



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 07/26/2002	
PROJ ID: P006568		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name : Rf-science Centers & Directed Research Project-phase I	Project Costs (US\$M)	15.1	20.3
Country: Brazil	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	8.5	8.5
Sector(s): Board: ENV - Central government administration (100%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	6.1	6.4
L/C Number:			
	Board Approval (FY)		94
Partners involved : Commission of European Communities, ODA	Closing Date	03/01/1997	12/01/1999
Prepared by : Elaine Wee-Ling Ooi			
Reviewed by : Martha Ainsworth		Group Manager : Alain A. Barbu	Group: OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
As part of the Pilot Program to Conserve the Brazilian Rain Forest, this project's overall objective was to promote the generation and dissemination of scientific knowledge relevant to conservation and sustainable development activities in the Amazon region. Specifically, it would a) support a grants program for funding research projects on a competitive basis in the Amazon region; and b) strengthen the two established research institutions of the Amazon, the National Institute for Amazon Research (INPA) and the Emilio Goeldi Museum of Para (MPEG).			
b. Components			
There were 2 components:-			
1) Directed Research (US\$5.7 million)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amazonian ecosystems' structure and function • Sustainable natural resource management • Socio-economic and cultural systems • Low environmental impact infrastructure 			
2) Science Centers (US\$9.4 million)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional management and administration • Rehabilitation and expansion of research infrastructure and equipment • Improve human resource capacity in scientific research and education • Dissemination of research results • Technical assistance in science and dissemination management (Overseas Development Agency) • Project implementation support • Policy studies and strategic plans at MPEG 			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
Actual costs were \$20.3 million (\$8.5 million from the Rain Forest Trust Fund (RFTF), \$5.62 million from Commission of European Communities) of which the government provided \$5.3 million against \$0.5 million at appraisal. ODA grant funded \$0.81 million for technical assistance against \$0.7 million at SAR. (The ICR also provided information on the USAID funded Emergency Assistance program of \$6.4 million which rehabilitated infrastructure and equipment of the two science centers.) The project closed on December 01 1999, 3 years behind schedule.			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research activities have been revitalized in the Amazon region and a grants program for funding priority research on a competitive basis was established. Dissemination of research results to the appropriate target groups has been uneven. • Capacity of two established research institutions of the Amazon, INPA and MPEG, has been strengthened. The goal of molding them into model science centers was only partially achieved. 			
4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional scientific knowledge of the region's natural resources base and of new opportunities for the 			

sustainable management of Amazonian plants and animals has been collected through the Directed Research component

- INPA and MPEG have benefited from critical infrastructure investments, introduction of strategic planning schemes, training of researchers and reestablished the dissemination of research results . The participation of researchers from both institutions in national and international scientific congresses was significantly expanded, and the number of PhDs was raised by 34% and 54% at INPA and MPEG respectively .
- The M&E arrangements, though not fully realized, were nonetheless better than most projects .

5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):

- Legal constraints due to existing Brazilian budget and personnel policies were not adequately factored in project design which prevented the establishment in the science centers of effective staff incentive systems and alternative fund raising schemes to lessen their dependence on the national treasury . This calls into question the financial sustainability of the institutions and likewise their potential for becoming model science centers .
- Complex disbursement arrangements, exacerbated by the internal bureaucracy of the financial management entity (FINEP) and the inexperience of local disbursement agencies, hampered project implementation and necessitated project extensions . The originally 2 year project was extended by 33 months.
- Project was overly dependent on counterpart for generating the M&E . Impact evaluations to be conducted independently by the International Scientific Advisory Group (GIAC) were only partially carried out.
- Incomplete dissemination strategy of project where research results were disseminated only to scientific community, government and large scale producers (ICR para 3.5.2) leaving out the small farmers and forest users who exert a considerable force in the Amazon .
- Lack of long term maintenance plan for the substantial rehabilitated physical works at the science centers

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome :	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	[OED's moderately sat. rating does not exist under the ICR's 4-point rating scale]. The project achieved most of its major relevant objectives, with significant shortcomings in assuring financial sustainability and independence and in reforming the two science centers .
Institutional Dev .:	Modest	Modest	
Sustainability :	Likely	Likely	
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Bank performance is marginally satisfactory. Project design should have factored in constraints from Brazilian budget and personnel policies, which compromised the outcome of an important objective. However quality of supervision was good.
Borrower Perf .:	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Borrower performance is marginally satisfactory. Many of the financial and implementation problems at the outset of the project were eventually resolved .
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:

Many lessons were presented in ICR, and only a few are noted here :

- Too often federal budgetary policies/processes which constrain project implementation and the weaknesses of the financial entities of the project are overlooked in project design . Also project objectives not supported by national legislation should not be attempted until the appropriate legislation has been changed .
- Phase I projects should have pre-established performance and evaluation indicators, including a post project monitoring scheme, especially if they support biodiversity conservation and natural resources management activities.
- Eligibility criteria for funding research should encourage concentration to ensure solutions to very precise problems, as opposed to supporting a wide range of thematic proposals distributed over a limited number of projects.

8. Assessment Recommended? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

Quality of the ICR was good. It provided a thorough and frank discussion of project achievements and shortcomings

In an effort to improve the follow-on project. However it did not explain the reasons behind the dramatic increase of counterpart funds from \$0.5 million to \$5.33 million nor where/how these were being utilized. Subsequent discussions with the region clarified issues. No comments were available from the co-financier.