**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2021**

Reporting from 1 July 2020to 30 June 2021

# INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS PIR

1. Instructions in blue are directed to Task Managers/ Administrative Officers
2. Instructions in red are directed to Project Managers and Executing Agencies
3. When filling up the respective cells, use the Normal style from the template. The text will look like this.

# 1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

# 1.1. Project details

This entire table is to be prepared by Task Managers

1. IDENTIFICATION

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Identification Table | | | GEF ID.: 5456 | *Insert*Umoja no.: | |
| Project Title | | | *Ecosystem-based Approaches to Adaptation (EbA) in the Drought-Prone Barind tract and Haor Wetland Area* | | |
| Duration months | *Planned* | | 48 Months | | |
| *Extension(s)* | |  | |  |
| Division(s) Implementing the project | | | Ecosystem Division | | |
| Name of co-implementing Agency | | | *NA* | | |
| Executing Agency(ies) | | | *Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of the Peoples Republic of Bangladesh.* | | |
| Names of Other Project Partners | | | *N/A* | | |
| Project Type | | | *Full Size Project* | | |
| Project Scope | | | National | | |
| Region | | | Asia Pacific | | |
| Countries | | | Bangladesh | | |
| Programme of Work | | | Climate Change Adaptation | | |
| GEF Focal Area(s) | | | Climate Change | | |
| UNSDCF / UNDAF linkages | | | Aligned with priority thematic area 3 “Resilience, disaster risk reduction and climate change” | | |
| Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) | | | SDG goal 13 (take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts) and 15 (protect, restore and promote sustainable management of forests, combat desertification and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss. | | |
| GEF financing amount | | | USD 4,955,000.00 | | |
| Co-financing amount | | | *USD 54,792,000.00* | | |
| Date of CEO Endorsement | | | 2 December 2016 ) | | |
| Start of Implementation | | | Aug 2020 | | |
| Date of first disbursement | | | *7 May 2018* | | |
| Total disbursement as of 30 June 2021 | | | *USD 300000.00* | | |
| Total expenditure as of 30 June 2021 | | | *USD 292014.00* | | |
| Expected Mid-Term Review Date | | | *June 2023* | | |
| Completion Date | | *Planned* | December 2020 | | |
| *Revised* | June 2025 | | |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date | | | July 2025 | | |
| Expected Financial Closure Date | | | Dec 2025 | | |

# 1.2. Project description

|  |
| --- |
| The Least Development countries fund (LDCF) has approved for the full time Project entitled” Ecosystem based approaches to Adaptation (EbA)in the drought prone barind Tract and wet land Haor area” in Bangladesh. Bangladesh is a land of diverse ecosystem which contain 25 Bio –Ecological Zones (BEZ). Barind tract and Haor basin are two BEZ with individual Biodiversity, Topographies and having special land use patterns. Barind tract and Haor wet land areas of Bangladesh contain high productive ecosystem that provide a valuable good and services to the local communities. The country is also vulnerable to climate change impact. Erratic rainfall, temperature raise, flash flood is the revelation of the climate in this area which effects crop production and ecosystem degradation.  The objectives of the project are to increase the capacity of Government and local communities living in the Barind Tract and Haor area and to reduce the negative effects of climate change using ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA). The project has three Outcomes:  **Outcome 1:** Strengthened technical capacity of local and national government officials to plan, implement and upscale EbA.  **Outcome** **2**: Local communities at project intervention sites are implementing EbA to restore degraded ecosystems and maintaining hard infrastructure that Complements EbA by promoting topsoil and water conservation.  **Outcome 3:** Government Ministries and Institutions in Bangladesh have access to improved scientific and traditional information on EbA to promote up scaling of this approach. This outcome will be generated through three outputs mentioned as: |

# 1.3. History of project revisions

To be completed by Task Managers

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Date** | **Main changes introduced in this revision** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

To be completed by UNEP Task Manager

* 1. 2.1. UNEP Subprogramme(s)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Insert the Subprograms(s) and biennia of the Pow to which the project contributes  **subprogram 1 -**Climate change | **Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s)&Indicator(s)**  **The project will contribute towards Expected Accomplishment (EA1) i.e.** Countries increasingly advance their national adaptation plans which integrate ecosystem-based adaptation and Indicator **(ii)** Increase in the number of countries have technical capacity to integrate ecosystem-based management into NAPs. |
| NA for this reporting period  [Section to be shared with relevant Regional and Global SubProgramme Coordinators] | |

* 1. 2.2. GEF Core Indicators (for all GEF 6 and later projects):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| GEF Core Indicators | **Indicative expected Results** |
|  | |

* 1. 2.3. Implementation status and risk

*[complete the fiscal year and select:1st PIR; 2nd PIR; …. Final PIR; select HS; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated to rate the progress towards outcomes and outputs in third and fourth lines; select H; S; M; L; to rate risks for the fiscal year you are reporting in the fifth line. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | FY 2021 | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ |
| PIR # | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | …. |
| Rating towards **outcomes** (section 3.1) | N/A |  |  |  |  |
| Rating towards **outputs** (section 3.2) | N/A |  |  |  |  |
| **Risk** rating (section 3.3) | M |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| The project was approved in December 2016 and PCA signed in February 2018. However, the project could not start its implementation phase because the executing agency required to prepare Development Project Proforma/Proposal (DPP) and get it approved by Planning Commission. The planning commission approved the DPP in February 2020.  After the approval of DPP, establishment of PMU and recruitment of the PMU team and experts could happen only in April 2021. Delay in recruitment is one of the reasons for the delay in project implementation.  The PMU prepared the first expense report and there are discrepancies in the expense reported and approved budget. The team referred to DPP template while reporting whereas GEF project document and approved budget needs to be followed by the team. There is continuous dialogue between PMU team, Climate Change coordinator of ROAP and Task Manager to resolve the issue and build the capacity of the PMU team in reporting.  The project has low capacity to manage the project as per UNEP and GEF guidelines. Department of Environment, PMU and UNEP including CCAU and ROAP needs to work closely to address this issue.  The project has organized soft launch of the project inviting relevant personel from Department of Environment, planning division and two local partners, Barind Multipurpose Development Authority and Water Development board. The local partners presented their plan in the meeting. However, the soft launch is not able to reach to wider stakeholders at national and local level.  Besides these implementation risk, detail risk assessment is done in table 3.3. (a) and (b). Based on it, the overall risk of this project is medium and risk mitigation measures identified in the section needs to be monitored closely. |

* 1. 2.4. Co-financing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned Co-finance**  **Total:**  (total only)  **Actual to date:** Complete (in $ and %. State the date for which this value is valid) | As the project was approved in 2016, most of the co-finance projects identified in the project document have phased out. The project team is revising co-finance plan and has identified potential new projects with total grant value of USD 18,762,360.57 from which co-financing could be derived. The revised co-finance plan will submitted by December 2021 |

* 1. 2.5. Stakeholder engagement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder engagement** | The project will revisit existing stakeholders’ engagement plan as per revised GEF template. The stakeholder engagement plan will identify relevant stakeholders and their role and responsibilities as well as grievance mechanism.  During this reporting period, the project launching workshop was organized. Due to pandemic, it was a soft launch where representatives from Department of Environment, planning division and two local partners, Barind Multipurpose Development Authority and Water Development board were invited. The project needs to reach out to larger stakeholders are national and regional level and share the project details including any variance and revision to the original document. |

* 1. 2.6. Gender

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gender mainstreaming** | The project will undertake gender assessment during baseline survey and based on it Gender Action plan will be prepared with detail plan and budget to mainstream gender in the project interventions. ToR for baseline survey and vulnerability impact assessment has been prepared. |

* 1. 2.7. Environmental and social safeguards management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Environmental and social safeguards management** | The project will revise the environment and social safeguard framework prepared during PPG phase as per the revised SRIF template and revisit the social and environmental risks. |

* 1. 2.8. Knowledge management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge activities and products** | Not applicable for this reporting period. |

* 1. 2.9. Stories to be shared

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stories to be shared** | Not applicable for this reporting period. |
|  | |

# 3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the* ***UNEP Task Manager****[[1]](#footnote-2) will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*

1. *Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1*
2. *Implementation progress – see section 3.2*

*Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.*

* 1. 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

[copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]

| **Project objective and Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline level** | **Mid-term target** | **End-of-project target** | **Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator &target as of 30 June 2021** | **Progress rating[[2]](#footnote-3)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:**  To decrease the vulnerability of local communities living in the Barind Tract and Haor Area to the negative impacts of climate change using Ecosystem-based Adaptation approaches (EbA). | Number of individuals benefitting from project interventions disaggregated by Gender | Zero |  | At least 6000 beneficiaries of which at least 40% will be women | Not application for this reporting period | NA |
| **Outcome 1:**  Strengthened capacity of local and national government to plan, implement and upscale EbA. | Degree to which capacity of regional, national and sub-national government institutions to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate EbA strategies and measures is strengthened. | Baseline study to be conducted at the project inception stage. |  | Increase by 3 in the capacity score assessment of each institution.[[3]](#footnote-4) | Not application for this reporting period | NA |
| Currently institutions– including CCC – are identifying climate change risks and adaptation options, but not appropriate EbA interventions to manage these risks. Government institutions do not prioritise the implementation of EbA interventions. |  |  | Not application for this reporting period | NA |
| Government from relevant ministries and departments – including MoEF, MoWR, MoA, DoE, DoAE, WARPO, FD, BMDA and BWDB – have been trained on: i) the effects of climate change; ii) management and relief of climate-related disasters; and iii) climate-resilient crops for adaptation. However,  government staff have not received training on EbA |  |  | Not application for this reporting period | NA |
| **Outcome 2:**  Adaptation technologies – including EbA– demonstrated in the Barind Tract and Haor Area to restore degraded ecosystems and promote topsoil and water conservation. | 1. Number of Village Conservation Groups (VCGs) implementing and maintaining EbA interventions in the Barind Tract and Haor Area. | 1. Zero |  | 1. Twenty Five | Not application for this reporting period | NA |
|  |  |  |  | Not application for this reporting period | NA |
| 2. Number of hectares of EbA demonstrated in degraded dryland and swamp forests | 2. Zero |  | 2. EbA implemented in at least: i) 50 hectares of degraded swamp forests; ii) 50 hectares of degraded upland forests; iii) 80 hectares of degraded dryland forests; iv) 130 km of strips along roads, canals, ponds and embankments | Not application for this reporting period | NA |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 3. Number of homestead plantations  established by the project. | 3. Zero. | 3. 1900 homestead | | 3. Zero. |  | 3. 1900 homestead plantations |  | *N/A* |
| 4. Number of adaptation technologies implemented to support EbA by conserving topsoil and water. | 4. Zero |  | 4. At least: i) 48 ponds excavated/re-excavated; ii) 6 canals constructed; and iii) 27 rainwater harvesting systems demonstrated. |  | *N/A* |
| 5. Number of climate-resilient livelihoods introduced at intervention sites through providing equipment, training and technical support. | 5. Zero |  | 5. 1545 (in at least four categories- fish production, floating vegetable gardens, farming gardens and spice cultivation). |  | *N/A* |
| **Outcome 3**  Improved access to scientific and traditional information on EbA to promote upscaling of this approach in Bangladesh. | 1. Number of government agencies using knowledge management tools developed by the project to share information on EbA. | 1. Zero |  | 1. At least 6 (including MoF, MoA, MoP, MoEF, MoL and MoWR). |  | *N/A* |
| 2. Number of PhD candidates and post-doctorate researchers conducting research focused on the environmental and socio-economic impacts of the EbA interventions and hard infrastructure implemented through the LDCF-financed project in the Barind tract and Haor area. | 2. Zero |  | 2. At least 2 PhD students and 1 post-doctorate researcher have been/are conducting research. |  |  |
|  | 3. Number of strategies and models promoting the replication and upscaling of EbA interventions validated by local and government. | 3. Zero |  | 3.  At least 3  (1 nation-wide EbA upscaling strategy for Bangladesh and 2 business case models.) |  | *N/A* |

**The Project has a Delay start. Base line survey and setting the midterm target yet to be done.**

* 1. 3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs

| **Outputs/Activities[[4]](#footnote-5)** | **Expected completion date[[5]](#footnote-6)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2020 (%)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2021 (%)** | **Progress rating justification[[6]](#footnote-7), description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay** | **Progress rating[[7]](#footnote-8)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1:**  Capacity development for implementing EbA and up scaling into national and local Plans. | | | | | |
| **Output 1.1:** Policy briefs developed (and training provided) on proposed revisions to policies and strategies related to dry land and wetland ecosystem Management to promote EbA, |  | N/A | 0% | Due to delay start of the project, policy brief has not yet prepared. | N/A |
| **Output 1.2:** Technical guidelines produced for the implementation EbA to  reduce vulnerability of local community livelihoods to climate change and |  | N/A | 0% | Initiative has been taken to formulated technical guideline for the implementation of EbA. |  |
| **Output 1.3:**  Training provided to national and local government staff, and VCG members on planning and implementing EbA Interventions. |  | N/A | 0% | 28(Twenty-eight) VCG group out of 37 (Thirty-seven) has been formed in the project intervention Area. |  |
| **COMPONENT 2:** EbA interventions that reduce climate change vulnerability and enhance naturalCapital. | | | | | |
| **Output 2.1**. Vulnerability impact assessments (VIA) (following UNEP-led PROVIA guidance) to select target communities in the Barind Tract and Haor Area; |  | N/A | 0% | The project is planning to undertake Vulnerability impact assessment. | |
| **Output 2.2**. Local authorities, communities, committees and user groups in the Barind Tract and Hoar Area trained on EbA, maintaining hard infrastructure, and developing livelihoods to strengthen Adaptive capacity to climate change; |  | N/A | 0% | NA | |
| **Output 2.3**. Degraded forests in the Haor area and Barind Tract rehabilitated using EbA; |  | N/A | 0% | MoU has been signed with the local partners | |
| **Output 2.4**. Hard infrastructure that reduces erosion in the Hoar Area and conserves water constructed in the Barind Tract and Haor area |  | N/A | 50% | Excavation of 19 (nineteen) ponds Out of 19 (Nineteen) has been completed as per design in the Document in the Barind tract Area. | |
| **Output 2.5.** Additional livelihoods demonstrated to enhance the resilience of local communities to climate Change. |  | N/A | 0% | Detailed work plan for additional livelihood option such as Orchard, fish culture, Mashroom cultivation, Homestead gardening , Nursery in each upozila in the project intervention site will be prepared | |
| ***Component 3:*** *Research and knowledge management for appropriate EbA design* | | | | | |
| ***Output 3.1:*** *A central database – for information on EbA lessons learned and cost-effectiveness from the Haor Area, Barind Tract and other regions across Bangladesh – established or strengthened* |  | N/A | 0% | NA | |
| ***Output 3.2:*** *Financial support provided to post-graduate and post-doctorate researchers to conduct research on specific climate change risks and the EbA interventions that are implemented by the project.* |  | N/A | 0% | NA | |
| ***Output 3.3:*** *A knowledge management plan developed to capture and share information on climate change impacts.* |  | N/A | 0% | NA | |
| ***Output 3.4*** *Frameworks that support replicating and upscaling of EbA in Bangladesh developed.* |  | N/A | 0% | NA | |
| ***Component 4*** M& E | | | | | |
| *Monitoring and Evaluation of the project* |  | N/A | 0% | NA | |

* 1. 3.3. Risk Rating

**Table A.** Risk-log

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (Inc. Safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Riskaffecting:** | **Risk Rating** | | | | | | | **Variation respect to last rating** | |
| Outcome / outputs | **CEO ED** | **PIR 1** | **PIR 2** | **MTR** | **PIR 3(this PIR)** | **PIR 4** | **PIR 5** | **Δ** | **Justification** |
| Political instability at the national level. | Project interventions delayed because of uncertain role allocation at the central level. | L | L |  |  |  |  |  |  | Due to delay start of the project, Risk assessment yet to be done |
| |  | | --- | | Disagreement between stakeholders on the  allocation of roles in the project. | | Project interventions delayed because of uncertain role allocation.  Effectiveness of project management is reduced. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The central information database established in the MoEF is not utilised or maintained over time leading to limited inter-institutional data sharing or collaboration. | Limited transfer of relevant project information amongst role players and end-users resulting in delayed or ineffective implementation of interventions. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The long-term nature of adaptation, in particular EbA, may lead to limited government support for project activities in the selected area. | Loss of government support may result in lack of prioritisation of project activities. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High turnover of staff members in implementing agencies (in particular MoEF, DoE and CCU). | Changes in project-related government priorities and poor institutional memory result in disruptions or delays in project implementation and coordination. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Increasing Overseas Development Assistance increases demands on time/capacity | Increasing Overseas Development Assistance results in increased demands on time for implementing agency officials, which in turn results in disruptions or delays in project implementation and coordination. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limited acceptance of stakeholders to accept change i.e. the adaptation alternative over the business-as-usual. This has a potential to affect the scaling up of project activities. | Communities may not adopt ecosystem restoration for adaptation activities during or after the project resulting in continued unsustainable use of resources. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disagreement over allocation of land for implementation of project activities. | Disagreement among stakeholders about site selection. | L | L |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under-developed land tenure system of property rights undermines project interventions. | Insecure/unsure land tenure system decreases buy-in to EbA interventions by local communities. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unfavourable climate conditions including current climate and seasonal variability and/or extreme weather events. | Current climate and seasonal variability and/or hazard events result in poor restoration results. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limited local technical capacity hinders project interventions. | Capacity constraints of local institutions and experts may limit the ability to undertake the research and demonstration activities. | L | L |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limited commitment/ buy-in from local communities. | Lack of commitment/buy-  in from local communities may result in failure of demonstration projects. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unsustainable land and natural resource use. | Unsustainable use of natural resources continues, leading to further degradation of ecosystems. | H | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implemented interventions are not cost-effective. | Priority interventions are not cost-effective which results in limited demonstration and will hamper the success of the interventions. Economic loss and budget allocation to other activities is reduced. | L | L |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local communities cannot access sufficient support to implement EbA interventions successfully. | Lack of sufficient support to implement EbA for local communities may result in failure of demonstration projects. | M | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Consolidated risk** | |  | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table B.** Outstanding medium & high risks

List here **only risks from Table A above that have a risk rating of M or worse** in the **current** PIR

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)** | **Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period** | **Additional mitigation measures for the next periods** | | |
| What | When | By whom |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disagreement between stakeholders on the  allocation of roles in the project. | Institutional representatives at the validation workshop will agree upon the roles and responsibilities of each participating stakeholder.  During project implementation, the project will include relevant ministries and departments as partners to implement project activities. The coordination and reporting arrangements between ministries and departments will be clearly defined at project inception. | The Project document has identified local partners, Barind Multipurpose Development Authority for EbA implementation in Barind área and Water Development Board for Haor área. The Project has signed MoU and both the local partners have initiated the work in their respective project área.  The project has soft launch due to pandemic and during the launching workshop, various members of department of Environment, deputy director of the department as well as representative of Barind Multipurpose Development Authority and Water Development board was present. The project needs to do preparatory work including assessment, climate vulnerability assessment and detail work plan and share with larger stakeholders. | The Project will launch the Project at larger scale sharing the information with national and local stakeholders.  The project will prepare a detail Stakeholders’ Engagement Plan and identify new stakeholders with defined role and responsibilities; standard operation modality for the project including reporting and coordination with various ministries as well as UNEP; Grievance mechanism etc.  The project will share the results of baseline survey, VA assessment with stakeholders. | By December 2021  By December 2021  June 2022 | PMU, PM, NPD with support from consultants and experts, |
| The central information database established in the MoEF is not utilised or maintained over time leading to limited inter-institutional data sharing or collaboration. | * Awareness will be raised among stakeholders on the availability of information on the central information database and importance of using the portal to share information on climate change and EbA. * Stakeholder consultations will be held to identify expectations of sharing information and to clarify responsibilities. * An IT technician – based in the MoEF – will control content upload and ensure that the information database is maintained during and after the project. | No mitigation measure has been undertaken until date. | The project will prepare detail plan with timeline to address this risk. | December 2021 | PM with supervisión and guidance from NPD |
| The long-term nature of adaptation, in particular EbA, may lead to limited government support for project activities in the selected area. | Regular stakeholder consultations will be undertaken with all government staff. Provide training and raise awareness of government authorities on the nature of EbA, and benefits from this approach that will accrue. This will also include active involvement in sharing information and lessons learned. | No progress during this reporting period | The project will prepare a detail Stakeholders’ engagement plan with detail analysis of stakeholders, their role and engagement plan.  The project will prepare various training manuals, guidelines, policy documents and knowledge products during the project duration. | SEP will be prepared by December 2021  At least one training manual and one protocol will be developed by June 2022 | PMU, PM, thematic experts. |
| High turnover of staff members in implementing agencies (in particular MoEF, DoE and CCU). | Alternative representatives within the involved institutions will be recommended at inception and involved in training to ensure continuity.  Technical guidelines will be developed in English and Bengali. These guidelines will guide new staff that become involved in the project | A soft launch of the project was organized. The details was not discussed during the launch.  No progress during this reporting period | SOP will be prepared for the project and will also contain details on staff recruitment, handover etc.  Technical guidelines will be prepared and will be part of SOP | SOP will be prepared December 2021 and technical guideline by June 2022 | PM with support from expert |
| Increasing Overseas Development Assistance increases demands on time/capacity | Stakeholders from the LDCF-financed project will collaborate with other related development projects/ programmes/ activities/ initiatives to ensure that capacity is built according to the required in-country needs. | Series of meeting was organized between PMU, project team and TM of UNEP, CC coordinator from ROAP. Monthly meeting was organized. Finance officer from UNEP organized orientation to the team on financial templates. | The project team need more orientation, support and hand holding on GEF requirements and templates. UNEP team needs to work intensively with the project team to deliver training on results based management, progress reporting and expenditure reporting. A mission will be planned as soon as possible to the country.  If this issues is not addressed, it has potential to impact the whole project and increase the risk level from medium to high. | UNEP CCAU and ROAP will continue the dialogue with the project team. Country mission will be planned as soon as situation permits. | PM, TM, UNEP CCAU, ROAP |
| Limited acceptance of stakeholders to accept change i.e. the adaptation alternative over the business-as-usual. This has a potential to affect the scaling up of project activities. | Awareness raised among local communities on the benefits of EbA.  Share lessons learned – including success of – the LDCF-financed project.  VCGs will promote sustainable management of restored ecosystems. | No progress during this reporting period | The project will continue to raise awareness, document case studies, prepare guidelines and policy briefs etc. | SOP will be prepared December 2021 and technical guideline by June 2022. | PMU with support from thematic experts |
| Under-developed land tenure system of property rights undermines project interventions. | EbA protocols will be informed by socio-economic assessments at project sites. These assessments will include information on land tenure to ensure the interventions will be sustained in the long term. | No progress during this reporting period | EbA protocol will be developed | June 2022 | PMU, PM with support from experts |
| Unfavourable climate conditions including current climate and seasonal variability and/or extreme weather events. | Climatic variability will be taken into account in the selection of species for EbA.  Adaptation technology infrastructure will support implementation of EbA by providing water and reducing erosion. | ToR for climate vulnerability has been prepared. The vulnerability assessment will identify climatic vulnerabilities and identify EbA options.  The project interventions are focused on addressing flood and drought due to climatic conditions | EbA protocol will be developed inclusive of climate resilient species. | June 2022 | PMU, experts and consultants selected for the assessment. |
| Limited commitment/ buy-in from local communities. | During project implementation, local communities will be actively engaged and trained to ensure their buy-in into the project. | No progress during this reporting period | Local communities and stakeholders will be trained and engaged in project interventions. For this training manual, protocols and guidelines will be prepared, This will be included in SEP | SOP will be prepared December 2021 and technical guideline by June 2022 | PMU, PM, NPD and experts, |
| Unsustainable land and natural resource use. | Training of local communities on the benefits of EbA and alternate livelihoods will be undertaken.  Local communities will be actively engaged during implementation. | No progress during this reporting period | Training manual, protocols and guidelines will be prepared. Stakeholder engagement plan and its monitoring will ensure that local communities and stakeholders will be engaged. | SOP will be prepared December 2021 and technical guideline by June 2022 | PMU, PM, NPD and experts, |
| Local communities cannot access sufficient support to implement EbA interventions successfully. | Training will be provided for local communities on planning and implementing EbA. | No progress during this reporting period | Training manual, protocols and guidelines will be prepared. Stakeholder engagement plan and its monitoring will ensure that local communities and stakeholders will be engaged. | SOP will be prepared December 2021 and technical guideline by June 2022 | PMU, PM, NPD and experts, |
| Delay in project implementation |  | Recruitment process completed and PMU team and experts are on board. | The PMU team and experts needs to be oriented on GEF and UNEP reporting template. | PMU, ROAP and TM/UNEP is in continuous communication and this dialogue will be continued. | PMU team, CC Regional Coordinator, TM |

**The project is at medium risk. The project is at its initial stage of implementation and most of the mitigation measures have not been initiated. Besides, the project team has low capacity to implement and report as per UNEP and GEF guidelines. Because of this, there is inconsistency in project reporting and financial reporting as well as project planning.**

**The project team has not done adequate preparatory work before implementing the project in the project sites. The project was developed before 2016 and the current scenario needs to be revised including stakeholders plan, risk assessment and vulnerability assessment. Based on these assessments and baseline scenario, the team was supposed to revise the workplan and budget and initiate the EbA interventions accordingly. However, the partners were contracted to undertake EbA interventions, mainly excavation of ponds, without any preparatory work.**

**The project team and experts lack the understanding of the project and its requirement including GEF/UNEP requirement and managing the project in ad.hoc manner. This has potential to increase the risk from medium to high. UNEP CCAU team and ROAP team needs to be involved with the project team to address these project management issues and mitigate the risk before further action is taken.**

1. For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Verified through Scorecard Scoring methodologies adapted from AMAT (2014)2 . The indicator is based on five step criteria of capacity assessment framework (expressed as questions): 1. Are the institutions in the process of identifying climate change risks and appropriate EbA interventions? 2. Are the institutions in the process of prioritizing EbA interventions, integrating this approach into relevant policies and strategies and specifying budget allocations and targets for these interventions? 3. Have the institutions – including the CCC – defined clear roles and responsibilities for the coordination and implementation of EbA interventions?4. . Is there evidence of effective implementation of EbA interventions by the institutions? 5. Is there evidence of strengthened institutional capacities within the Climate Change Cell, BMDA, BWDB, BHWDB, DEA, BFD, DLS – through gender-sensitive training – for the continuous assessment, learning and review of EbA strategies and measures? Each question is answered with an assessment and score for the extent to which the associated criterion has been met: not at all (= 0), partially (= 1) or to a large extent/ completely (= 2). An overall score is calculated, with a maximum score of 10 given five criteria. These five criteria will be reviewed and validated at inception phase of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Outputs and activities (or deliverables) as described in the project log frame (and work plan) or in any updated project revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The completion dates should be as per latest workplan (latest project revision). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. As much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-8)