



:

-

2012 / 1433

:

:

/

2012/ 1433



:

:

20811774 :

:

:2012/5/5

:

[Handwritten signature] :
[Handwritten signature] :
[Handwritten signature] :

.

.1

.

.2

.

.3

-

.....

.....

....

....

.....

....

.....

...

.....

.....

.....

.....

...

:

.

.....:

...../...../.....

:

.(2005)

.(2004)

. 2009-2007

.(2006)

) .

(1996

:(2010)

:

6.2

6.2

()

6.2

5.1

4 2 : 6)

(2010) .(

1870

2278

%40

568

%.10

%12.7

:

:

.%30

:

.%44 30

:

.%100 45

:

.

.

:

(9.9 -5)

(4.9)

(19.9-10)

30)

(29.9-20)

(2008

) .(

6

)

(

/

()

) .

(2009

2000

.2015

18

8

(1999)

.2015

.2015

(OCHA)

:

" "

2010

236

664

89

147

(2008).

(2008) .

) . /
(2008

(1999) . ()

) .
(2008

“ ” “ ”

) .

(2007

(2007) .

(2007) .

(2007) .

(2007) .

(2007) .

·)

(

(2007) .

()

()

)

(

·

(2007)

)

(2007 " "

" "

) .

(2007

) .

(2007 " "

) .

(2007 " "

()

) . /

(2007 " "

()

) .

(2007 " "

CAP

) .

(2007 " "

-2007

452


2010

2010-2007

207

.SPSS

5



The Evaluation of food security programmes in the West Bank from the perspective of the beneficiaries and the implementing organization.

Case study: Food security programmes funded by the Welfare Association

Prepared by: Fayha Issa Nijem.

Supervised by: Dr. Azzam Saleh.

Abstract:

The current study focused on the evaluation of food security programmes in the West Bank from the perspective of the beneficiaries and of the implementing organization, taking food security programmes funded by the Welfare Association (WA), which is an independent Palestinian development organization, as a case study owing to the long history of this organization in the contribution to the Palestinian development process.

The evaluation of food security programmes in the West Bank from the perspective of the implementing organizations was carried out by measuring project relevance with the detected needs, project efficiency and project sustainability. It also examined the phases of project evaluation carried out by the WA and the assessment of project impact on beneficiary organizations.

The study also examined the evaluation of food security projects from the perspective of project beneficiaries looking at areas such as the impact of the projects in terms of beneficiaries' degree of satisfaction from the services provided by the implementing organization and the project's impact on the economic situation of the beneficiaries as well as project sustainability.

The population of the study included in the first place, beneficiary organizations of the WA who received at least one grant from the WA for implementing a food security project during the period between 2007 and 2010. The total number of beneficiary organizations who fulfilled these criteria was 8 organizations. In the second place, the population of the study included beneficiary farmers of the projects implemented by these organizations was 452 farmers distributed throughout the different villages of the West Bank.

The selected sample of the study targeted all the beneficiary organizations who implemented food security projects during the period 2007-2010 and a randomly sample of the beneficiary farmers totaled 207 farmers.

The study was designed and carried out according to the descriptive approach, using the method of personal interviews with beneficiary organizations and beneficiary farmers for primary data collection.. After data collection and verification, data analysis was carried out using the statistical analysis software SPSS.

The results showed that most of these organizations had access to the national strategies before designing their food security programme, 5 of the beneficiary organizations did not have a published strategic plan, whereas a large proportion of beneficiary organizations confirmed that the WA-funded projects contributed to the achievement of their strategic objectives. The results also showed that all beneficiary organizations conducted surveys for assessing the needs of their target groups with the participation of the local community institutions in the targeted sites. The results showed that the beneficiaries participated in the phase of project implementation but were not involved in the phases of project design and monitoring. With regards to project evaluation, the results demonstrated that half of the beneficiary organizations conducted evaluations which were carried out by the project coordinators. The evaluations took into consideration the basic standards of the evaluation process whereas the concept of evaluation was restricted to the delivery of administrative completion reports without the verification of the implemented activities.

The results also showed that the percentage of women benefitting from the project was 83% of the total beneficiaries. Regarding to the level of communication with the beneficiaries, the results of the interviews showed that the level of communication was not satisfactory since 49% of the beneficiaries were not familiar with the name of the beneficiary organization and 70% of the beneficiaries did not identify the name of the funding party. The results also demonstrated that 81% of the beneficiaries were satisfied with the services that they received from the project. Whereas, the level of satisfaction of the beneficiaries with the interest of the organizations in the projects was 47% and the level of satisfaction of the beneficiaries in the follow up of the project by the beneficiary organizations was 36%.

The study concluded with a set of recommendations including the dedication of greater efforts by the WA and their partner organizations to ensure the implementation of a system of monitoring and evaluation of projects for the future use of the information produced by the system in improving the design and implementation of future projects regardless of the absence of project coordinators; it is recommended to initiate the coordination process among partner organizations before the process of beneficiary selection to ensure maximum impact and effectiveness. Finally, the WA should take into consideration the results of the conducted evaluations in its funding decisions.

1.1

()

) .

(2010 ()

:

(1996/)

"

(1996)"

):

(1996

.1

.2

.3

.(

)

.4

.

(2009 ()

). .

.1983

(2009)

2013-2011

/

300

(

)

700

10

.\$ 1,100,000

2.1

2010 -2007

3.1

:

.1

:

1983

.1

.2

2010 -2007

1,100,000

.3

.4

4.1

:

()

:

5.1

.1

.2

.3

.4

6.1

(1

(2

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

(3

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

(4

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

(5

7.1

.2010 -2007

:

:

:

2010 -2007

452

:

:

(2010 -2007)

.

(452)

2010-2007

207

8.1

:

(1

.

(2

.

(3

.

9.1

.(

)

•

•

•

1.2

(2009) .

"

(1996)

(1996

) ."

.

(2011) .

:

-
-
-
-

).(

)

(1996

:

.1.1.2

:

.1

"

"

(1998

) "2000

%3

(2000

) "

) .

(2009

:

.2

: .3

- -
[]

(2009)

: .4

(2009) .

(2011) .

.2.1.2

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

(2008) . .7

963

(2003) .

(2008) .

2.2

(80)	(923) 2007
(40)	(963) 2008 (1992-1990)

2009 - 2010-2008
 (80) (925) 2010 (1.023)
 (12)

2010

2009-2008

2008 ()

(33)

6

4.9

6.5

.1.2.2

1.2

(100=2000 -1998)

:1.2

156	121	247	168	174	129	2007
196	138	240	239	234	164	2008
195	126	281	234	250	154	2008
215	128	278	277	273	173	2008
217	132	276	276	285	196	2008
214	132	266	278	276	161	2008
215	142	265	270	280	155	2008
219	144	263	273	292	156	2008
213	143	264	255	273	183	2008

201	146	247	240	230	188	2008
190	148	218	226	209	174	2008
166	145	197	190	162	153	2008
154	135	171	177	141	155	2008
148	130	151	174	132	151	2008

www.fao.org/worldfoodsituation/FoodPricesindex/en :

%25 1.2
 %40 2007 2008
 %32 2008
 .%36

(2008 ())

2.2

)

: 2.2

(100=2004-2002

128	220	238	225	182	2008
118	142	174	150	257	2009
118	123	185	160	233	2009
119	126	167	144	262	2009
119	129	162	156	318	2009
118	144	158	150	327	2009
117	158	166	152	321	2009
119	208	171	162	361	2009
119	216	171	169	334	2009

2010 :

2020-2011

()

()

%30

%20

(2011

) .

3.2

2002

-

-

(2008)

(2010) .

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

(2008) .

4.2

(2010 " ") .

2003

()

) .

(2008 ()

:

2007

2008

2008

2003

%40

%34

2006

%38

2008

2006

2006

132

2008

158

.(2008

)

%20

:3.2

7.9	6.5	6.22	4.1	()
8	9	9	10	
23.6	25.5	27.9	30.1	
50	43.6	38.8	32.3	18)

(

.2008

:

7.9

4.1

3.2

-

2009

-

2009

2008

2008

%25

2009

%20

.(2009

%35

2008

%44)

2009

2009

.2008

%15

2009

%29

%60
%18 2008 %56
%58 %64
%28
%24
%43 %44
(2009) .()

.1.4.2

(%60) (%25)

(%66)

18 27
(2010 ()) .2009

%200

180
(2010) .

218

.2.4.2

30
(2010) .

2008

(2008)

/2008

:4.2

157	152	143	142	141	143	122	25	-
187	191	199	203	208	212	219	60	-
50.5	48.4	47.4	46.8	46.6	46.9	45.8	1	
28.7	28.6	28.8	28.6	29	29	28.8	1	
126	132	126	127	128	134	127	50	-

%3.6

2009

2009

(2010) .

.3.4.2

2009

"

"

%52.5

%56

%49

"

"

%49)

(2009

).

%53

()

.4.4.2

)

(

).

)

2009

(2010 ()

).

:

.5.4.2

) . 2009
(2009
%60 ()

232 20 2009 199
99
) . 2009
(2009

() 2009 2679
10,400 2007-2005
) .2009 -
(2009

.6.4.2

2007
400 669
269

(2009 ())

:

1.7

" " 2009-2007

252

413)

665

27

(

113

365

2010

2009

(2009 ()

) .

.7.4.2

45

2009

"

"

"

"

(22

23)

(2009 ())

:2009

"

"

()

)

(

جدول رقم 5.2: النداء الموحد في مجال الأمن الغذائي في الأراضي الفلسطينية للعام 2009

%			%			
47	2,242	4,737	108	46,186	42,649	2003
43	2,345	5,450	52	43,183	82,576	2004
41	5,162	12,599	53	45,750	86,476	2005
4	1,561	36,897	124	131,859	106,628	2006
40	5,794	14,480	101	149,876	147,668	2007
56	12,617	22,485	86	172,948	202,129	2008
		56,077			262,209	2009

2009-2003

:

" "

5.2

262

2009

2003

(2003

6)

%24

)

(2006

2009

"

%150

(2009 ()

) ."

.8.4.2

:

:

.

•

10

:

•

1997

()

:

•

2008

2005

•

:

1983

1948

.(2009)

1948

:

:

:

:

:

•

•

•

:

•

.(2009) .

•

:

(2009) .

:

.(2010)

:

.(2010)

:

:

.

•

.

•

.

•

.

•

.

•

.(2009)

•

1983

:

:

•

1999

1994

:

•

:

•

2000

2000

.
.1.5.2

15 1948
1.2) 4.6 2010-2007
1.39 2008 1.18 2009 850 2010
. (2007

.2.5.2

2010-2008
1948

:
(2010) . 3

2013-2011

)
(1948
29

(2012-2008)

) .

2.2

(2010

2010-2007

.3.5.2

2010-2007

)

.(2009

:

•

•

•

.(2009

) .

-2007

620

(

)

700

2010

10

60

80

()

()

) . \$ 1,100,000

.(2009

/

()

(CBOs)

.(2009

) .(QMS)

) .

.(2009

6.2

/

.1.6.2

.2009 ()

/

()

. /

.2.6.2

.2008 ()

/

(DSS)

/

:

.3.6.2

2009 ()

/

:

•

•

•

()

.4.6.2

/ / (:)

2009

)

(

"

.5.6.2

2009

"

2008

2005

. 150

.

:

2007

/

.6.6.2

/

(APIS)

.(APIS)

/

.7.6.2

2009 ()

.()

2009

2005/

.8.6.2

2005

: " "

/

.(2005) .

2010

/" "

.9.6.2

2013-2011

" :

"

:

:

.1

.2

:

.3

:

/

.4

:

:

.5

.6

:

.7

:

1.3

:

.

.

.1

.

.2

.

.3

.

.4

.

.5

.SPSS

.6

.

.7

2.3

2010 – 2007

:

-1

2010 – 2007

(1)

- 2

.1.3

(452)

: :1.3

.2010-2007

15			
10			
10			
35			
50			
4			
10			
13			
6			
33			
8			
9			

9			
26			
18		/	
23			
10			
51			
75	() ()		
100			
12			
15			
11			
11			
21			
10			
80			
542			

:

(2010 - 2007)

(452)

2010-2007

:

$$n = \frac{\left(\frac{z}{d}\right)^2 \times (0.50)^2}{1 + \frac{1}{N} \left[\left(\frac{z}{d}\right)^2 \times (0.50)^2 - 1 \right]}$$

=N

0.95

=Z

1.96

0.05

=d

(207)

(2.3)

:2.3

الجهة المنفذة	اسم المشروع	مواقع التنفيذ	العدد الكلي	العينة
جمعية الحياة البرية - فلسطين	توفير الأمن الغذائي	ارطاس	15	6
		تقوع	10	5
		خلايل اللوز	10	5
		المجموع	35	16
مجموعة مهندسي الصرف الصحي الفلسطينيين	تحسين اقتصاد الريف و انتاج الغذاء	بيت عنان+قطنة+القببية+خراب اللحم	50	23
		دير غزالة	4	2
		زبوبا	10	5
		الجملة	13	6
		عرانة	6	3
المجموع	33	16		
جمعية الدراسات العربية- مركز ابحاث الاراضي	مشروع الحديقة المنزلية	صوريف	8	4
		خاراس	9	4
		الشيوخ	9	4
		المجموع	26	12
مركز العمل التنموي معا	الأمن الغذائي المنزلي	عصيره الشمالية	18	8
		بزاريا	23	10
		برقة	10	5

23	51		المجموع	
35	75	سلفيت(دير استيا+رافات) طولكرم(كفر عيوش+شوفه)	حديقة منزلية	الجمعية التعاونية لتنمية الثروة الحيوانية
46	100	بيت ريما+دير غسانه+عطاره+نعلين+بيت لقيا+دير ابو مشعل	تأهيل حدائق منزلية	المركز العربي للتطوير الزراعي
6	12	زبوبا		
7	15	عرانة		
5	11	دير غزالة	حدائق منزلية	الجمعية التعاونية للتسويق الزراعي
5	11	الجملة		
10	21	بزاريا		
5	10	برقة		
37	80		المجموع	
207	452		المجموع الكلي	

4.3

1.4.3

5

2.4.3

:
()) (12) . ()
/ /

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

3.4.3

:
) : : .1
.(

) : (13) :

.2

.(

:

.3

.

4.4.3

(5)

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

5.3

(8)

(207)

2010-2007

40

()

6.3

7.3

.()



1.4

: .1

:

.(2009)

10 2010 - 2007

756500

()

16

10 300

60

1.3 .

.

: .2

:

2008-1979

(1995)

•

(2005 1995)

•

1.4

(2005)

:1.4

1979	
1991	
1999	/
1999	
2001	/
2002	/
2004	
2008	

:

.3

3

7

2.4

:2.4

1	
3	
8	
1	
1	
0	
7	

: .4

3.4 .

:3.4

8	
1	
4	
2	
4	

:

(2009) .

2.4

7 .1

5

3

7

5

4.4

3

:4.4

1	7	
5	3	
1	7	
3	5	

/

) .

(2010

) .

(2008

(2010) .

) .

(2010

.2

4

4

4

5.4

:5.4

4	
4	
2	
8	
4	

:

) .

(2008

3.4

7

.1

7

6.4 .

:6.4

-	1	7	:
-	1	7	:"
3	1	4	:"
4	1	3	:"
-	-	8	:"

.2

5

8

7.4

:7.4

3	5	
-	8	
6	2	
-	8	

4 .3

4 4

8.4 . 4

:8.4

4	4	
4	4	
4	4	
4	4	
4	4	
4	4	
4	4	/
4	4	
4	4	

4.4

:

7 .1

9.4

:9.4

		:
1	7	
1	7	
1	7	

:

.2

6

10.4

:10.4

1	1	6	" "
-	2	6	" "
-	-	8	" "
-	2	6	" "
-	-	4	" "

5.4

6 .1

5

3

3

4

11.4

:11.4

-	2	6	
-	3	5	
-	5	3	
-	8	-	
-	8	-	

6.4

6

.1

4

5

12.4

:12.4

-	-	2	6	
-	-	4	4	
-	-	3	5	

7.4

4

.1

6

4

8.4

%82.9

.1

%26.2

%45.6

(50-41)

.2

13.4 .(60-51)

:13.4

%	
3.4	30-18
18.4	40-31
45.6	50-41
26.2	60-51
6.3	61

2009

.3

14.4 .%38.3

:14.4

%	
10.7	
5.3	
38.3	
28.2	
6.3	
0.5	
10.7	

(2009 ()

)

"

"

2009

.%41.1

.4

15.4

:15.4

%	
42.1	
11.6	
18.8	
9.7	

14.0	
------	--

:

.%69.4

. .5

16.4

:16.4

%	
69.4	
0.8	
7.4	
9.1	
13.2	

:

.6

17.4 .%41.2

:17.4

%	
27.8	
7.2	
23.7	
41.2	()

:

%41.1

(2009) .

9.4

:

6.92

.1

%3.74

18.4 .%2.53

%2.29 15

:18.4

%	
6.92	
3.74	
3.28	
2.29	15
1.79	15
1.97	15
2.53	
1.84	
1.81	

:

%6.92

5.7

2009

). 7.9

4.1

(2009

10.4

%50.7

.1

%49.3

.%70.5

%29.5

19.4

:19.4

%	%	
49.3	50.7	
70.5	29.5	

:

.2

%81.1

%74.8

%46.6

20.4

.%35.9

:20.4

%	%	%	%	%	
-	1.5	3.9	81.1	13.6	
-	1.0	6.3	74.8	18.0	
-	4.4	35.0	46.6	14.1	
0.5	13.6	34.0	35.0	17.0	

:

.3

%1.5

%98.5

21.4

:21.4

24	20	15	10	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	/
4.9	5.3	1.9	6.8	0.5	0.5	3.4	11.7	2.4	9.2	46.6	5.3	1.5	%

:

.4

%46.1

%100

22.4

:22.4

%	5 %	5-3 %	%	%	
-	11.7	38.8	46.1	3.4	

:

.5

%32.0

%49.5

23.4

:23.4

%	%	%	%	
15.5	32.0	49.5	2.9	

:

.6

%54.9

24.4

:24.4

%	%	%	/
43.2	54.9	1.9	
92.7	3.4	3.9	
85.0	13.1	1.9	
87.9	10.7	1.5	
79.1	6.8	14.1	(.....)
87.9	2.9	9.2	

:

%15.0

.7

%85.0

%31.9

.8

%68.1

()

) .

(2009

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

:

(25.4)

0.00	78.291	5	14	16	24	
		8	23	93	7	
		7	3	2	0	

25.4

0.05

24

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

:

(26.4)

0.174	1.996	93	20	
		82	31	

26.4

0.05

0.174

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

:

(27.4)

0.00	64.202	0	121	
		37	48	

27.4

0.05

121

48



1.5

:

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

()

- -

•

•

•

•

2.5

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

" : (2010) •

.2007 : (2007) •

.2008 : (2008) •

.2009 : (2009) •

: (2008) •

: (2011) •

: (2008) •

: (2010) •

: : (1996) •

.. : (2010) •

: (2011) •

- . / :(2011) . •
- . :(2010) . •
- :(2011) •
- . :(2011) . •
- :(2009) . •
- ... :(2011) •
- :(2009) () •
- :(2011) •
- " :(2011) •
- :"2020 – 2011
- :(2007) . •
- (-)
- :(2008) . •
- " " :(2011) •

:(2008) •

:(2010) () •

" :(2009) •

2010 - 2008 :(2009) •

" :(2009) •

" :(2011) •

:(2003) •

:(2009) •

:(2006) •

:(2009) •

:(2005)

•

:(2008) .

•

()

:(2008) .

•

()

:(2008) .

•

()

:(2009) .

•

()

:(2009) .

•

()

:(2009) .

•

()

:(2011) ()

•

:(2008) ()

•

- 2013 – 2011 : (2010) •
- : (2007) •
- (–)
- : (2009) •
- " " : (2010) •
- : (2005) •
- - : (2008) () •

	\$/			
				2007
	79500) (
	79500) (
	79500) (
	79500) (
	79500) (
	79500) (/
	79500) () (()		

				2009
	52500)	(
)	(
() 80	115500)	(
)	(
4 4	32000)	(
)	(



.....

”

“

-

.....

.....:



	()	.1
	()	.2
	/ /	.3
		.4
		.5
		.6
	/ /	.7
		.8
		.9
		.10
) (...	.11
<input type="checkbox"/> . .1 .2		.12

		.3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8	
			.13
		.1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6	.14
2010-2007			15
			15.1
			15.2
			15.3
			15.4

(RELEVENCE) :

1.2

.2

.1

2.2

.....

3.2

.2

.1

()

4.2

.....

.....

.....

.....

5.2

.2

.1

6.2

.....

7.2

.2

.1

8.2

.....

9.2

.2

.1

()

10.2

.4

.3

.2

.1

.6

.5

EFFECTIVENESS):

1.3

	.2	.1	
	.3		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(

):

2.3

.1

.2

.3

.()

.4

.5

.6

.7

3.3



.2

.1

4.3

.....
.....
.....

5.3



.2

.1

6.3

.....
.....
.....

7.3



.2

.1

8.3

.....
.....
.....

9.3

.2

.1

10.3

6.3

.2

.1

)

7.3

(

.2

.1

.

.1

.2

.1

.

.2

.2

.1

.

.3

.2

.1

.

.4

.1 .

.5

.2

.2

.1

.

.6

.2

.1 .

.7

.2

.1 .

/

.8

.2

.1

.

.9

.....
.....

(EFFECIENCY) :

:

: 1.4

.2 .1 .1

.....
.....

.2 لا .1 نعم .2 تاريخ الانتهاء

.....
.....

.2 .1 .3

.....
.....

:

2.4

	.2	.1	
	.3		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>		

)

3.4

:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....



1.5

.2

.1

2.5

.2

.1

3.5

.3

.2

.1

()

4.5

.....

5.5

()

.....

.....

.....

6.5

.2

.1

7.5

.2

.1



(Sustainability) :

1.7

.2

.1

2.7

.....
.....
.....

()

3.7

.....
.....
.....

4.7

.2

.1

5.7

.....
.....
.....

:3



.....

..... :

:

.....

..... /

.....

.....

.....

:

. / . / . / . / .

:

1. الجنس

ا. ذكر.

ب. أنثى.

2. العمر

ا. 18-30

ب. 31-40

ج. 41-50

د. 51-60

ه. 61 فأكثر.

3.

أ. أمي.

ب. يقرأ ويكتب.

ج. تعليم اساسي.

د. تعليم ثانوي.

ه. دبلوم

و. كلية مجتمع.

ز. بكالوريوس فأعلى.

4.

ا. مزارع.

ب. موظف.

ج. عامل.

د. أعمال حرة.

ه. عاطل عن العمل.

5.

أ. مزارع.

ب. موظف.

ج. عامل.

د. أعمال حرة.

ه. اخرى، (حدد.....)

.6

ا. □ الاب. ب. □ الام. ج. □ الاخ الاكبر. د. □ اخرى. حدد.....

..... :

.1

.....

.2

15

.....

.3

()

.....

..... :

.1

.....

.2

.....

.3

: .4

. :

.5

.6

.5 5 .4 5-3 .3 .2 .1

.....

.7

.....

.8

.4 .3 .2 .1

: .9

			/	
				.1
				.2
				.3
				.4
			(.....)	.5
				.6

.10

.2

.1

.11

.....

.12

.

.13

.....

.....

.....

.....

.14

.....

.....

.....

.....

/

.15

.....

.....

()

.16

83

1

85

2

97

3

13		1.2
14()	2.2
17()	3.2
20	4.2
242008	5.2
45	.2009	1.3
48	:	2.3
54	1.4
54	2.4
55	3.4
56		4.4
57	5.4
59	6.4
60		7.4
60	8.4
	

61	9.4
62		10.4
	
63	11.4
64	12.4
65	13.4
66	14.4
66	15.4
67	16.4
67	17.4
68	18.4
69		19.4
	
70	.	20.4
70	21.4
71		22.4
	
71	23.4
72		24.4
	
73		25.4
	
74		26.4
	
74		27.4
	

	
	
	
	
	
1	:
1	1.1
3	2.1
4	3.1
5	4.1
5	5.1
6	6.1
6	7.1
7	8.1
7	9.1
8	10.1
9	:
9	1.2
10	1.1.2
11	2.1.2
12	2.2

13	1.2.2
15	3.2
16	4.2
19	1.4.2
20	2.4.2
21	3.4.2
21 ()	4.4.2
21	5.4.2
22	6.4.2
23	7.4.2
25	8.4.2
27	5.2
30	1.5.2
30	2.5.2
312010-2007	3.5.2
33	6.2
33	1.6.2
34	2.6.2
35 :	3.6.2
36	4.6.2

37		5.6.2
38	: ..	6.6.2
39	7.6.2
40	8.6.2
40 " "	9.6.2
44	
44	1.3
44	2.3
47	3.3
49	4.3
49	1.4.3
50	2.4.3
50	3.4.3
51	4.4.3
52	5.3
52	6.3
52	7.3
53	
53	1.4
55		2.4
58	3.4
61	4.4

62	5.4
64	6.4
64	7.4
65	8.4
68	9.4
69	10.4
73	11.4
75	
75	1.5
77	2.5
78	
102	
103	
105	