTED %		APPROVED No.	APPROVED % of Submitted	APPROVED % of Approved Projects	DISAPPROVED No.	DISAPPROVED % of Submitted	DISAPPROVED % of Dissapr. Projects	PENDING No.	PENDING % of Submitted	PENDING % of Pending Projects
Industry	6	100	100	2	33.3	100	3	50.0	100	1	16.7	100
Machinery	4	66.7	100	2	50.0	100	2	50.0	66.7	-	-	-
Credit	1	16.7	100	-	-	-	1	100	33.7	-	-	-
Intrast.	1	16.7	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	100

TABLE 7D

EDUCATION

	SUBMITTED			APPROVED			DISAPPROVED			PENDING		
Branches	No.	%		No.	% of Submitted	% of Approved Projects	No.	% of Submitted	% of Disappr. Projects	No.	% of Submitted	% of Pending Projects
Education	45	100	100	22	48.9	100	20	44.4	100	3	6.7	100
Vocational	22	48.9	100	13	59.1	59.1	7	27.3	35.0	2	13.6	66.7
Class Cons.	23	51.1	100	9	39.1	40.9	13	47.8	65.0	1	13.0	33.3

TABLE 8

PROJECTS SUBMITTED, APPROVED, DISAPPROVED AND PENDING (1977 - 1983) BY BRANCH, IN US$

Branch	Total Submitted	%	Approved	%	Disapproved	%	Pending*	%
Agriculture	28,529,495	100	10,146,000	35.6	11,009,000	38.6	7,374,495	25.8
Water (Drinking) Sewage	13,888,816	100	12,278,580	88.4	914,000	6.6	696,236	5.0
Soc. & Comm. Services	2,058,278	100	1,180,582	57.0	655,530	32.0	222,166	10.8
Health	6,058,042	100	735,022	12.1	5,323,020	87.9	-	-
Education	5,295,487	100	3,115,067	58.8	1,944,700	36.7	235,720	4.5
Roads	2,078,883	100	1,675,973	80.6	402,910	19.4	-	-
Electricity	2,020,517	100	1,840,189	91.1	44,814	2.2	135,514	6.7
Industry	1,925,000	100	445,000	23.1	980,000	50.9	500,000	26.0
Charity	188,000	100	68,000	36.2	115,000	61.2	5,000	2.7
Food Distrib.	4,500,000	100	4,500,000	100	-	-	-	-
	66,542,518	100	35,984,413	54.1	21,388,974	32.1	9,169,131	13.8

* Average 8 months, if pending since 1982, classified as disapproved

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 9

PROJECTS APPROVED, DISAPPROVED AND PENDING
ANERA
IN US$

Branches	Total	Approved	%	Disapproved	%	Pending	%
Agriculture	22,319,000	6,108,000	27.0	9,991,000	44.8	6,300,000	28.2
Water	6,734,000	6,180,000	91.8	54,000	0.8	500,000	7.4
Health	5,000,000	-	-	5,000,000	100.0	-	-
Education	2,379,000	615,000	25.9	1,764,000	74.1	-	-
Industry	1,925,000	445,000	33.1	980,000	50.9	500,000	26.0
Electricity	1,591,000	1,591,000	100.0	-	-	-	-
Charity	188,000	68,000	36.2	115,000	61.2	5,000	2.6
Social Serv.	60,000	45,000	75.0	15,000	25.0	-	-
Total	40,196,000	14,972,000	37.3	17,919,000	44.6	7,305,000	18.2

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 10

PROJECTS APPROVED, DISAPPROVED AND PENDING
CDF
IN US$

Branches	Total	Approved	%	Disapproved	%	Pending	%
Water	6,810,000	5,850,000	85.9	860,000	12.6	100,000	1.5
Agriculture	6,136,000	4,118,000	67.1	1,018,000	16.6	1,000,000	16.3
Comm. Services	1,549,000	969,000	62.6	580,000	37.4	-	-
Roads	1,201,000	856,000	71.3	345,000	28.7	-	-
Health	940,000	660,000	70.2	280,000	29.8	-	-
Education	510,000	240,000	47.1	70,000	13.7	200,000	39.2
Electricity	9,000	9,000	100	-	-	-	-
Total	17,155,000	12,702,000	74.0	3,153,000	18.4	1,300,000	7.6

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 11

PROJECTS APPROVED, DISAPPROVED AND PENDING
CRS
IN US$

Branches	Total	Approved	%	Disapproved	%	Pending	%
Roads	877,883	819,973	93.4	57,910	6.6	-	-
Education	2,406,487	2,260,067	93.9	110,700	4.6	35,720	1.5
Soc. & Comm. Services	449,278	166,582	37.1	60,530	13.5	222,166	49.4
Water	344,816	248,580	72.1	-	-	96,236	27.9
Electricity	420,517	240,189	57.1	44,814	10.7	135,514	32.2
Health	118,042	75,022	63.6	43,020	36.4	-	-
Agriculture	74,495	-	-	-	-	74,405	100.0
Food Distr.	4,500,000	4,500,000	100	-	-	-	-
Total	9,191,518	8,310,413	90.4	316,974	3.5	564,134	6.1

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 12

AVERAGE TIME OF REPLY AND OF
POSITIVE REPLY
BY MAIN BRANCH* (in months)

Dis. of Projects	Avg. Time Reply	Avg. Time Positive Reply
Electricity	19.3	15.3
Agriculture	16.9	9.2
Education Classr.	12.3	8.3
Industry	12	3
Water (Drinking)	7.4	5.6
Charity	6.8	6.3
Health	6.6	7.0
Soc & Comm. Services	6	5.5
Roads	4	4.6

* Not including Pending projects (no reply for less than 12 months)

Source: PVO Primary data

TABLE 13

AVERGE TIME OF REPLY
BY SUB-BRANCHES

Type of Project	Average Time of Reply (Mos.)
Roads	4.2
Education	9.4
Education/Voc.	15.4
Water/Drinking	7.2
Water/Sewage	4.0
Water/Pipes	3.8
Water/Other	14.5
Soc. & Comm. Services	6.0
Electricity	19.3
Agriculture/Machinery	22.0
Agriculture/Marketing	16.5
Agriculture/Processing	19.2
Agriculture/Credit	4.0
Agriculture/Irrigation	16.5
Agriculture/Land Dev.	7.0
Agriculture/Livestock	33.0
Health	6.6
Charity	6.8
Industry/Machinery	12
Industry/Infrastructure	-
Industry/Credit	48
General Average Time of Reply	12.2 Months

Source: PVO Primary data