



|   |                              |                                 |               |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>1. Project Data:</b>   |                              | <b>Date Posted :</b> 07/23/2002 |               |
| <b>PROJ ID:</b> P010448   |                              | <b>Appraisal</b>                | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>Project Name :</b> Forestry Research Education And Extension Project   | <b>Project Costs (US\$M)</b> | 56.48                           | 54.88         |
| <b>Country:</b> India   | <b>Loan/Credit (US\$M)</b>   | 47.05                           | 42.98         |
| <b>Sector(s):</b> Board: RDV - Central government administration (80%), Agricultural extension and research (12%), Forestry (8%)  | <b>Cofinancing (US\$M)</b>   | NA                              | NA            |
| <b>L/C Number:</b> C2572  |                              |                                 |               |
|   | <b>Board Approval (FY)</b>   |                                 | 94            |
| <b>Partners involved :</b> None   | <b>Closing Date</b>          | 12/31/1999                      | 12/31/2001    |
| <b>Prepared by :</b>  | <b>Reviewed by :</b>         | <b>Group Manager :</b>          | <b>Group:</b> |
| Nalini B. Kumar   | Andres Liebenthal            | Alain A. Barbu                  | OEDST         |
| <b>2. Project Objectives and Components</b>   |                              |                                 |               |
| <b>a. Objectives</b>  |                              |                                 |               |
| According to the SAR the main project objectives were to "strengthen the capacity of national and state institutions to plan and undertake priority research programs, to improve the system of forestry education in research and academic institutions, and to improve the extension of research findings ." Important additional objectives were to improve policy and project preparation capabilities within the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF), and develop and test on a pilot basis methods for conservation of biological resources in protected areas .   |                              |                                 |               |
| <b>b. Components</b>  |                              |                                 |               |
| The project had the following components : research management, extension, research program support, forestry education, forest policy and preparation, conservation of biodiversity . Though there was no revision of the components during the project period, some targets were revised at mid -term in the light of experience . Mid term decisions also included the addition of a few works and equipments and furnishings . A small amount of support was also made available to another Tamilnadu protected area as a part of the biodiversity component .  |                              |                                 |               |
| <b>c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates</b>   |                              |                                 |               |
| Total project cost at appraisal were US \$ 56.48 million of which the IDA share was US \$ 47.05 million. At closing total project costs were US \$ 54.88 million of which the IDA share was US \$ 42.98 million. The project was appraised in May 1993 and approved in February 1994. Progress on the project was very slow until the mid term review and the project was rated a problem project . There were two one year extensions before the project closed on Dec . 31, 2001.   |                              |                                 |               |
| <b>3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:</b>   |                              |                                 |               |
| The project was a complex and ambitious operation that was able to achieve most of its relevant objectives albeit with significant shortcomings (see section 5).  |                              |                                 |               |
| <b>4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:</b>   |                              |                                 |               |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The capacity of the national organization, the Indian Council of Forest Research and Education, to plan, prioritize and undertake research was improved . A National Forest Research Plan was developed;</li> <li>• Useful linkages were formed with external research bodies both within India and internationally;</li> <li>• A new postgraduate forestry education curriculum and a set of curricula for use in the primary and secondary school system were developed;</li> <li>• A new library building was constructed and equipped .</li> <li>• Successful development and testing at the Kalakkad -Mundantharai Tiger Reserve methods for conservation of biological resources in protected areas through eco -development.</li> </ul> |                              |                                 |               |
| <b>5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):</b>  |                              |                                 |               |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension to the private sector has been limited;</li> <li>• The project had negligible impact on improving policy analysis and project preparation capabilities within the</li> </ul>   |                              |                                 |               |

MOEF;

- Limited achievements in developing the Forestry Research Information System which was crucial to monitoring and evaluation of research projects;
- Human resource development plan could not be finalized by project end;
- Little or no impact on the ground from eco-development investments at the Great Himalayan National Park .

| 6. Ratings :                | ICR          | OED Review              | Reason for Disagreement /Comments  |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Outcome :</b>            | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | OED rates a project as moderately satisfactory [a rating which does not exist under the ICR's 4-point rating scale] when it achieves most of its major relevant objectives but with significant shortcomings. The shortcomings noted under section 5 are significant.  |
| <b>Institutional Dev .:</b> | Substantial  | Substantial             |  |
| <b>Sustainability :</b>     | Likely       | Likely                  |  |
| <b>Bank Performance :</b>   | Satisfactory | Satisfactory            | Bank performance is rated satisfactory but only marginally so. Despite considerable prior experience of working with MOEF (the Bank has supported several forestry projects in India), the Bank overestimated the capacity of MOEF to coordinate the project and to implement its policy component. Despite the intensive supervision (17 missions), the Bank failed to closely monitor fund management which created implementation problems .  |
| <b>Borrower Perf .:</b>     | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory          | There were serious implementation problems over the life of the project . Budget issues, delay in release of funds, rapid staff and management turnover, inadequate planning and prioritization of activities by the implementing agency and lack of overall project coordination negatively affected implementation . The ICR also acknowledges that audit covenants were in violation because of delayed submission of audit reports and opportunities for international cooperation and interchange were missed because of lack of timely processing of proposals . |
| <b>Quality of ICR :</b>     |              | 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 ICR identifies some important lessons . Two lessons from the ICR are repeated here . (i) Design of a project involving multiple implementing agencies should not rely upon overall coordination by a national ministry, unless that ministry has already demonstrated its capacity for such coordination; (ii) Sustainability considerations must be thought through right from the very beginning of the project . This includes sufficient care in the process of formation of groups/institutions, capacity building efforts and having a conscious strategy for external inputs (including NGOs).

The ES adds another lesson : India has the largest number of poor in the world, a large percentage of whom are dependent directly or indirectly on forests for a living. There is need to strengthen the research input for forest activities that impact the poor, i.e those focused on improving productivity of non timber forest products, if future forest sector activities are to have a significant poverty reduction impact .

#### 8. Assessment Recommended? ☒ Yes ☐ No

**Why?** To verify the outcome, institutional development and sustainability impact . An audit will also be justified to validate and check the sustainability of the achievements of the eco -development pilots.

#### 9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR is satisfactory and presents a high quality and complete Log Frame Matrix (Annex I).

