



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 04/02/2002	
PROJ ID: P034080		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name: Biodiversity Collections	Project Costs (US\$M)	11.39	9.88
Country: Indonesia	Loan/Credit (US\$M)		
Sector(s): Board: ENV - Central government administration (68%), Tertiary education (22%), Information technology (10%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	7.20	7.11
L/C Number:			
	Board Approval (FY)		94
Partners involved : GEF	Closing Date	10/31/2000	03/31/2001
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
Andres Liebenthal	Anwar M. Shah	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
The main objective of the project was to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Research and Development Center of Biology (PPPB) of the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) to support systematic biological collections .			
b. Components			
(i) systematic collections and research in botany and zoology; (ii) information systems management, (iii) scientific collaborations and services; and (iii) project management and coordination;			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
Disbursements of this GEF grant reached 99%, and government counterpart funding 66%, of the levels estimated at appraisal. The closing date of the project was extended by five months to accommodate minor delays in implementation.			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
The project has substantially achieved its main objective of strengthening the institutional capacity of PPPB of LIPI and delivered most expected outputs . However, while the project was consistent with GEF criteria for eligibility, the relevance of the project's objective can only be rated as modest in relation to the country's and sector's development priorities and the CAS objectives of improving environmental management and strengthening government capacities, since it was narrowly focussed on strengthening the capacity of a single research center (with about 335 staff) with a very limited role.			
4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:			
The most significant outcomes of the project include :			
(i) extensive training of PPPB's botany (herbarium) and zoology (museum) staff, improved management, working conditions, equipment and facilities for herbarium and museum collections;			
(ii) training of PPPB's IT staff, development and partial implementation of a biodiversity information system and LAN to support for herbarium and museum, and provision of equipment and accessories .			
(iii) PPPB's capacity to repatriate Indonesian specimens has been strengthened, and scientists from abroad feel more comfortable in sending their collections .			
(iv) establishment by PPPB of a number of collaborative research programs and publication of 17 field guides have raised PPPB's status among scientific institutions and its ability to participate in the international scientific community on an equal basis.			
5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):			
a. although the ICR indicates that the Government is committed to continued funding of PPPB activities, it does not discuss the financial situation of the PPPB, and indicates that a financial and institutional sustainability study was very much delayed, which suggests that provisions for the long term financial sustainability of activities initiated by the project may not have been adequately considered in the project's design and implementation .			
b. although the project has strengthened the restoration capacity of the herbarium, the current restoration capacity is			

lower than the rate of increase of the collection, which raises a serious concern about the 88% of the collection that are still unrestored, and a large backlog of unmounted specimens, that are stored under unsatisfactory conditions .

c. the acquisition of essential scientific literature reached only 50% of the potential acquisitions . This large gap in the availability of scientific references will make it difficult to conduct competitive research at international standards .

d. the opportunity to develop an institution-wide system of information sharing has been missed, with the result that there is as yet no intranet or internet access to the herbarium or the museum .

e. issues on intellectual property rights have not been addressed, and this threatens the availability and usefulness of the data to the research community and the public .

f. 36% of grant funds were spent on project management and coordination .

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome :	Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	The project's objective was rather modest in relation to the CAS objectives of improving environmental management and strengthening government capacities, and there were significant shortcomings in achieving them.
Institutional Dev .:	Substantial	Modest	The project's institutional development impact was limited by its narrow scope and inability to address systemic issues such as PPPB's financing strategy and intellectual property rights.
Sustainability :	Likely	Likely	
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	The QAE was marginally satisfactory, as the project should have staked out more ambitious objectives in relation to the country's and sector's development needs.
Borrower Perf .:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR :		Satisfactory	

NOTE: ICR rating values flagged with '*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

The main lesson is that the Bank needs to be more selective in the projects that it undertakes . Even a project such as this one, with a very limited objective focussed on strengthening a single research center (with a staff of 335) with a very narrow role in the context of sectorial management and the country's public sector, required a substantial level of support, including 36% of grant funds and 11 supervision missions (with an average of four staff per mission), and achieved only moderately unsatisfactory results . In view of the project's experience, the Bank needs to carefully consider whether such exercises are consistent with its role .

8. Assessment Recommended? Yes No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR provides a comprehensive, candid, and detailed discussion of the implementation experience of the project . However, its quality could have been substantially improved if it had asked and discussed basic questions about the rationale and priority of the project in relation to the CAS objectives of environmental management and strengthening government capacities (as adduced in the SAR), or at least within the context of Indonesia's Biodiversity Action Plan and of the GEF's objectives, mandates and eligibility criteria .