

Enhancing Coastal Adaptation and Resilience in Bangladesh (CARB)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12014
Countries
Bangladesh
Project Name
Enhancing Coastal Adaptation and Resilience in Bangladesh (CARB)
Agencies
CI
Date received by PM
9/18/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Tshewang Dorji
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

2/22/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks.

2/2/2026: GEFSEC

Revise the project title to emphasize adaptation and resilience as a main focus of the proposal

10/27/2025: GEFSEC

The LOE mentions the Forest Department from the Department of Environment, and Friendship, as the executing partners. However, only Friendship has been entered in the GEF Portal. Please include all the relevant executing partners.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 02/20/2026

The title has been revised in line with the updated proposal (page 2).

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

Forest Department, Department of Environment, Government of Bangladesh has been included as an executing partner. (page 2)

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

2/22/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks.

2/2/2026: GEFSEC

Thanks for the revision.

Appreciate some of the GEBs of the project. However, it would also be useful to mention some anticipated local-level adaptation benefits.

10/27/2025: GEFSEC

Please briefly explain how the climate change adaptation interventions proposed in this project connect to the REDD+ strategy, blue carbon initiatives, just transition principles, and carbon market mechanisms as mentioned here. Although leveraging the global environmental benefits of adaptation projects is important, it would be valuable to emphasize how these interventions can help reduce local vulnerability and strengthen resilience to climate change impacts.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 02/20/2026

Anticipated local-level adaptation benefits has been further specified in the project summary (page 3).

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

As per feedback from GEFSEC regarding LDCF objectives, project Component 2 has been revised with a move away from the REDD+ and blue carbon objectives and instead focuses on strengthening capacities of subnational actors and on access to finance and markets at community-level for effective and inclusive climate change adaptation and resilient livelihoods of coastal communities. This has been reflected with an update to the Project Summary (page 3)

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

2/22/2026: GEFSEC.

Thanks.

2/2/2026: GEFSEC

a) Please summarize the project's main objective concisely.

b). Generally, all components places significant emphasis on capacity building. While capacity building efforts are valid and necessary, it is important to ensure they are streamlined for greater effectiveness, including some level of conceptual clarity on the areas of capacity building. Additionally, it is crucial to acknowledge that the local community may possess a wealth of indigenous knowledge regarding mangrove rehabilitation and its ongoing management. Capturing and integrating this local expertise and know-how can significantly enhance the relevance and sustainability of capacity building initiatives. Please streamline the capacity building and training proposal. Details on the modalities of delivering capacity building program can be further developed at the PPG stage.

Component 1/Outcome 1.1

Similar feedback applies to the capacity building section as mentioned above. Additionally, it is unclear how outcome indicator 1.1(c) will be achieved.

Component 1/Outcome 1.2

Thank you for recommending livelihood diversification initiatives. However, when providing in-kind grant support to communities, it is essential to adopt an integrated approach that emphasizes value addition, market development, and connections with the financial sector to ensure the long-term sustainability of project outcomes. Therefore, it is respectfully suggested to outline a concept where such grants will be allocated based on identified needs and a performance of the community, linking to the revenue stream, instead of providing blanket allocation, while ensuring inclusivity.

Component 2:

Outcome 2.1

Similar feedback applies to the capacity building section as mentioned above. With regards to vulnerability and risk assessment, is it feasible that this exercise can be conducted during the PPG stage, and feed in the outcome into the restoration plan?

Outcome 2.2

Thank you for suggesting access to finance and market development. Please assess whether this outcome can be linked with Outcome 1.2 and clarify how financial management training can lead to supports for business plan formulation and implementation. For example, the project could offer financial management training to aid in creating business plans, which can then be supported by grants and access to capital from institutions like microfinance providers.

10/27/2025: GEFSEC

- a). Please revise the project objective to clearly emphasize strengthening the resilience of the coastal area. The current reference to biodiversity and livelihoods does not clearly connects with the objective.
- b). Please note that the LDCF is specifically mandated to support climate change adaptation initiatives in Least Developed Countries (LDCs). While it is encouraging to see that the project proposes interventions with climate mitigation benefits, the scope of this project must remain focused on climate change adaptation. Therefore, please revise the project components, outcomes, and outputs to align with an adaptation rationale, or provide a clearer explanation of how the proposed components are directly related to adaptation. For example, several proposed outcomes under Component 2 cannot be supported by the LDCF unless there is a clear and strong adaptation rationale.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 02/20/2026

- A) The project's main objective has been summarized more succinctly (page 4).
- B) Indicators and project descriptions have been updated to clarify, streamline, and provide more detail on the conceptualization of capacity building elements. The proposal has been adjusted to reflect that local expertise, and indigenous knowledge will be integrated throughout the project. (pages 4-10; pages 19-25)

Component 1/ Outcome 1.1

Outcome 1.1 has been updated to address the feedback regarding capacity building. Indicator 1.1(c) has also been updated to better reflect the intent behind the indicator, i.e. through mangrove restoration, embankment segments will be stabilized (page 4). Further details have been provided in the project description section to better reflect how this indicator will be achieved (pages 19-20)

Component 1/Outcome 1.2

This comment has been addressed to clarify that in-kind grants will be allocated on a performance-based approach based on adoption readiness rather than as a blanket approach (page 5). The criteria for the performance-linked framework will be prepared during PPG phase. This has been further detailed in the project description section (pages 20-21).

Outcome 2.1

The feedback on capacity building has been addressed by updating the Outcome and its indicators (pages 5-6). With regards to the vulnerability and risk assessment question, the project proposes that during PPG phase, a preliminary screening and review of existing Union-level vulnerability and risk assessment reports will be conducted to inform restoration planning. During project implementation, these assessments will be refined and updated where necessary to ensure alignment with ecosystem-based restoration and climate-resilient livelihood interventions. This has been updated under the project description section (pages 21-22).

Outcome 2.2

Outcome 2.2 builds on Outcome 1.2 as described in the proposal. This has been updated under the project description section to provide further clarification of the linkages between the two outcomes (page 21; pages 22-23).

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

a/b) As per feedback from GEFSEC regarding LDCF objectives, project Component 1 has been slightly revised to better reflect the adaptation focus and Component 2 (Outcome 2.2 and respective outputs and indicators) has been revised with a renewed focus on access to finance and markets at community-level for effective and inclusive climate change adaptation and resilient livelihoods of coastal communities. This has been reflected with an update to the Indicative Project Overview (pages 4-9) and with an update to the Project Description (pages 17-22)

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Under M&E, please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan. Because of the strong inclusion and whole of society aspects of the project, please include in KM products and communications, lessons learned and best practices in advancing gender equality, women's empowerment and facilitating inclusion, and ensure their wide dissemination for broader learning and scaling up.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

This feedback has been addressed under Component 3 and Component 4 (pages 4-9; pages 22-23), noting an increased focus on gender-sensitive knowledge management system and communications strategies, as well as ensuring gender-specific results are included in the M&E reports. In addition, the updated Component 2 has included strong gender and social inclusion objectives. (pages 4-9; pages 17-22).

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

2/3/2026: GEFSEC

a) Please refer to 3(b) above

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

a) Please refer to 3(b) above

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

This has been addressed as described under section 3.1 above.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

2/3/2026: GEFSEC

a) We acknowledge that the Sundarbans are sensitive to sea level rise. Since this section also refers to other climate hazards?such as cyclones, tropical storms, salinity, and erosion?briefly explain how these climate hazards contribute to the vulnerability of the Sundarbans.

Additionally, the sea level rise projection under the RCP8.5 scenario with a timeline of 2100 is not particularly useful for the project. In addition to RCP8.5 scenarios, please discuss other emission scenarios and their short- to medium-term timelines so that the proposed interventions are realistic and relevant.

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

- a) Please revise the description to emphasize how climate hazards and their impacts on coastal areas can be understood from a systems perspective. Consider how various elements?such as rising sea levels, increased storm frequency, and changing precipitation patterns?interact with natural and human systems within coastal environments. This approach highlights the interconnectedness of ecological, economic, and social components, illustrating how disruptions in one part of the system can have cascading effects throughout the entire coastal region.
- b). In this project, it is not clear how the explanations provided under "Limited Institutional Capacity and Policy Implementation Gaps" and "Lack of Enabling Conditions for Blue Carbon Finance" serve as the main barriers.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 02/20/2026

A) Additional evidence on how other climate hazards contribute to the vulnerability of the Sundarbans has been provided. We would also like to draw attention to references already made to other climate hazards in this section. These are described particularly under "Key systems drivers" (page 13) and "Social-ecological systems description" (pages 13-14) with reference to climate-induced cyclones impact on ecosystem sensitivity and economic development and with reference to salinity intrusion impacts on health in the region.

We have also updated this section with short- to medium term- climate scenarios. (page 11)

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

a) The Project Rationale has been updated to further emphasize how climate hazards and their impacts on coastal areas, both now and under future climate scenarios, are interlinked and interact with both natural and human systems within the coastal environments in Bangladesh. Due to page limits, this section will be further expanded on during the PPG phase. (pages 10-14)

b) The main barriers have also been updated to reflect the updated Component 2, with the two barriers referred to in this point revised as "Limited institutional capacity and policy implementation coordination", particularly at subnational level as a barrier identified under the NAP and "Lack of enabling conditions for access to finance". (pages 14-15)

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

2/3/2026: GEFSEC

a). Please review to ToC in the context of climate change adaptation

b. Please refer to 3(b)

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Please refer to 3(b)

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 02/20/2026

a) The ToC in the context of climate change adaptation has been updated (page 18)

b) Addressed

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

As per feedback from GEFSEC regarding LDCF objectives, project Component 2 has been revised with a renewed focus on access to finance and markets at community-level for effective and inclusive climate change adaptation and resilient livelihoods of coastal communities. The Theory of Change has been updated to reflect this feedback. (pages 17-18)

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency's Comments

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Please adjust the indicators upon addressing the comments under the 3(b)

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

Indicators have been updated to reflect the changes in Component 2 with a renewed focus on access to finance and markets at community-level for effective and inclusive climate change adaptation and resilient livelihoods of coastal communities. (pages 20-22)

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Whereas the ESS rating is medium, the rating of the Environmental and Social risk category is substantial. Please ensure these two ratings are aligned as per guidance in the GEF Risk Appetite (GEF/C.66/13).

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

Noted. This feedback has been addressed by updating the rating in the PIF in line with ESS rating and mitigation actions. (page 27)

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC:

Please clarify that series of community consultations were participated by Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous Peoples groups as well.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

This feedback has been addressed under "Project Rationale" key stakeholders consulted? to confirm that community consultations included Indigenous Peoples. (page 16)

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Yes

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/2025: GEFSEC:

Please complete the investment mobilize category for the Banque Raiffeisen in Luxembourg in the co-financing table

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

Done. Description of how ?investment mobilized? co-financing was identified has also been included under the co-financing table.

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/2025: GEFSEC

The LOE mentions the Forest Department from the Department of Environment, and Friendship, as the executing partners. However, only Friendship has been entered in the GEF Portal. Please include all the relevant executing partners.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 01/29/2026

Forest Department, Department of Environment, Government of Bangladesh has been included as an executing partner.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to

assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

2/22/2026: GEFSEC

Recommended for technical clearance. Please resubmit the PIF, removing the highlights within the document.

10/20/2025: GEFSEC

Not yet. Please address the above comments

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF February 23, 2026:

Many thanks. In the roadmap section we uploaded a project document with no highlights.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Review

10/27/2025

2/4/2026

2/22/2026

Agency Response

1/29/2026

2/20/2026

2/23/2026