



## **Implementing Ecosystem-based Management in Ecologically Critical Areas in Bangladesh**

### **Part I: Project Information**

#### **GEF ID**

9913

#### **Project Type**

FSP

#### **Type of Trust Fund**

GET

#### **Project Title**

Implementing Ecosystem-based Management in Ecologically Critical Areas in Bangladesh

#### **Countries**

Bangladesh

#### **Agency(ies)**

UNDP

#### **Other Executing Partner(s):**

Ministry of Environment & Forests

**Executing Partner Type**

Government

**GEF Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Taxonomy**

Climate Change Adaptation, Climate Change, Focal Areas, Climate information, Climate resilience, Ecosystem-based Adaptation, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Biodiversity, Productive Seascapes, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Biomes, Rivers, Lakes, Wetlands, Financial and Accounting, Payment for Ecosystem Services, Conservation Trust Funds, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Sustainable Agriculture, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques, Ecosystem Approach, Sustainable Livelihoods, Income Generating Activities, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Demonstrate innovative approach, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Stakeholders, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Private Sector, SMEs, Community Based Organization, Civil Society, Academia, Non-Governmental Organization, Local Communities, Communications, Awareness Raising, Behavior change, Education, Public Campaigns, Partnership, Type of Engagement, Participation, Information Dissemination, Consultation, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Women groups, Beneficiaries, Gender-sensitive indicators, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Gender results areas, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Participation and leadership, Access and control over natural resources, Access to benefits and services, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Enabling Activities, Learning, Theory of change, Adaptive management, Indicators to measure change, Capacity Development, Innovation

**Rio Markers****Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

**Climate Change Adaptation**

Climate Change Adaptation 1

**Duration**

72In Months

**Agency Fee(\$)**

289,403

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-4_P9	BD-4: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes and seascapes and production sectors Program 9: Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface	GET	3,046,347	10,500,000
Total Project Cost(\$)			3,046,347	10,500,000

**B. Project description summary**

**Project Objective**

To apply an ecosystem-based framework for managing Ecologically Critical Areas in Bangladesh to enhance the conservation of globally significant biodiversity and support local livelihoods.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------	------------	---------------------------	----------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1: Designing a financially viable, ecosystem-based management framework for Ecologically Critical Areas (ECAs).	Technical Assistance	<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> Ecosystem-based framework/system applied to the planning and management of ECAs, institutionalized, and operational as indicated by:</p> <p><i>(a) Number of policy and planning tools for addressing application of ecological standards to achieve favorable conditions in ECAs - at least three</i></p> <p><i>(b) Number of institutions that have adequate trained staff and procedures in place for gender mainstreaming</i></p> <p><i>(c) Average increase of institutional</i></p>	<p>Output 1.1: Improved ecosystem-based framework for effective planning and management of ECAs, including (i) establishing an ECA Technical Advisory Committee to advise and guide on wetland monitoring and compliance system (ii) design of national generic standards for monitoring of wetland conditions and its application to the two pilot ECAs; and (iii) documentation of results of application of the ecological framework to the two pilot ECAs and its replication to other ECAs</p> <p>Output 1.2: Strengthened institutionalization and multi-sector coordination at national, district, upazila, union and community levels by (i) applying and operationalization of the 2016 ECA management rules; (ii) re-invigorating and refine modalities for ECA committees at District, Upazila, Union and Village Council Group levels to oversee planning, ecosystem-based management and compliance monitoring; (iii) defining opportunities to work with the private sector to reduce ecological impacts in Halda River; and (iv) documentation of best practices and lessons to inform mainstreaming of the ECA management rules</p> <p>Output 1.3: Legal and policy instruments, necessary to enforce compliance with achieving and maintaining favorable ecological condition of ECAs, identified and submitted to government to adopt. This will entail: (i) applying common property principles for guaranteeing community access to resources, information, justice and participation; (ii) establishing public-private partnership arrangements for pollution control; (iii) developing guidelines for applying “pollution pays” principle; and (iv) developing clear principles for sharing and access to monitoring information generated through application of generic ecological standards.</p> <p>Output 1.4: Sustainable financing strategy for ECAs developed</p>	GET	403,600	1,719,775

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 2: Applying an ecosystem-based framework to effectively plan, manage, finance and monitor compliance in target ECAs.	Investment	<p><b>Outcome 2:</b></p> <p>Improved ecological condition of target sites (Halda River and Morjat Baor) through effective community engagement and benefit sharing arrangements indicated by:</p> <p><i>(a) Number of ECA management plans adequately sourced in terms of staff and resources and approved by government – at least 50% of ECAs</i></p> <p><i>b) 10-15% improvement in water quality indices from baselines at selected monitoring stations in the two ECAs</i></p>	<p>Output 2.1: Assessment of current ecological conditions in target sites to inform their future management. This will be achieved through (i) detailed information gathering to assess wetland condition and types of stressors to enable screening of ECA sites for signs of impairment and development of management responses; (ii) identifying opportunities for partnerships for improving management, monitoring and restoration efforts; (iii) evaluate costs of restoration of degraded habitats and river water quality at completion of monitoring program.</p> <p>Output 2.2: Ecosystem-based management plans (5 years), with associated monitoring, action and financing plans, prepared and being implemented for target sites. This entails: (i) establishment of ECA committees and VCGs; (ii) on basis of findings of ESIA undertaking pollution assessment study of project ECAs to identify pollution types, sources and gaps in enforcement and legislation; (iii) recruit consultant to facilitate management planning for two pilot ECAs and process for engagement of stakeholders; (iv) establish stakeholder forum; (v) establish management planning task Force for delivering management planning framework and support priority investments; (vi) apply ecological monitoring framework to the two ECA sites and track compliance with measures agreed in management plan to achieve favorable ecological conditions[1]; and (vii) establish Management Board in each ECA to oversee and monitor implementation of management plans</p> <p>Output 2.3: Range of activities piloted in target sites to enhance protection of biodiversity and restore ecosystem to improve livelihoods through (i) identification of target locations for project investment; (ii) consultation and</p>	GET	2,152,464	6,121,501

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 3: Strengthening the institutional and technical capacity of the Department of Environment (DoE) to put in place measures to address threats to ECAs and ensure that responsible parties restore and maintain the integrity of ECAs.	Technical Assistance	<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> Institutional capacity, knowledge management, gender mainstreaming and monitoring and evaluation contributes to identification of improved tools, approaches and best practices for replication and scaling up as indicated by:</p> <p><i>(a) Establishment and technical capacity of ECA Management, Monitoring &amp; Compliance Unit (MMCUC) within DoE as measured by:</i></p> <p><i>- MMCUC established and operational with staff (3 wetland ecologist, 1</i></p>	<p>Output 3.1: Communications Strategy and Action Plan developed and implemented by (i) prepare communication and knowledge management plan; (ii) prepare communications materials and implement plan; (iii) implement gender action plan; and (iv) institutionalization of programs through MMCUC.</p> <p>Output 3.2: ECA Management, Monitoring &amp; Compliance Unit established within DoE through: (i) recruitment of wetland, compliance monitoring, information management and communication specialists; (ii) establish ECA management, monitoring and compliance unit (MMCUC) in DoE to facilitate information management and monitoring of ECAs; (iii) establish national standards for ECAs in terms of water quality and habitat/ecosystem quality; (iv) establish ECA Scientific Advisory Panel to advise on water quality and other ECA parameters; and (v) entrust ECA committee with monitoring</p> <p>Output 3.3 Modular training program, informed by competency-based needs assessment for ECA stakeholders, designed, operational and institutionalized, including: (i) identification of competency needs and standards for training of key agencies and committees; (ii) develop training modules by ECA MMCUC and conduct training; and (iii) institutionalize training program with MMCUC or academic or training institutional, as appropriate</p> <p>Output 3.4 National spatial, web-based information, learning and participatory monitoring system for ECAs established and operational through: (i) identification of institution for hosting ECA information and monitoring system; (ii) assess user needs at national, district, upazila and union levels and VCGs; (iii) design of ECA information and monitoring system and identification of reporting infrastructure and data population methods; (iv) launch of information and monitoring system; and (v) institutionalization of information and monitoring</p>	GET	345,283	2,133,724



Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
				Sub Total (\$)	2,901,347	9,975,000
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
				GET	145,000	525,000
				Sub Total(\$)	145,000	525,000
				Total Project Cost(\$)	3,046,347	10,500,000

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
Government	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change	Grant	10,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	500,000
Total Co-Financing(\$)			10,500,000

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Bangladesh	Biodiversity		No	3,046,347	289,403
Total Grant Resources(\$)						3,046,347	289,403

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

---

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

## F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

☐

**PPG Amount (\$)**

150,000

**PPG Agency Fee (\$)**

14,250

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Bangladesh	Biodiversity		No	150,000	14,250
Total Project Costs(\$)						150,000	14,250

## Core Indicators

### Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	11025.00	0.00	0.00

### Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

### Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

### Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

### Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	11,025.00		

### Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		300		
Male		700		
Total	0	1000	0	0

## **PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION**

### **1. Project Description**

#### *A.1. Project Description.*

There are no significant changes in the project design from the original PIF, with the exception that the project duration was reduced from 6 to 5 years on account of the tight budget and in keeping with the experience of past GEF projects in Bangladesh, namely e.g. Coastal and Wetland Biodiversity Management Project (CWBMP) and Community-based adaptation to climate change through coastal afforestation (ICBAAR) project. During the PPG stage, Outcomes and Outputs have undergone some modification as required to improve the design of the project and reflect the outcomes of PPG consultations and assessments. All original elements of the PIF are still included in the Outcome and Output statements of the project as detailed in Table B. These are further detailed in *Section A.1.3 of this CEO Endorsement Request and Annex G of CEO ER*.

The co-financing amount has increased from the PIF estimate of USD 6,000,000 to 10,500,000 ensuring a more realistic figure.

#### ***1) Global environmental problems, threats, root causes and barriers to be addressed.***

There are no significant changes from the PIF. Through the PPG process - threats, impacts, and barriers presented in the original PIF have been further refined and elaborated through consultations. In addition, the project has been simplified to reduce the number of Outputs and activities. Please refer to *Section II “Development challenge” and Section IV “Results and Partnerships” in the UNDP Project Document for details*.

#### ***2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.***

There is no significant change from the PIF. However, *Section II Development challenge, baseline scenario and Section IV Results and Partnerships, Part on “Partnerships and Stakeholder engagement” of the UNDP Project Document* identify a wider range of partners that would be involved in project implementation and include baseline initiatives (including baseline budget estimates) that will contribute to the results of the project.

#### ***3) Proposed alternative scenario, with brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project***

The relevance and feasibility of the proposed outcomes and outputs have been confirmed (*Refer Figure 2 for Theory of Change and Section IV, of UNDP Project Document*) through additional expert review and extensive consultations during the preparation phase of the project (*Refer Section IV “Results and Partnerships”, Stakeholder engagement plan and*

*Annex 5 of UNDP Project Document*). Project indicators and targets have been refined to reflect on-the-ground practicalities and ecological considerations. One modification from the original PIF has been as discussed below:

Output 2.4 in PIF, namely “Monitoring systems designed and operational” has been moved to Component 3 as Output 3.2 as “ECA Management, Monitoring & Compliance Unit established within DoE” to specifically also include a permanent institutional arrangement for the information and monitoring system.

**Response to Project Reviews** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion, and responses to comments from the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF) is provided in Annex B of the CEO ER.

#### ***Alignment with GEF focal area strategies***

The proposed project is aligned with the goal of the **GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy** to: *maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services it provides to society, through contributing both to conserving biodiversity and maintaining habitats in protected areas and to its conservation and sustainable use in production landscapes and seascapes*. It will address **Objective 4** of this Strategy, which is: *mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes and seascapes and production sectors*, by virtue of targeting ECAs – inland freshwater and coastal wetlands that are ecologically important but critically impacted from human activities. It is targeted at: strengthening the financial sustainability of the ECA system; enhancing the governance of ECAs by introducing an ecosystem-based framework to their management and monitoring compliance with that framework; engaging with the private sector to challenge the status quo and apply the “polluter pays” principle through incentives and disincentives; and thereby contributes directly to **Program 9: Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface**.

#### ***4) Incremental/additional cost reasoning***

Baseline projects as well as other contributions to the project’s baseline and co-financing are given in *UNDP Project Document Section IV (Results and Partnerships, p.30)* for each project component, and *Section IX (Financial Planning and Management, p.90)*.

The indicative co-financing for the project has been confirmed with a total of USD 10,500,000 (see Table C above). GEF resources will be used to address efforts in developing an enabling framework for integrated ecosystem-based management of ECAs, the pilot application of the ecosystem-based framework in the two target ECAs, and the strengthening of institutional and technical capacity to address threats to ECAs and ensure that key partners work together to maintain the integrity of the ECA network. This will be done through the provision of incremental funding to add on to investments already being made by project partners. The project preparation phase has also engaged stakeholders, developed a shared vision and initiated steps towards the removal of barriers for effective implementation. The project can therefore, be considered entirely incremental above the baseline situation.

#### ***5) Global Environmental Benefits (GEB)***

The GEF increment builds on the existing programs undertaken by the Government of Bangladesh for ECA management and conservation, maintaining its ecosystem services and values, sustainable fisheries and wetland management. In the alternative scenario enabled by the GEF, the project will work towards removal of systemic and institutional barriers for ECA resources planning through: (i) strengthened institutional, legal and regulatory frameworks that incorporate biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services considerations into sectoral, national and sub-national planning system; (ii) strengthened national capacity for integrated ecosystem-based management planning in ECAs; (iii) biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into the agricultural, fisheries and other wetland related forestry sectors, supporting the reduction of key threats to globally and regionally threatened ecosystems and



species; and (vi) knowledge management for wetland conservation, ecosystem services, and sustainable fisheries, agriculture and livelihood practices is captured and shared, encouraging ongoing and widespread implementation. The proposed project generates GEBs by contributing to Aichi Targets #5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 19.

**Global environmental benefits** post-project will be improved management and compliance monitoring of 395,229 ha of inland freshwater bodies (lakes and rivers) and coastal and marine habitats in respect of GEF's replenishment target of 300 million hectares of improved management of landscapes and seascapes. The project's global benefit reflects the total area of Bangladesh's ECAs network (384,529 ha) plus the proposed Halda River ECA of 10,700 ha (*refer to Annex 13 for ECA statistics*). This global benefit (post-project) will be generated as a result of the project's intervention to introduce an ecosystem-based framework to the planning and management of ECAs, whereby the determinants (criteria) of *favorable ecological condition* are identified and management regimes and targets are prescribed by DoE for the responsible authority/manager to implement. This will provide the basis upon which DoE will monitor compliance, using participatory monitoring processes involving CSOs, communities and academia, as appropriate, to augment its own official oversight.

The key biodiversity values of the two pilot sites are:

- The Halda River is the single major source of Indian carp (*Labeo rohita*) eggs in Bangladesh and possibly in South Asia, being the major freshwater breeding ground and natural gene-bank of pure Indian carp
- It provides habitat for the endangered Ganges Dolphin (*Platanista gangetica*, EN) and several other endangered birds, and habitat for a wide variety of endemic species.
- The river provides a wide range of habitats as it evolves from mountain streams to estuary, and the resulting mix of river habitats, associated wetlands, forestry, mangrove and saltmarsh support a diverse array of locally and globally important species.
- Morjat Baor is famous for its diversity of over 100 species of freshwater fish species, including *Botia dario*, a nationally endangered fish species
- The lake is also very important habitat for bird species, such as the locally endangered little black cormorant (*Phalacrocorax sulcirostris*), Great White Egret (*Ardea alba*), kingfishers and other species. The abundant plant life also supports diverse and abundant communities of invertebrates, amphibians and reptiles.

The **immediate global environmental benefit** during the lifetime of the project will be up to 11,025 ha of wetlands under restoration (and being managed in compliance with criteria that will result in favorable ecological conditions being achieved in the long-term) which represents the total area of the two target existing and proposed ECAs, the latter (Halda River) expanding the existing ECA network by 2.8% - a further global benefit.

The GEF increment will be crucial to financing the interventions necessary to shift the current baseline from one of having the fundamental governance structures for ECA management piloted, institutionalized in a handful of sites and now underpinned by new ECA Management Rules to a financially viable network of ECAs that is managed with due regard to conserving biodiversity, maintaining *favorable ecological condition* and sustaining ecosystem services to benefit local livelihoods. Benefits to local livelihoods are likely to be very significant, particularly with regard to improved water quality along the Halda River and in Morjat Baor. The increment to be achieved from the additional GEF funds is summarized below in Table 2. While ECA projects have been subject to project interventions for 20+ years and, while their conservation status has improved to some extent in about half of them (others not having benefitted from such projects), they continue to be project dependent (i.e. sustainable solutions have yet to be realized). The fundamental issue is enforcement of the law, based on the "polluter pays" principle. To be able to enforce the law, the responsible authority (Department of Environment) needs to know: (i) the ecological status of the wetland (all ECAs are wetlands, to date) and whether or not that status is changing for better or worse under the existing management regime/lack of management scenario; (ii) the prior healthy status of the ECA before it became ecologically degraded, including the species and/or habitats for which it is nationally/globally important for biodiversity conservation and provision of ecosystem services; and (iii) the measures necessary to restore and/or maintain the ECA to good ecological condition. Based on this knowledge, the DoE is then able to prescribe the management measures necessary for the wetland owner/manager/user to restore and/or maintain the good condition of the wetland. Having agreed the management prescriptions, which form the basis of the ECA management plan, DoE monitors the status of the wetland to ensure that its good condition is being maintained or attained within a specific timeframe. Such monitoring provides DoE with ability to track implementation of the management agreement and, if necessary, penalize the

responsible party for non-compliance. In the case of 3<sup>rd</sup> parties polluting an ECA wetland, for example, such impacts will show up in the monitoring and polluters can be brought to justice once the DoE is able to identify the source of such pollution.

Underpinning the monitoring, therefore, is a hydrological framework that provides a set of national standards for wetland ecosystems, based on physical (e.g. water clarity), chemical (e.g. levels of oxygen and pollutants such as nitrogen and phosphorus) and biological (e.g. algal mats, aquatic plants and animals) indicators that can be applied to individual ECAs. It is this hydrological framework that needs to be developed and adopted under the county's ECA legislation via the ECA Management Rules (Component 1), applied to the two project sites by way of demonstration (Component 2) and institutionalized (Component 3). Thus the project intends introducing a sound scientific approach to ECA management that can be applied across the ECA network in a consistent manner and used as a basis for enforcing compliance with the management measures prescribed by DoE in consultation and agreement with the wetland owner(s). Stakeholders, particularly local communities, need to be introduced to this science as part of the management planning process and their practical experience in managing their wetlands for agricultural, fishery and other purposes should be taken into account and contribute to design of management interventions. The management planning process should be envisaged as a meeting between scientist and practitioner, respectively bringing the technical knowledge and local experience together. A further dimension to this particular GEF-6 project is its engagement with the private sector, something not previously addressed in previous ECA projects but a necessary ingredient of a holistic approach to ECA management, given that the private sector is a significant polluter of some ECA wetlands. Hence the focus on Halda River, heavily polluted by industry and proposed as an ECA. The project's incremental value lies in demonstrating, using the selected ECAs, the development of participatory ecosystem-based wetland resources management, enterprise based sustainable natural resource practices and sustainable livelihoods for local communities to improve the favorable ecological conditions, including while conservation of wetland biodiversity, maintaining habitat and ecosystem services and ameliorating climate change impacts.

The project will be able to develop and demonstrate a matrix of best practices for Bangladesh's ECAs for scaling up and replication in other ECAs nationally and regionally and for the recognition of the importance of gender mainstreaming in such actions. A series of guidelines, knowledge management publications and awareness events will support the achievement of these targets.

**Table 2: Summary of incremental cost rationale and global environmental benefits**

Summary of baseline scenario	Summary of GEF scenario	GEF increment by project end
------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------

<p>ECA network (<b>Annex 1</b>) comprises 13 wetlands established from 1999 under Bangladesh Conservation Act 1995; currently covers 384,529 ha[1]<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>ECA responsibility vested in DoE but land tenure often lies with third parties (e.g. Forest Department).</p> <p>ECA management to date is largely project dependent, of which there have been at least 9 multi-million dollar investments since 1999 (<b>Table 1</b>).</p> <p>Most projects have focused on 4 ECAs where governance structure was successfully piloted by CWBMP in 2003-2011. Five ECAs, notified from 2009 onwards, have not benefitted from key projects.</p> <p>Limited financial resources and capacity continue to hinder mainstreaming and scaling up of project successes and best practices.</p> <p><i>Status quo</i> is unsustainable: ECAs are not being maintained without continuing project investments; nor is there any robust, transparent mechanism to monitor <i>status quo</i> and ensure compliance with agreed interventions.</p> <p>ECA Management Rules finally approved in 2016, underpinning institutionalization of a governance system represented at every government level from national to Union Council, are yet to be mainstreamed across all ECAs.</p>	<p>Financially viable ecosystem-based management framework designed, mainstreamed across ECA network and institutionalized.</p> <p>Ecosystem-based framework applied to effectively plan, manage, finance and monitor compliance in target ECAs. SEA approach deployed to engage key stakeholders in an open, holistic, transparent and participatory manner.</p> <p>ECAs engaged for first time with private sector to address pollution of water from industrial effluents.</p> <p>Institutional and technical capacity of DoE strengthened to put in place measures to address threats to ECAs and ensure that responsible parties restore and maintain ECA integrity.</p> <p>Network-wide, transparent monitoring system established for ECAs to track status of their ecological condition.</p>	<p>DoE enabled to resource ECA network in terms of adequate staffing with relevant competencies as result of developing and implementing a Sustainable Financing Strategy.</p> <p>Governance structure is fully institutionalized and mainstreamed across ECAs in wake of applying 2016 ECA Management Rules.</p> <p>Ecosystem-based framework developed and applied to two 11,025 ha of wetland managed in compliance with criteria that will result in <i>favorable ecological condition</i> being achieved on the long-term.</p> <p>At least 50% of ECA with ecosystem-based management framework to achieve long-term favorable environmental conditions</p> <p>Establishment of Halda River as ECA (10,825 ha) under <i>Bangladesh Environmental Conservation Act of 1995</i> with established ECA management committees at district, upazila and union levels; village conservation groups established as cooperative societies; rules in place in terms of permissible and prohibited activities; management plan approved for ecosystem-based management</p> <p>Provision of vital technical and other resources to support establishment of the new Halda River ECA, expanding ECA network by 2.8% (10,825 ha).</p> <p>Local livelihoods benefit substantially from a range of ecosystem goods and services – to about 1,000 persons with average 15% increase in incomes</p> <p>Information management system established for ECA network, which includes provisions for monitoring <i>favorable ecological condition</i> of ECAs, GIS and knowledge management.</p> <p>Improved quality of water in Halda River (by 10-15%) at defined locations (locations where project interventions are targeted) resulting from engaging with private sector specifically to address industrial effluent pollution and Morjat Boar through improved weed control and agricultural practices.</p>
--	--	--

Global environmental benefits, additional to those generated from the introduction of an ecosystem-based management framework at the ECA system level, include the following specific ones in the target ECAs:

**Halda River:** conservation of a pure gene bank of major Indian carps (e.g. *Catla catla*, *Labeo rohita*, *L. calbasu*, *Chirhinus chirhosus*), and a globally unique customary tradition of collecting the fertilized eggs from the spawning grounds. Also enhancing the protection of the Ganges dolphin (*Platanista gangetica*).

**Morjat Haor:** Renowned high diversity of fish (over 100 species) and locally endangered bird species, including little black cormorant (*Phalacrocorax sulcirostris*), Great White Egret (*Ardea alba*), kingfishers, etc.

---

[1] This is the revised area, based on more accurate GIS estimates of Sonadia Island and Marjat Baur ECAs. The legally notified total area amounts to 379,022 ha. Details are provided in **Annex 1**.

#### ***6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.***

**Innovativeness:** The project design is innovative in several ways. First, it proposes to pilot the first programs in Bangladesh for integrated ecosystem-based planning and management in ECAs. The project seeks to mainstream biodiversity and water quality and conservation outcomes in sectoral and local planning systems. This approach, that would involve multi-stakeholder planning and an inter-sectoral coordination approach to ECA management in Bangladesh that would propose the following approaches: (i) the ECA wetland ecosystem being viewed as a system in its self, comprised of various natural, cultural and socio-economic components; in turn, it is part of the bigger national, regional, thematic, and global networks of wetland habitats; (ii) ECA would be appropriately managed by ecology-based planning using a patch-matrix model for biodiversity and water quality and conservation outcomes, taking account of wetland ecology, inter-connectedness, vegetation zoning, regional land-use planning, hydrological parameters, nature and cultural integration, etc. (i.e. ecosystem-based planning); (iii) bringing actors from the districts, upazilas, unions communities, market and civil society sectors together to achieve mutual understanding and negotiate and implement mutually agreeable plans, combining top-down and bottom-up approaches and promotion of community participation (i.e. inter-sectoral coordination); and (iv) promoting a conservation and water-based economy in ECAs, with value creation and increased economic benefits for local people; labeling of goods and services from the wetlands (e.g. tourism products and services; sustainable agricultural products; sustainable fisheries and resource utilization, etc.); consumption and production in line with sustainable development; fair distribution; and awareness of conservation of nature and culture. Lessons learned on collaboration with the fisheries, agriculture, tourism and other relevant sectors can be shared with other ECAs in the country and regionally. Secondly, it is innovative because it would seek to link wetlands, riparian restoration and protection and wetland-based agricultural systems as part of a larger effort to improve biodiversity conservation outcomes and improve connectivity of individual components of the ECA and adjacent areas. Thirdly, it would articulate the special biodiversity and ecosystem features of each ECA at the time of its designation, identifying the criteria necessary to maintain these features in ‘favorable ecological condition’ and introducing management agreements between the DoE and parties responsible for the site (i.e. land owner, tenant etc.). The governance of UK’s Sites of Special Scientific Interest[2]<sup>2</sup> (most SSSIs being privately owned) may be a useful reference model to follow up with Natural England, UK’s nature

conservation agency and establish a monitoring framework for the ECA system that will cover both the management and ecological status (health) of individual wetlands. Fourthly, it would serve as a pilot to develop and test sustainable financing mechanisms at the local level (community or district level) to improve incentive for community engagement in conservation and sustainable wetland resource,

### **Sustainability and Scaling Up**

The project will address sustainability as follows:

**Financial sustainability** will be achieved by a number of means, including: (i) ensuring that through the integrated ecosystem-based planning exercise for the ECAs, the national, district and private entities that will facilitate the convergence of financial resources to support conservation and sustainable community livelihoods that would help financially sustain activities beyond the life of the project; (ii) ensure partnership arrangement between national, district and local institutions, communities, NGO and private sector partners within the ECAs that will ensure complementarity and cost-effectiveness of multiple partners and investments; (iii) develop new business models for ECA pollution control that recognize the full range of environmental ecosystem services provided by ECAs and their attendant species and ecosystems. Developing market linkages for sustainable fisheries and agriculture products and services, ecotourism and local livelihoods through value chain mechanisms can financially sustainability and expand investments beyond the project period; while training of local entrepreneurs and micro, small and medium enterprises and establishing linkages with financial institutions and private sector, including the use of potential PES mechanisms through the financial sustainability study under Output 1.4 could lead to diversification of funding base from management of ECAs.

**Institutional sustainability** will be ensured through systematic capacity development of existing national public institutions (DoE and others) and district, upazila and union entities, local communities and civil society organizations that operate in the ECAs. By engaging these stakeholders in gender responsive conservation and ecosystem management investment planning, the project will help establish alliances for conservation and sustainable use of biological resources that is expected to continue beyond the project period. Carefully tailored training and capacity building to enhance the skills of local communities in relation to sustainable fisheries and agriculture and micro, mini and small enterprises (MMSE's) will provide institutional sustainability. The project's institutional arrangements will further help build coordination structures at the national and ECA levels with representation from different development sectors and stakeholders (including district, upazila and union committees, NGOs and private sector) to implement integrated ecosystem-based planning and to ensure that sub-national development plans mainstream biodiversity policies. To ensure sustainability of institutional arrangements for integrated ecosystem-based management planning and ensuring mainstreaming of biodiversity policies into socio-economic development, the Government of Bangladesh will work towards strengthening and institutionalization of these coordination mechanisms as part of its long-term strategy to streamline and support biodiversity goals. Formalization of these coordination arrangements will enable sustaining and scaling up of benefits of the project within ECAs in the country.

**Social sustainability** will be enhanced through the development/strengthening of stakeholder participation mechanisms for the target ECAs. A Knowledge Management and Communication plan will be developed early during the project to facilitate awareness and enhance stakeholder participation. The project will ensure adequate consultation and participatory decision making to ensure that project activities are detailed in collaboration with local communities, so that extensive consultation including all affected groups is

undertaken prior to delineation of conservation and sustainable fisheries and agricultural activities. Social sustainability will also be achieved by strengthening of village conservation groups (VCGs), ensuring their active participation in planning and implementation of conservation and sustainable wetland resource management practices, improving community capacity for management of wetland resources and for improving grievance redressal mechanisms that will ensure social sustainability. These objectives and measures are all to be anchored in a gender responsive approach resulting from robust mainstreaming of gender in all aspects of the project cycle.

**Environmental sustainability** will be achieved through a coordinated ecosystem-based approach involving improved wetland management approaches, sustainable fisheries and agricultural and other wetland resource use practices natural resources, water quality management and riparian area management, securing improved wetland restoration, improving incentives for conservation and community participation. It would also help reduction of external threats on ECAs through targeted ecosystem-based partnerships, with the intent to manage and control the pollution of water bodies and improve inter-institutional collaboration. The water focus of integrated ecosystem-based management will help to mitigate climate change impacts and enhance community resilience. This work at ECA level is aimed at ensuring environmental and socio-economic sustainability through improved institutional capacity, policies and legislation.

**Potential for scaling up:** Thus, the potential for scaling up is high with this enhanced capacity established within DoE; and supported by the new multi-sector ECA Scientific Advisory Panel described in Section IV.ii (p.51). It is also noteworthy that a precedent has previously been established with the previous GEF-funded ECA project, *Coastal and Wetland Biodiversity Management Project 2003-2011* (CWBMP), which DoE scaled up with its Community-based Adaptation in the ECAs through Biodiversity Conservation and Social Protection Project (CBA-ECA) from 2010 to 2015. The governance, capacity, training, management, monitoring and financial strengthening of the ECA system achieved and demonstrated in the two project sites during the lifetime of this project, including the adoption of standards, protocols and tools, will benefit other ECAs during and subsequent to its implementation. Moreover, all of the knowledge and experience gained, lessons learned, training modules, templates for management planning and monitoring, management plans and associated monitoring data, and legal and regulatory provisions will be readily accessible on a web-based learning and participatory monitoring system with GIS capabilities. It is anticipated that this system will be hosted by DoE via a portal that will be maintained by the ECA SMCU. The Project's investment component will seek to develop synergies among rural development and private sector actors and programs with an objective of raising additional investments that will fund and expand models of ECA conservation and resource use and alternative livelihood activities within and outside of the targeted ECAs. The financial strategy plan would facilitate replication and scaling (Output 1.4, p.37) and help assess sustainable financial and institutional arrangements for scaling up, develop a best practices and conduct dissemination events to encourage uptake of integrated ecosystem-based approaches in other ECA sites. In particular, activities to be undertaken as part of the effort of scaling up include the following:

- **Develop a financial strategy** based on lessons learned at the field level that will ensure that the integrated ecosystem-based management planning approach and models developed and pilot tested in the pilot ECAs is scaled up in the country. Component 3 would support the analysis, documentation and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned that deliver tangible improvements in biodiversity, wetlands and wetland resources status to provide examples for replication. It would also entail participation in regional workshops and best practice sharing events to improve learning and exchange of experiences in mainstreaming biodiversity considerations, and integrated ecosystem-based wetland management planning and practices. Based on these best practices and lessons, the financial strategy will provide a basis for actions at other key ECAs, identify required institutional and

coordination arrangements resources and partnership commitments (including with NGOs and private sector), select interventions and potential sites for replication by the fifth year of the project.

- **Annual seminars** for key staff and decision makers on best practices, experiences and needs;
- **Financial mechanisms** identified to strengthen and upscale financial support to conservation and sustainable wetland resources management in ECAs
- **Publishing of best practice manuals/handbooks/compendiums** of integrated ecosystem-based management approaches; and
- **End of project national seminar** on outcomes and replication for integrated ecosystem-based approaches in Bangladesh

### ***7) Cost efficiency and effectiveness***

The project has been designed to reflect the most cost-effective approach. A number of strategies were evaluated during the project formulation stage to identify those strategies and activities that demonstrate this cost-effective approach. The cost-effective approaches that have been applied to the project are the following:

*Defining a holistic and integrated approach to project formulation:* The project adopts an integrated ecosystem-based management framework on the basis of which achievement of favorable ecological conditions are envisaged so as to ensure that ecologically rich habitats in the ECAs and their various interactions are connected to maximize opportunities for synergies, such that selected actions and interventions generate multiple benefits. This is accomplished through development and implementation of well-designed ECA management actions (and community resource management and livelihood measures in agriculture, fisheries, tourism etc. that incorporate mainstreamed biodiversity policies and best practices in terms of improved food security and more resilience to climate events, whilst improving livelihood benefits, biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services.

Intervention sites in the pilot ECAs will be selected using a tiered-approach adopting a systematic and spatially explicit method that optimally captured the best multiple criteria-based choice of the project sites. The approach considered globally significant and nationally important species in identifying the sites to ensure their protection and better management.

*Sequencing of activities:* Project design and sequencing of project activities ensures that foundational activities are completed first, to the extent feasible, or in parallel, such as (i) establishing governance and coordinating mechanisms at the national and sub-national levels; (ii) legislative and regulatory changes clarifying responsibilities of ECA planning, management and oversight; legislative and regulatory changes to facilitate to mainstreaming biodiversity into sector and environmental planning; and (iii) capacity improvements developed to provide the necessary groundwork for later demonstration of best practices in the two pilot ECAs and beyond; The project includes subsequent documentation, dissemination of best practices for scaling up under Outcome 3 and feedback mechanisms to influence further policy and legislative changes, as appropriate.

*Models to demonstrate benefits:* Project design ensures selectivity in the identification and development of on-the-ground demonstration investments (in Outcome 2, p.40) so as to ensure cost-effectiveness in terms of avoiding duplication and ineffective spread of activities. Locating these mix of management and restoration activities in selected ecologically rich areas and where threats are manageable within the pilot ECAs will help demonstrate tangible impacts on the ground rather than spreading activities widely and in a scattered manner throughout the ECAs. It would also support identification and demonstration of a few financial sustainability efforts as a means to ensure community participation and

financing of investments, improve financial sustainability and long-term financial commitments for community livelihood activities, rather than have to depend on government hand-outs, thus empowering communities in the management of their own enterprises.

*Building on existing lessons and best practices:* As a measure to ensure cost-effectivity, project design focuses on use of available resource to the extent possible building on the existing ECA rules, existing mechanisms for integration of biodiversity consideration into district, upazila and union planning and using NGOs that are already active in the area to support local level planning, capacity building and provision of implementation support. Rather than invest in extensive Integrated planning that cannot be implemented without high levels of planning expertise, this project will invest in ecosystem-based plans that are specific to the ECAs and narrower in its scope and reach. The process for ecosystem-based planning advocated here is both effective and cost-efficient. Rather than hire expensive external consultants, local planning teams consisting of NGOs and local government technical specialists will make use of available information and extensive stakeholder consultations to develop plans that follow the “No Regrets” principle adopted by national policies. This results in plans that have higher levels of participation and buy-in.

*Data management systems:* The project will focus on the development of standardized, but simple information collection and databases at ECAs (including cost-effective GIS solutions) that is also a proven and effective way to collect and share data. The Knowledge Management and Communication Strategy in particular makes use of simple and effective local forms of communication.

---

[1] This is the revised area, based on more accurate GIS estimates of Sonadia Island and Marjat Baur ECAs. The legally notified total area amounts to 379,022 ha. Details are provided in **Annex 1**.

[2] <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-areas-sites-of-special-scientific-interest#condition-assessments>

#### **A.2. Child Project?**

**If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.**

N/A

#### **A.3. Stakeholders**

**Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.**

Wide range of consultations with stakeholders have been conducted during the PPG stage. Initial stakeholder analysis during the PIF stage was followed up with consultation during the PPG stage in terms of the design of the project. During the PPG stage, the stakeholder analysis was updated and elaborated following consultations undertaken by international and national consultants at the landscape sites and with the national and sub-national governments addressing both institutional stakeholders in the context of their statutory involvement in the project, and more broadly for non-governmental stakeholders including wetland resource-dependent communities. Field level stakeholder



consultations were conducted to obtain the perspective of the different stakeholders during the period July through December 2018. A number of bilateral meetings with future partners were also conducted. An Inception Workshop was conducted on July 24, 2018 and a Validation workshop on May 25, 2019, in Dhaka to discuss the project design and reach general consensus on project outcomes, outputs, activities and institutional arrangements for the project.

The purpose of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP) for the project is to ensure long-term sustainability of the project achievements, based on transparency and the effective participation of the key stakeholders. The objectives include the following: (a) to identify the main stakeholders of the project and their basic roles and responsibilities in relation to the project; and (b) to take advantage of the experience and skills of the main stakeholders, safeguard their active participation in different activities, reduce obstacles in project implementation, and sustain gains after project completion. The approach is based on the principles of fairness and transparency in selection of stakeholders, ensuring consultation, engagement and empowerment of relevant stakeholders. This is to ensure: (i) better coordination between them from planning to monitoring and assessment of project interventions; (ii) access of information and results to relevant persons; (iii) accountability of stakeholders; (iv) implementation of grievance and redress mechanism; and (v) sustainability of project interventions after its completion.

Stakeholder involvement will enhance the planning and management of ECAs in Bangladesh. Stakeholder engagement will secure the conservation of globally and nationally important biodiversity within the ECAs, and mainstream biodiversity and sustainable wetland resource use within an ecosystem-based management framework. MoEFCC will be responsible in ensuring that collaborative links will be established with other national and sub-national governments, private sector, NGOs and local communities. The Project may solicit the services of NGOs to implement project activities.

Annex 5 of the UNDP Project Document provides a detailed stakeholder engagement plan and defines the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders.

## Documents

Title

Submitted

**In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.**

**Select what role civil society will play in the project:**

**Consulted only; Yes**

**Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes**

**Co-financier;**

**Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body; Yes**

**Executor or co-executor;**

**Other (Please explain)**

#### **A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).**

This project recognizes that men and women in Bangladesh play different roles in managing wetland resources. While, women and men possess different knowledge(s) and transmit it in various ways due to their respective roles and responsibilities in the private and public spheres, women both historically and currently are primarily responsible for food preparation and distribution and for ensuring the short and long-term health of the family and community. However, it has frequently been considered a sector dominated by men, making it difficult for women's participation on access to wetland resources and benefits arising from these resources. Men have better access to and control of wetland products and agricultural machinery including access to and control of training and, extension services. However, men and women have equal access to and control over agriculture, labour, credits (loans), health and, education services.

In general, most people in the communities, especially women and elderly women, do not have a solid understanding of ways and means of managing wetland resources more sustainably, they do, however, have a sense that business patterns are changing, affecting their wetland resource collection/harvesting yields and resulting in more difficult living conditions for their families. Almost all of women in Bangladesh as well as in each community may not have a conceptual understanding of how to deal with fair or equity benefit sharing, particularly with respects to their livelihoods and development and an understanding of sustainable harvesting techniques and its use. This is further aggravated by the lack of proper capacity development programs. Consequently, this has resulted in inappropriate use of wetland resources and the gradual depletion of wetland biodiversity. For more detailed information on gender relationships in Bangladesh refer **Annex 6** of UNDP Project Document.

A socio-economic and gender assessment was undertaken during the PPG phase to review the role of women, men and disadvantaged groups in the two project sites, identify any potential impacts of the project on each gender group, and develop a Gender Action Plan for the project. The assessment aimed to ensure an inclusive approach through which women and men are able to participate actively and benefit equitably, have equitable access to the project resources and receive fair social and economic benefits. This study is reported in Annex 6, along with the Gender Action Plan. The gender analysis is focused on four domains of empowerment:

- Access to Information relating to present condition, future possible threats and participatory problem solving;
- Development of alternative livelihood skills for women, men and youth;
- Participation in conservation of natural resources and
- Leadership development.

The Gender Action Plan describes actions to mainstream gender across project components and outcomes via specific outputs and includes gender indicators. The key strategies to achieve this include but are not limited to:

- Mobilize support from gender specialists;
- Designate gender focal points to be responsible for gender related activities;
- Build capacity of the project management staff to promote gender equality;
- Ensure women's genuine and equal representation (e.g. in task forces, committees, training, sustainable livelihoods etc., allocating women-targeted budgets if necessary to achieve this);
- Ensure women's equal access to project information (e.g. by ensuring specific consultations with women's groups);

Project specific actions to empower women, including establishment and capacity support for women's groups in sustainable livelihoods, product development and marketing, community-based ecotourism development, and reduction of women's workloads and improvement of working conditions through facilitating appropriate technology (such as efficient cooking stoves, improved water supply, etc.).

## Documents

Title

Submitted

**Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?**

**If yes, please upload document or equivalent here**

**If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:**

**Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes**

**Improving women's participation and decision making Yes**

**Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes**

**Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?**

Yes

### A.5. Risks

**Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being, achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.**

As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Manager will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. when impact is rated as 5, and when impact is rated as 4 and probability is rated at 3 or higher). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

**Table 2: Project Risk and Mitigation Matrix**

Risk Description [1]	Significance of Risk [3]	Mitigation Measures
<b>General Risks</b>		
Government's limited finances and capacity to effectively fulfill its mandate to protect ECAs by enforce compliance with legal provisions, hence the long-term unsustainability of project interventions.	I=3, P=3 Moderate	Consolidating and expanding government's capacity to address its environmental pollution control responsibilities, particularly in the case of wetland ECAs that are the focus of this project, will be underpinned by a sustainable Financing Strategy. This will be targeted at the national five-year planning level and effective enforcement of the polluter-pays principle, using policies (existing and new) and mechanisms to incentivize pollution reduction and mitigation measures. The strategy will be informed by assessing costs of its delivery versus financial benefits of having rivers with relatively clean (unpolluted) water that can be used for local consumption, irrigation and public water supplies. In addition, the project will look at establishing public-private partnerships to support collaborative efforts to reduce their impact on this river and its catchment through demonstrating operating practices, processes and management schemes that result in positive outcomes for both business and the aquatic environment. Application of a 'polluter pays' principle is acknowledged but not widely expressed in Bangladesh environmental legislation but the 1995 Environment Conservation Act enables the Director General to determine compensation from persons causing environmental damage and for them to take corrective measures. The project also entails under Output 2.1 to (i) identify and evaluate potential PES opportunities, particularly in relation to public water supplies for Chittagong City and the fisheries and (ii) undertake an economic valuation of the benefits generated from functioning ecosystems and, in the case of dysfunctional ecosystems, the unrealized opportunity costs. Such demonstration and studies will help make the economic case for more private and public financing (beyond the MoEFCC) to support management of ECAs. Further Output 2.2 will help demonstrate sustainable economic activities (fisheries, agriculture and livelihoods) that can have a positive impact on ECAs as a means to facilitate replication and uptake.
Government may be unable to provide adequate human resources and technical capacity to support implementation of the project and beyond. <i>Category: Capacity</i>	I=3, P=3 Moderate	Government considers this project to be a priority for Bangladesh. It will be important, therefore, to ensure that the full-size project is designed appropriately to match the capacities of government during the initial years of implementation. Thus, the project will support creation of an ECA Standards, Management & Compliance Unit during its inception to benefit from training and implementation activities from project outset. Thereafter, implementation of the Financing Strategy should provide for institutionalization of this Unit, as well as the project's modular training program in wetland management, monitoring and enforcement, as part of the project's exit strategy.

Engagement with the private sector limited and insufficient to secure ownership from major polluting industries to reverse trends in declining water quality during life of project. <i>Category: Operational</i>	I=4, P=3 High	<p>This initiative of the project to demonstrate how pollution of wetlands can be reversed by tackling point sources of pollution, notably from industrial waste and untreated sewage, will be a huge challenge as it places responsibility on the polluter to pay for the costs of removing pollutants from water before discharging them into rivers and other water bodies.</p> <p>The project will take the following steps towards maximizing awareness, transparency, accountability and equitability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Establish a platform for engaging with the private sector, specifically the Halda River Impact Group under the auspices of the Chittagong Chamber of Commerce &amp; Industry. This Group will set up a Trust Fund and collaborate closely with the relevant ECA Committees at District and Upazila levels in the deployment of its funds.</li> <li>· Design or adopt a water quality monitoring framework and sampling program for Halda River, using indicators that meet international standards, in collaboration with the Ministry of Water Resources.</li> <li>· Introduce regulations under the 2016 ECA Management Rules to apply these water quality standards and begin to enforce compliance,</li> <li>· Work with the large industries polluting the Halda River, to prepare them ahead of the ‘polluter pays’ principle being enforced.</li> <li>· Conditions for, and identify targets for mid-term and end of term. This should be undertaken by MoEFCC or contracted out to an independent body.</li> <li>· Set up an independent multi-sector national ECA Scientific Advisory Panel to support the national ECA Committee, DoE’s SMCU and sectors that have most impact on wetlands and other water bodies.</li> </ul>
--	------------------	---

Risk Description [1] <i>Risk Category [2]</i>	Significance of Risk [3]	Mitigation Measures
Risks from Social and Environmental Screening Report (Annex 4 of UNDP Project Document)		

<p><b>Risk 1:</b> The two ECAs have some degree of resource conflicts that could be exacerbated and result in inequitable or discriminatory for poor or marginalized people if activities are planned without adequate consultation and consideration of the needs and aspirations of marginalized groups</p> <p><b>SES Principle 1: Human Rights, Q2 and Q8</b></p>	<p><b>I=3, P=2 Moderate</b></p>	<p>Risk 1 assumes that those most dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods are the poorest and most marginalized members of society, they could be inequitably impacted by measures to make the paradigm shift from over-exploitation to sustainable use of natural resources in ECAs.</p> <p>Risks will be managed by (i) ensuring that project activities are detailed in collaboration with Upazila and Union governments and local communities, to define management and sustainable use of resources in a manner to avoid discrimination and inequalities and hence reduce conflict; (ii) consultation and planning process will follow FPIC procedures to ensure that all concerns of all people are heard and adequately addressed; (iii) screening checklist based on the SESP that will be developed early in project implementation (to screen all investments to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles and is sustainable; and (iv) project grievance redressal system provides a mechanism to address any specific community concerns and resolve conflicts.</p>
<p><b>Risk 2:</b> Creation of ECA in Halda River and application of ECA rules and ECA management practices might potentially restrict access to resources or basic services, in particular for marginalized individuals or groups.</p> <p><b>SES Principle 1: Human Rights, Q1, Q3 and Q4 and Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement Q2 and Q4</b></p>	<p><b>I =3, P=3 Moderate</b></p>	<p>Risk 2 will be managed through (i) ensuring that project activities are detailed in collaboration with Upazila and Union governments and local communities; (ii) management of sustainable use of resources (for fisheries, egg collection and farming) planned and managed under community governance mechanisms that will take into consideration current uses of these resources; (iii) use of a screening checklist for project investments based on SESP to screen all investments (including harvest limits) to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles and ensure avoidance of restriction in access to the extent feasible; (iv) planning will ensure that decisions regarding restrictions, if any, on resource use will not be imposed, but will involve through an informed, transparent and consultative community consensus building process, and any restrictions, if any will be adequately compensated to match or exceed loss of incomes or livelihoods. An alternative livelihood development plan will be prepared early in project implementation (Year 1) for any households that are likely to be denied access to resources or current livelihood practice; (v) use of adequate consultation procedures to ensure consent regarding project investments and grievance redressal system as a mechanism to address any specific community concerns and resolve conflicts.</p>

<p><b>Risk 3:</b> There is a risk that duty-bearers may not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?</p> <p><b>SES Principle 1: Human Rights, Q5</b></p>	<p><b>I =3, P=3 Moderate</b></p>	<p>Risk 3 managed by: (i) assessed and undertaking capacity needs assessment on additional capacity needs of DOE, upazila, union and community requirements for effective planning and management of ECAs, based on which capacity building programs will be instituted; (ii) technical support to agencies to enhance the planning, management and monitoring of project investments; (iii) management plans for two ECAs will define specific favorable conditions to meet this requirements, including the technical, institutional and capacity needs; (iv) UNDP regular monitoring will assess any specific additional capacity needs and define measures to achieve same and (v) sustainability/financial plan will also provide a vehicle for determining the capacity and technical needs and potential financial mechanisms to achieve same</p>
<p><b>Risk 4:</b> If Risks 1 and/or 2 apply, then women's ability to use natural resources within ECAs could be adversely affected.</p> <p><b>SES Principle 2: Gender, Q4</b> Moreover, the potential for discrimination against women could be reproduced.</p> <p><b>SES Principle 2: Gender, Q1 and Q2</b></p>	<p><b>I =3, P=2 Moderate</b></p>	<p>Risk 4 managed by: (i) ensuring active participation of women in the planning phase of the project; (ii) applying "<i>Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Action Plan</i>" (Annex 6) on how perspectives, rights, and interests of men and women are addressed to ensure that the project contributes to gender equality and create equitable opportunities for women and men at all levels of engagement; (ii) use of a gender and socially inclusive lens will be applied to every project activity and output to further analyze impacts on the rights of women and vulnerable peoples, (iii) special investments would be planned based on women's requirements to ensure that they adequately benefit from project investments; (iv) capacity building programs to enhance the capacity of women and vulnerable members to take an active part in the planning and decision making process at the ECA or sub-ECA levels; (v) program and project level implementation arrangements, including gender consultant to providing training to project staff and key Upazila and Union staff on approaches that ensure active participation in decision making on all aspects of the project; and (vi) monitoring plan and gender action plan has gender responsive indicators to access gender dimensions, including that the project scores a Gender Scorecard 2 Marker.</p>
<p><b>Risk 5:</b> Inappropriate measures to restore wetlands, such as using exotic tree or mangrove species, could result in changes to habitats and ecosystem functioning.</p> <p><b>SES Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation, Q1 and Q5</b></p>	<p><b>I =3, P=2 Moderate</b></p>	<p>Risk 5 managed through (i) Preparation of rehabilitation and restoration plans for the identified sites and restoration measures will ensure development of protocols that meet local and international criteria for ecological restoration and biodiversity conservation and which avoid the use of IAS. The restoration and rehabilitation plans will encourage the use of native species and restoration efforts; and (ii) use of screening checklist during early project implementation based on eligibility criteria for project investments developed to screen all investments to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles and is sustainable.</p>

<p><b>Risk 6:</b> Development activities (such as harvesting of terrestrial and aquatic resources) can have adverse impacts on species and habitats if not well implemented</p> <p><b>SES Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation, Q2, Q3, Q4, Q6, Q7, Q9</b></p>	<p><b>I =3, P=1 Moderate</b></p>	<p>Risk 6 managed through: (i) selection of target locations within the ECAs for project interventions to conform to the project's objective of 'enhancing the conservation of biodiversity through mainstreaming of biodiversity into planning policies and practices into ECAs; (ii) all community fisheries, agriculture and livelihood activities will take place outside the key biodiversity areas (spawning and nursery areas), within ECAs through appropriate zoning arrangements; (iii) use of screening checklist developed using SESP w to screen all investments to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles and is sustainable. Such a checklist would also include the identification of investment location in relation to ECAs; and (iv) setting acceptable sustainable limits on harvest of fisheries products based on status and health of such populations and establishment of monitoring protocols. These considerations have positioned the project into a framework of synergy</p>
<p><b>Risk 7:</b> Climate change may adversely influence the potential outcomes of project interventions.</p> <p><b>SES Standard 2: Climate Change, Q2</b></p>	<p><b>I=4, P=4 Moderate</b></p>	<p>Risk 7 managed through: (i) Implementation of participatory planning processes for ECAs based on ECA rules ensuring that activities are environmentally sustainable and supporting best practices managed for their climate risks: (ii) improved ECA management and conservation practices would improve protection and management of critical ecosystems services as well as wildlife habitat, which should help to increase the overall resilience of the natural systems to climate risks in the areas compared to business as usual; (iii) in terms of the Monitoring Plan, the condition of the natural ecosystems would be monitored to ensure that activities do not damage these sensitive ecosystems so that it is in a better overall situation to manage climate changes (iv) knowledge and Communications activities is a key framework to improve awareness of climate and ensuring measures to improve climate resilience and (v) identify and encourage regulatory and voluntary measures to protect the wetlands.</p>



<p><b>Risk 8:</b> Management and control of urban waste, agro-chemical pollutants and untreated industrial waste may involve occupational health and safety risks,</p> <p><b>SES Standard 3, Q1 and SES Standard 7, Q2</b></p>	<p><b>I=3, P=2 Moderate</b></p>	<p>Risk 8 will be managed through following measures on the basis of the findings and recommendations of the ESIA that will be undertaken under Output 2.1 and the pollution study under Output 2.2:(i) The dredging of the ox-bow lake will be undertaken following consultation with local communities, including determination of safe disposal sites for the dredged materials; (ii) Contractual proposals for dredging of ox bow lake would require specific details on the transport and sites and methods for disposal of dredged materials. Evaluation of proposals would include specific consideration for transport and disposal of dredged materials and payment clauses included in the contract to ensure that such measures are followed. (iii) The PMU (with support from the local environmental entities) will monitor the transport and disposal of materials(iv) In terms of removal and disposal of water hyacinth from the lake, this will follow the same procedures as above (i) through (iii) and (v) Every effort will be made to try to find alternative uses for the water hyacinth plant materials, including conversion to mulch and use as natural fertilizers</p>
--	-------------------------------------	---

The Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) was finalized during project preparation, as required by UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES). The eight risks identified at PPG stage, all were rated as moderate, were reviewed and in the light of consultations with communities in the two selected project sites. The risk associated with Indigenous people during the PIF stage was not relevant to the project as the ECA site where IPs were present, namely Cox’s Bazar –Teknaf Peninsular was excluded from the project in order to restrict the number of target sites to 2 rather than 3. **Thus, overall SESP risk categorization for the project is Moderate.**

#### A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

##### **Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.**

Specific details on project implementation arrangement including governance structure, organogram, roles and responsibilities of different entities is described under Section VIII “Governance and Management Arrangements” (p. 88) of UNDP Project Document. Terms of Reference for Key project staff is included in Annex 3.

The **Implementing Partner** for this project is the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC). The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

The **Project Board** (PB) The Project will provide overall direction and oversight in the delivery of project outcomes. The PB will be chaired by Secretary, MoEFCC and include the Secretary, DoE, DoF, FD, Tourism Department, Chair of the National ECA Committee, Chair of the ECA Technical Advisory Panel, representatives of the two ECA District Committees and Chittagong Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

The PB shall perform the following tasks: (i) formulate and submit overall plan and annual plans for the project implementation; (ii) prepare and carry out the actual project implementation; (iii) carry out activities related to bidding, contract management; (iv) budget management, perform financial and asset management of the project; (v) monitor and

assess the implementation of the project activities; (vi) prepare the acceptance and transfer of the results of the project after completion, finish audit works, transfer assets of the project, prepare the terminal report and financial statement of the project, follow regulations on project closeout as per UNDP-GEF procedures.

**National Project Director:** NPD is the designated representative of MoEFCC. He/she will head the PMU and will be accountable to MoEFCC for the use of project resources and to deliver on outcomes. The NPD will manage the implementation of all project activities and will work closely with all partner institutions to link the project with complementary national programs and initiatives. The NPD is accountable to the PB for the quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of the project intervention implementation, as well as for the use of resources. The NPD will be technically supported by contracted national and international consultants and service providers. Recruitment of specialist services for the project will be done by the NPD, in consultation with UNDP and MoEFCC. The NPD will not be paid by the project, but will represent a government in kind contribution to the project.

**National Project Manager (NPM):** will be assigned with responsibility to support NPD in technical aspects of the project, provide direct guidance to project management unit to achieve project results/targets. The NPM responsibilities are identified in Section VIII and Annex 3 of the UNDP Project Document.

**Project Management Unit (NPMU)** consisting of a National Project Director, National Project Manager, **Technical Coordinator**, Community Development Associates and Administrative/Financial Staff. This team will assist the PB to run the project on a day-to-day basis. The functioning of PMU will end when the final project Terminal Evaluation report and corresponding management response, and other documentation required by the GEF and UNDP, has been completed and submitted to UNDP (including operational closure of the project).

**Project Assurance** will be undertaken by the UNDP Program Officer responsible for the project based in the UNDP CO. The UNDP Program Officer will also act as a focal point of UNDP CO in facilitating and monitoring the project implementation. He/she will maintain a continuous partnership with the project team and participate in all project reviews, work/budget planning meetings, monitoring visits and evaluations. She/he will certify the annual and quarterly work-plan/budgets/progress reports, as well as proposed use of unspecified budget within the annual budget already approved for the project.

**Coordination with other projects:** The proposed project will coordinate with several government programs and specific projects associated with it to generate positive results through combined effort (where appropriate) and to share lessons learned and best practices. These are:

- *GIZ Managing the Sundarbans mangrove forests to conserve biodiversity and adapt to climate change* (2015-2019): executed by the Forest Department and focuses on protected areas management in collaboration with civil society and communities. Potential synergies include a knowledge management and interactive platform for information sharing and application of a harmonised approach to monitoring and evaluation[1]..
- The Government of Bangladesh is currently investing Lakh Taka 78,556.7123 (c. US\$ 96.6 million) in its Protection of *Sundarbans Mangrove Forest (PSMF) Surakhsha Project*, executed by the Forest Department. It is aimed at enhancing management effectiveness through community-based approaches to conserve the mangrove forest and sustain local livelihoods.
- *Sustainable Forests & Livelihood (SUFAL) Project* (2019-2024): Main objective of the World Bank funded project is to restore degraded forest ecosystems and conserve biodiversity through sustainable forest management practices. The Project aims to improve forest management and increase benefits for forest dependent communities in targeted sites by financing nearly 272,500 hectares of forest land that includes 79,000 hectares of forests on public and private lands, including about 22,000 hectares of coastal green belt across

147 Upazilas (sub-districts). This project is funded by World Bank (US\$ 175 million) and developed by Bangladesh Forest Department. The project will directly benefit about 40,000 forest dependent households – with special emphasis on women and adolescent girls – by increasing their participation in forest management and access to diversified income generation options. In addition, about 180,000 people will benefit through involvement in collaborative forest management activities. The Bangladesh Forest Department will also receive support through training and skills development opportunities.

· *USAID /Bangladesh funded Protibesh project (2019-2024) (\$10m - \$24.99m)* aims to build the GOB's capacity to respond to a wide array of threats to biodiversity conservation in collaboration with civil society organizations and community stakeholders. It will also collaborate with and engage local partners in the effective management, protection and governance of critical forest and aquatic ecosystems while advancing economic incentives to further biodiversity conservation. This activity will target local communities in regions with key biodiversity areas, which could include the Sundarbans Reserve Forest in south-western Bangladesh, the ecologically critical forest and wetland zones of north-eastern Bangladesh, and or other regions of the country with critical biodiversity. It will be implemented at the national level in collaboration with GOB ministries in Dhaka and at the local and regional level in partnership with units of local government, co-management organizations, regional organizations and other related entities. The activity could also involve upstream communities, cities and regional entities as necessary to address specific threats (pollution, wildlife poaching, human settlement encroachment, etc.) to key biodiversity areas in a coordinated and holistic fashion.

The GEF-funded Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into sustainable development pathways in Bangladesh (2017-2021) seeks to promote the application of adaptation options to vulnerable agro-ecological regions, population groups and sectors. In addition the project entails improving climate information systems to guide climate resilient policy and decision-making and build institutional and planning capacities to integrate climate change adaptation in budgetary, planning and social protection programs at national and sub-national levels.

---

[1] <https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/37949.html>

**Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:**

#### **A.7. Benefits**

**Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptaion benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?**

The socio-economic benefits of the project will be seen at the individual as well as collective community level which means that changes at the household level and also in economic groups such as VCGs, producer groups and cooperatives will be there in the following manner:

- At least 1,000 persons in the pilot ECAs will directly benefit through improved livelihoods and incomes, of which an estimated 30% will comprise of women;
  - Implementation of integrated ecosystem-based management approaches for ECAs will result in improved and sustainable fisheries, agriculture and other wetland resource use activities, agriculture and improved water quality that will collectively result in better conservation and livelihoods outcomes;
  - Improved access to basic goods and technical services, technology and improved agricultural, fisheries, livelihood and tourism practices - diversification and enhancement of livelihoods in wetland and non-wetland (e.g. agriculture) activities will ensure more livelihood options and better prices and income.
  - An increase in community incomes from sustainable wetland and livelihood activities of around 15% wherein around 30% of beneficiaries will be women;
  - The focus on addressing gender inequality wherein various initiatives such as technological interventions for drudgery reduction in livelihood and household based activities, promotion of alternative livelihood options, participation of women in various local conservation committees are proposed. The project envisages more gender equality in context of sex ratio, decision making powers, ownership and control of wetland resources, reduction in drudgery as well as working hours of women and women leadership as well as participation; and
- Stable or improved populations of key endangered species in the ECAs.

#### **A.8. Knowledge Management**

**Elaborate on the Knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user- friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.**

Knowledge management is included under Component 3. A knowledge management and communication plan will be developed at the beginning of the project to achieve the overall goal of creating linkages between the stakeholders from the national, sub-national and local levels for information, exchange of ideas and implementation of community-based conservation (including community fisheries and agriculture), sustainable wetland resource management, livelihood and ecotourism activities. The knowledge management and communication plan is intended to ensure that: (i) the project is well understood, accepted, and implemented effectively and equitably; (ii) knowledge and lessons learned from the implementation process of this project are captured, documented and used to improve current and future project practices; (iii) understanding of integrated ecosystem planning and management is increased; (iv) knowledge management products are disseminated and used; and (v) local communities have increased awareness of wetland biodiversity conservation and threats to wetland biological resources and ecosystems. In addition, it will help identify promising and good practice ecosystem-based and adaptive mechanisms relevant to ECAs and help document and disseminate results of best practices to enable up-scaling to other ECAs in the country and across the region.

#### **B. Description of the consistency of the project with:**

##### **B.1. Consistency with National Priorities**

**Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.**

The project is well-aligned to international targets for biodiversity conservation (and sustainable development). It will contribute to the *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* and achievement of its goals, notably:

**Goal 14** Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development; and

**Goal 15** Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss;

while also helping to end poverty (**Goal 1**), achieve gender equality (**Goal 5**), ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation (**Goal 6**) and combat climate change (**Goal 13**).

The proposed project is aligned directly with the provisions of The Bangladesh Environment Conservation Act, 1995 and its 2010 Amendment Act that concern the declaration and planning of ECAs under the remit of the Department of Environment, along with the Department's mandate to control pollution. More specifically, it supports the application of the Ecologically Critical Area Management Rules, recently introduced in 2016, which provide a governance structure for managing ECAs and address the need for alternatives for people dependent on ECAs for their livelihood. Governance roles for a National Committee, District and Upazila committees, Union Coordination Committee and Village Conservation Group are defined. Other provisions include management by public-private partnerships and constitution of Ecological Management Funds for individual ECAs. These new rules have been informed by over a decade of experience in establishing and managing ECAs and now is a timely opportunity to apply them in an holistic, integrated manner, while also piloting a public-private partnership or similar approach to extend that experience to the private sector over pollution issues from industry and from agriculture.

**National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan (2016-2021):** The project will contribute significantly to achieving at least half of the 20 national targets identified in the Action Plan, as listed below.

- (1) Relevant stakeholders will be aware of the value of biodiversity and play an active role in ensuring sustainable use.
- (6) Stock assessment of fish, invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants will be undertaken keeping in mind the safe ecological limit and awareness raising of the stakeholders will be enhanced so that aquatic biodiversity will be managed and harvested sustainably, legally taking into account of ecosystem based approach towards avoidance of overfishing and conservation of threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems.
- (8) Study on impact of pollution and excess nutrient on functioning of major ecosystems will be conducted and enforcement drive for controlling pollution will be strengthened.
- (11) Bangladesh's ... 3% area under inland wetlands and coastal ecosystems ... will come under PAs or ECAs with development and implementation of management plan for these areas.
- (12) The extinction of known threatened species will be prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.
- (14) Develop and implement restoration plan for degraded wetlands and rivers taking into account the needs of vulnerable people and local communities.

- (15) Initiate implementation of restoration plan for degraded ecosystems, especially forest lands and wetlands for addressing climate change mitigation, adaptation and combating desertification.
- (18) Traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of local communities or ethnic groups will be recognized and documented.
- (19) Agencies responsible for Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management will be adopting modern information technology like GIS and RS and information on biodiversity will be shared through Clearing House Mechanism (CHM).
- (20) Financial resources will be mobilized towards accelerated implementation of targets and activities of updated NBSAP.

The core theme of the *7th Five Year Plan for Bangladesh* is “Accelerating Growth, Empowering Citizens”. This is enshrined within the context of climate resilient, sustainable growth, with special focus on governance issues to enhance productivity and developing a knowledge-based economy. The plan will be implemented by mobilizing private investment through Public-Private Partnerships and Foreign Direct Investment. The agenda for higher growth is coupled with measures to protect the environment as the Plan accommodates the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals and Agenda 2030. Much of this theme resonates well with the conceptual design of this proposed project and its more innovative elements, including its focus on: consolidating and institutionalising the governance of the ECA; engaging with the private sector for the first time to address industrial and agricultural pollution of wetlands; and underpinning the system with a web-based learning system and GIS that will include a reporting facility to document ECA condition (health) and compliance in managing the system.

A sustainable development pathway that is resilient to disaster and climate change; entails sustainable use of natural resources; and successfully manages the inevitable urbanization transition is a central theme of the Plan., alongside an overall strategy of inclusiveness that empowers every citizen to participate beneficially in the development process. Within the environment sector, these themes translate into a number of goals and targets to which this proposed project will contribute, notably:

- Increase productive forest coverage to 20 percent.
- Promote zero discharge of industrial effluents.
- Urban wetlands are restored and protected in line with the Wetland<sup>[1]</sup> Conservation Act.
- At least 15% of the wetland in peak dry season is protected as aquatic sanctuary.
- Land zoning for sustainable land/water use completed.
- Environmental, climate change and disaster risk reduction considerations are integrated into project design, budgetary allocations and implementation process.

More specifically, the *7th Five Year Plan* calls for the following:

- a new approach to industrial pollution/waste management involving communities, local institutions, news media, law enforcement agencies and other relevant stakeholders to engage with the polluters;

- management of agrochemicals to avoid/reduce pollution of water bodies; and
- a program of actions for ECAs, including the creation of a knowledge center for ECAs and wetland management.
- a poverty environment nexus that ensures environmental sustainability, community resilience and conservation of natural resources by mainstreaming environment, climate change and disaster risk management into development planning at local and central levels is also highlighted in the Plan, along with the need to improve overall environmental governance at every level of operation.

Furthermore, specific activities identified in *7th Five Year Plan* under Issue 4: Ecologically Critical Areas (ECAs) & Wetlands Management Programme (p. 434) are very much in line with this proposed project:

Finalize demarcation of the declared ECAs.

- Sustain & replicate ECA & wetland management project(s) in other areas with the ultimate objective of restoration and damage prevention.
- Develop ECA specific protection/restoration management plan in consultation with local community and implement the plan in a time bound manner.
- Sustain and replicate ECA co-management projects.
- Sustain and replicate community-based adaptation of ECAs through biodiversity conservation and social protections.
- Create a knowledge Centre for ECA & Wetland management.
- Identify wetland ecosystems significant for biodiversity to be declared and managed as ECAs.

These activities will be reviewed during the PPG to maximise the alignment of the Project Document with them.

[1] This is an error in the Plan and should read “Environment” Conservation Act.

### C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

**Table 3:** Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to Project Budget[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
<b>Inception Workshop</b>	UNDP Country Office	USD 7,000	USD 2,000	Within two months of project document signature
<b>Inception Report</b>	Project Manager	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to Project Budget[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
<b>Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP</b>	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
<b>Risk management</b>	Project Manager with support of Technical Coordinator Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
<b>Monitoring of indicators in project results framework</b>	Project Manager with support of Technical Coordinator	USD 10,000 [USD 2,000 /year]	USD 5,000 [USD 1,000/year]	Annually before PIR
<b>GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)</b>	Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
<b>Lessons learned and knowledge generation</b>	Project Manager and consultant support	USD 15,000	USD 5,000	Annually
<b>Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant</b>	Project Manager UNDP Country Office	USD 10,000	USD 5,000	Possible ESIA & ESMP inputs; on-going
<b>Stakeholder Engagement Plan</b>	Project Manager UNDP Country Office	None	USD 5,000 [USD 1,000/year]	Annual Stakeholder Forums; on-going
<b>Gender Action Plan</b>	Project Manager UNDP Country Office UNDP GEF team and consultants	None	USD 4,000	On-going
<b>Addressing environmental and social grievances</b>	Project Manager UNDP Country Office	None	None	On-going
<b>Project Board meetings</b>	Project Board UNDP Country Office Project Manager	None	USD 4,000 [USD 1,000/year]	At least twice/year
<b>Technical Advisory Panel meetings</b>	Project Manager	USD 5,000 USD 500/meeting	USD 5,000 [USD 1,000/year]	At least thrice/year
<b>Supervision missions</b>	UNDP Country Office	None[2]	None	Annually
<b>Oversight missions</b>	UNDP-GEF team	None13	None	Troubleshooting as needed
<b>GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits</b>	UNDP Country Office and Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	To be determined.



GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to Project Budget <sup>[1]</sup> (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Mid-term GEF core indicator to be updated	Project Manager	None	None	Before mid-term review mission takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 26,000 (IC+NC) [based on 20 days to include demo sites]	USD 9,000	Between 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR.
Terminal GEF core indicator to be updated	Project Manager	None	None	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 36,500 (IC+NC) [based on 30 days to include demo sites]	USD 5,000	At least three months before operational closure
Translation of MTR and TE reports into English	UNDP Country Office	None	None	As required. GEF only accepts reports in English.
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> [Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses]		<b>USD 109,500</b>	<b>USD 49,000</b>	

<sup>[1]</sup> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

<sup>[2]</sup> The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

**PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)**

**A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

<b>GEF Agency Coordinator</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator	5/28/2019	Tashi Dorji, UNDP Regional Technical Specialist		tashi.dorji@undp.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).**

<p><b>This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):</b></p> <p><b>Goal 15:</b> Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Target 15.1: By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreement</li> <li>- Target 15.5: Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species</li> <li>- Target 15.9: By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts</li> </ul> <p><b>SDG Goal 1: End Poverty in all its form everywhere:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Target 1.1: By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance</li> </ul>
<p><b>This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Program Document (2017-2020)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outcome 3: Enhance effective management of the natural and man-made environment focusing on improved sustainability and increased resilience of vulnerable individuals and groups</li> </ul>
<p><b>This project will be linked to the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IRRF Output 1.4.1: Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains</li> <li>- IRRF Output 2.4.1: Gender-responsive legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions strengthened, and solutions adopted, to address conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing of natural resources, in line with international conventions and national legislation.</li> </ul>

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions
--	----------------------------------	----------	-----------------	-----------------------	---

<p><b>Project Objective:</b> To apply an ecosystem-based framework for managing Ecologically Critical Areas in Bangladesh to enhance the conservation of globally significant biodiversity and support local livelihood.</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> Area of <u>new</u> wetland declared as Environmentally Critical Area under Bangladesh Environment Conservation Act of 1995 (revised 2010)</p> <p>-</p>	<p>10,825 ha of Halda River proposed as ECA</p>	<p>10,825 ha of Hald River declared as ECA listing prohibited activities under Bangladesh Environmental Conservation Act of 1995</p>	<p>The 10,825 ha of Halda River ECA with established ECA management committees at district, upazila and union levels; village conservation groups established as cooperative societies; rules in place in terms of permissible and prohibited activities; management plan approved</p>	<p><b>Data Sources and methods:</b> Government gazette notification of ECA declaration - Notification of establishment of ECA management committees and VCGs -Approved management plan for ECA</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> -Development strategies and management plans will be officially approved by governments with allocation of appropriate funding for their implementation; -The district, upazila and local authorities will take active part in developing the strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project; -Local communities are convinced that critical habitats in their vicinities will benefit livelihoods and ecological security to them and they will participate in conservation and restoration work; -Local community-based institutions would establish an effective institutional mechanism to facilitate conservation outcomes.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> -Administrative/political changes may undermine the implementation of the management plan strategies; -Limited capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project; -Competing interests between national, district, local and sectoral interests and local communities regarding management and access to natural resources may undermine effective management of ECAs.</p>
--	---	---	--	--	--

	<p><b>Indicator 2: (ref: GEF-7 Core Indicator 11):</b> Number of direct fisher and agricultural beneficiaries with increased incomes (15% increase) disaggregated by gender</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Based on improved and sustainable fisheries practices, value addition and alternative/supplementary income sources for fishers and improved environmentally-friendly agricultural practices, improved marketing and storage for agricultural farmers</p>	<p>250 fishers in Morjat Baor ECA receiving annual income of approximately USD357 from fisheries activities and 50 agricultural farmers</p> <p>500 (non-professional) fishers from proposed Halda River ECA receiving annual income of approximately USD324 and 100 agricultural farmers</p> <p><u>Note:</u> The annual income figure for Morjat Baor based on publication by Bappa, S.B., Hossain, M., Dey, B.K. and Aktar, S. (2014) in publication Socio-economic status of fishermen in Morjat Baor in Kaligonj. These figures will be validated in Year 1. Baselines for agricultural farmers will be established in Year 1. Annual incomes for Halda River based Extrapolated from aggregation of income data from 50 fishermen in Halda river from publication of Kabir, H., Kibria, M., Jashimuddin, M., and Hossain, M.M. (2013). Economic Valuation of Tangible Resources from Halda. International Journal of Water Research. Results to be validated in Year 1, along with</p>	<p>- 250 fishers and 50 agricultural farmers from Morjat Baor; and</p> <p>- 500 fishers and 100 agricultural farmers from Halda River ECAs</p> <p>- 10% increase in annual income from baseline values, with at least 30% women beneficiaries</p>	<p>- 250 fishers and 50 agricultural farmers from Morjat Baor; and</p> <p>- 500 fishers and 100 agricultural farmers from Halda River ECAs and around 250 other dependents on ECA resources receiving at least 15% increase in annual income from baseline values, with at least 30% women beneficiaries.</p>	<p><b>Data sources and methods:</b> Annual income surveys and reports Progress reports Community consultation reports</p> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Natural disaster/climate change may affect the restoration work.</li> <li>-Limited capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project.</li> <li>-Political transitions effects implementation of plans.</li> <li>-Livelihood benefits from sustainable management may be limited and slow for communities to give up current unsustainable practices.</li> <li>- Lack of involvement from private sector and/or resource users (including vulnerable people) with continued unsustainable practices.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Local communities, national and sub-national governments understand livelihood benefits and ecological security from cooperation with and sustainable management of land, water and other natural resources. Thus, they will participate in sustainable management and ecosystem restoration</li> <li>Sub-national governments, CBOs, private sector and communities collaborate closely for preparation of Integrated ecosystem plans and approaches</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---	---	---

	<p><b>Indicator 3: (Ref: UNDP's IRRF indicator 2.5.1)</b></p> <p>Gender-responsive measures in place for conservation, sustainable use, and equitable access to and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems as indicated by:</p> <p>(a) Policy/planning frameworks</p> <p>(b) Legal and regulatory frameworks and</p> <p>(c) Institutional frameworks</p>	<p><i>Gender based policies and practices not adequately addressed due to lack of awareness, capacity and commitment</i></p>	<p><i>Policy and institutional arrangements in place to enhance integration of gender actions in ECA planning and management</i></p>	<p>(a) At least 3 policy/ planning frameworks namely: (i) Guidelines for ecosystem-based framework for ECAs; (ii) Guidelines for ECA committees at district, upazila and union levels; and (iii) Guidelines for ECA management/ operational planning</p> <p>(b) at least 2 regulatory framework on – (i) Rules for ecology management fund; (ii) Rules for applying Polluter Pay Principle.</p> <p>(c) institutions with trained staff and procedures – (i) at least 2 district ECA Committee; (ii) at least 4 Upazilla ECA Committee; (iii) at least 12 Union ECA Committee.</p>	<p><b>Data sources and methods:</b></p> <p>Progress reports</p> <p>Policy documents</p> <p>Notification of regulations</p> <p>Staffing reports</p> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <p>-Gender concerns might get neglected in the pursuit of economic gains</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <p>There is adequate awareness and commitment within national and sub-national entities to improve gender participation; Staff are adequately trained and sensitized to gender issues and concerns</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--

<b>Outcome 1:</b> Ecosystem-based framework/system applied to the planning and management of ECAs, institutionalized, and operational	<b>Indicator 4:</b> Level of institutional capacities for integrated ecosystem-based planning, management and monitoring of ECA as measured by UNDP's capacity development scorecard	<i>Limited institutional capacities for planning, management and monitoring of ecosystem-based approaches to ECAs as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard baseline values of 29</i>	<i>Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 5-point increase in UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard baseline values</i>	<i>Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by 20 points in UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard from baseline values</i>	<b>Data sources and methods;</b> UNDP capacity scorecard Progress reports  <b>Risks:</b> Priorities of national, district and local government might shift if development benefits take long to manifest  <b>Assumptions:</b> The national government will develop appropriate legislative, policy, institutional and
--	--	--	--	--	---

	<p><b>Indicator 5:</b> Percentage of ECAs with defined ecosystem-based framework and standards to achieve favorable ecological conditions</p> <p><u>Note:</u> An <u>ecosystem-based management framework</u> for ECAs represents a multi-sector and multi-stakeholder integrated management approach that recognizes the full array of interactions within an ecosystem, including humans, rather than consider single issues, species, or ecosystem services in isolation. This approach intends to work across sectors and interests to manage species and habitats, economic activities, conflicting uses, and the sustainability of resources within ECAs and allows for consideration of resource tradeoffs that help protect and sustain diverse and productive ecosystems and the services they provide.</p> <p>- <u>Favorable ecological conditions</u> is reached when each of a number of critical biotic and abiotic indicators selected by a technical advisory panel reach levels which are judged to allow full ecosystem functioning of the ECA</p>	<p><i>Currently there does not exist clear biodiversity features and values for establishing favorable ecological conditions in ECAs</i></p>	<p><i>Ecosystem-based framework/system established for the two pilot ECAs, including standards for establishing favorable ecological condition in them.</i></p>	<p><i>Ecosystem based framework/system established for at least 50% of ECAs for identifying standards for achieving favorable ecological conditions</i></p>	<p><i>technical measures that facilitate integrated ecosystem-based planning and management in a timely manner.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>-Development of ecosystem-based management strategies and plans will be officially agreed with district governments with allocation of appropriate staff and funding for their implementation</i></li> <li><i>-The districts and local governments will take active part in developing the strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project</i></li> <li><i>-Local communities are convinced mainstreaming biodiversity into key development sectors in ECAs is in their long-term interests</i></li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	---	---



	<p><b>Indicator 6:</b> Implementation of 2016 ECA rules and its compliance as measured/indicated by:</p> <p>(a) Sustainable financing strategy and action plan</p> <p>(b) Ecology management fund</p>	<p><i>Currently, 2016 ECA Management Rules have yet to be applied and there is no scientific framework against which compliance monitoring can be applied.</i></p>	<p><i>ECA management rules developed and applied, along with development of sustainable financing Strategy for ECAs prepared and operational and institutional Action Plan developed, including design and creation on an Ecology Management Fund with respect to Halda River and Morjat Baor</i></p>	<p><i>DoE strengthened and adequately resourced with respect to ECAs, as evident from:</i></p> <p><i>§ ECA MMCU and fully operational across ECA network, monitoring compliance;</i></p> <p><i>§ ECA Technical Advisory Panel functional with clear rules and procedures</i></p> <p><i>§ 'Polluter pays' policy successfully applied in Environmental Courts with respect to project sites.</i></p> <p><i>§ Private-public partnerships for resource conservation functional in two pilot ECAs</i></p> <p><i>§ Ecology Management Fund functional with clear rules for soliciting financial resources and procedures for fund utilization and monitoring</i></p>	<p><b>Data sources and methods:</b> <i>New regulations and other legal instruments issued by national and sub-national governments. Compliance data held on ECA Information System.</i></p> <p><b>Risks:</b> <i>Delays in prompt promulgation and application of legislation handicaps effectiveness of ECA MMCU, all of which has knock-on implications with respect to other deliverables.</i></p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> <i>Political and administrative support forthcoming from the highest levels (e.g. Prime Minister's Office, MOEFCC) regarding compliance monitoring, polluter pays principle and Ecology Management Fund.</i></p>
--	---	--	---	--	--

<b>Outcome 2:</b> Improved ecological condition of target sites (Halda River and Morjat Baor) through effective community engagement and benefit sharing arrangements	<b>Indicator 7:</b> Number of ECA management plans adequately sourced in terms of staff and resources and approved by government	<i>ECAs do not have ecosystem based management and financing plans</i>	<i>Co-Management and financing plans under development in at least 50% of ECAs</i>	<i>At least 50% of ECA have approved and revised ECA co-management and financing plans with clear staffing and financial sources identified</i>	<b>Data sources and methods</b> ECA management and financing plans approval notices <b>Risks:</b> -Development of ecosystem-based management strategies and plans will be officially agreed with district governments with allocation of appropriate staff and funding for their implementation <b>Assumptions:</b> -Adequate staff and resources available for ECA planning -Government is committed to improving management of ECAs
--	--	--	--	---	---

	<p><b>Indicator 8:</b> Improvement in water quality in ECAs in terms of pH, DO, COD, BOD, N and P and other relevant parameters as determined by ECA frameworks</p>	<p><i>Baselines for Halda River are: DO (0.93-5.15 mg/L); BODs (30-545 mg/L); COD (43-983 mg/L); pH (6.3-7.3); EC (110-524 uS/cm); Chloride (12-56 mg/L); Alkalinity (35-67 mg/L); and Hardness (38-121 mg/L).</i></p> <p><i><u>Note:</u> The baseline data above is based on work of Bhuyan, S and Abu Bakar, M (2017). Assessment of water quality in Halda River. Current baselines as described above are variable and inconsistent and would be established in Year 1 for locations where interventions are proposed for both ECAs as the basis for monitoring water quality changes</i></p>	<p><i>7-10% improvement in water quality indices from baselines at selected monitoring stations</i></p>	<p><i>10-15% improvement in water quality indices from baselines at selected monitoring stations</i></p>	<p><b>Data Sources and methods:</b> Annual sampling reports for DO, BODs, COD, PH, EC, Chloride, Alkalinity and Hardness etc.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p><i>-Direct sources of pollution from industry or other commercial enterprises might negate any positive impacts from local communities</i></p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <p><i>-Adequate capacity and interests exists to undertake regular monitoring</i></p> <p><i>-Ability to relate any changes in water quality to project investments and community actions</i></p>
--	---	---	---	--	---

	<b>Indicator 9:</b> (a) No. Village Conservation Groups (VCGs); and (b) Total no. VCG members with at least 30% female representation	0	(a) 10 (b) 200	(a) 50 (b) 1,000	<b>Data sources and methods</b> Consultation with communities reports. Number of villages to be confirmed. <b>Risks:</b> -Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project <b>Assumptions:</b> -Indicator may not correlate directly with improved livelihood but it is indicative of self-empowerment, which is likely to result in improved livelihoods. -Local communities are convinced that critical habitats in their vicinities will benefit livelihoods and ecological security
<b>Outcome 3.</b> Enhanced institutional and technical capacity to effectively administer and monitor status of ECAs to safeguard biodiversity and secure ecosystem services.	<b>Indicator 10:</b> Establishment and technical capacity of ECA Management, Monitoring & Compliance Unit (MMCUC) within DoE as measured by: (a) MMCUC established and operational (b) Number of staff recruited and trained to safeguard ECAs	Limited capacity and technical competence in wetland restoration and management prevent DoE from fulfilling its mandate in safeguarding ECAs, all of which are wetlands.	- MMCUC created, - ecosystem-based framework applied to the restoration of project sites (Halda River and Morjat Baor) and - monitoring system in place to track compliance with prescriptions embedded in their respective management plans.	- MMCUC fully staffed (3 wetland ecologists, 1 compliance officer, 1 IT/systems specialist, 1 communications officer), fully funded by DoE, and - restoration measures identified, prescribed and being monitored for 100% ECAs.	<b>Data sources and methods</b> ECA management and monitoring reports Progress and staffing reports Training reports <b>Risks:</b> DoE may not be able to absorb costs of running this new unit by end of project. <b>Assumptions:</b> Establishing MMCUC at project inception maximizes the timeframe for building its technical capacity and field experience, with the project providing technical support through the services of its Senior Technical Specialist, who will closely work with the Unit.

	<p><b>Indicator 11:</b> Spatial information and learning systems established as measured by:</p> <p>(a) Design of web-based information systems;</p> <p>(b) Design of monitoring and reporting systems and data population</p> <p>(c) System institutionalized and operational within MMCU with multiple users</p>	<p><i>Currently there is no centralized spatial information system for ECAs. Moreover, water quality is not monitored routinely to track the condition of wetlands.</i></p>	<p>- Spatial web-based knowledge and information system developed and networked across ECAs, and</p> <p>- populated with a library of IAS legislation, regulations, policies, strategies, management plan and guidelines</p> <p>- spatial data and a data monitoring facility to track wetland ecological status.</p>	<p>Information system fully functional, with data monitoring system designed and established for the project sites, and 5 years of monitoring data uploaded remotely from both project sites and accessible to ECA MMCU.</p>	<p><b>Data sources and methods</b> Report of web-based design Progress and budget reports</p> <p><b>Risks:</b> Data security is a constant threat and special provisions should be in place to ensure that monitoring data are regularly backed up and stored with a third party.</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> Government agencies, NGOs and others are willing to share their data.</p> <p>Information system will be hosted by DoE, who will be able to finance its maintenance and further development post-project.</p>
	<p><b>Indicator 12:</b> Increase in level of knowledge (disaggregated by gender) on ecosystem-based approaches as defined by the following:</p> <p>(a) Number of community members trained and adopting new technologies and practices</p> <p>(b) Communication strategy and action plan developed and effectively implemented</p>	<p><i>Coordinated outreach on conservation threats lacking. Limited awareness of impact unplanned development among general public. Baseline survey established in Year 1 after KAP survey</i></p>	<p><i>At least 100 community members trained in relevant ecosystem-based best practice approaches and 50% effectively applying these measures (at least 30% women beneficiaries)</i></p>	<p><i>At least 500 community members trained in relevant ecosystem-based best practice approaches and 50% effectively applying these measures (at least 30% women beneficiaries)</i></p>	<p><u>Means of verification:</u></p> <p>-KAP surveys</p> <p>- KM documents, best practice documents, proceedings of dissemination events and implementation reports</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u></p> <p>-Stakeholders willing to actively participate in the review process.</p> <p>- Project management will be able to identify, document and disseminate the best practices</p> <p>-Mid Term Review and End of Project</p>

	<b>Indicator 13:</b> Number of knowledge products that reflects best practices and lessons learned	<i>Limited number (less than 5) of KM products on conservation and sustainable resource management codified and disseminated nationally and regionally</i>	<i>At least 5 additional KM products on conservation and sustainable resource management codified and disseminated nationally and regionally</i>	<i>At least 20 additional KM products on conservation and sustainable resource management codified and disseminated nationally and regionally</i>	<i>Evaluation of the project will also contribute to identifying the best practices</i> <i>-Best practices from sustainable resource management readily available to resource users</i>  <u>Risks:</u> <i>-Government priorities may change from due to political pressure from resource users</i> <i>-Actions among the assorted agencies and NGOs remain uncoordinated</i>
--	--	--	--	---	---

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).**

Comment	Response	Relevant Section of UNDP Project Document and - GEF CEO ER.
<b>Comments from GEFSEC Review (PIF STAGE)</b>		
None		
Comments from STAP		

<p>1. The project would be much improved by the simple act of including maps depicting the location and extent of potential target areas as well as a list of acronyms because there are many within the project which are not well defined, or at all. For example, the entire project centers around the notion of “ecosystem-based framework”, however, this concept is not explained anywhere in the project document. Similarly, the PIF discusses “sustainable financing mechanisms: with no description of what these are, and how sustainable financing will be achieved.</p>	<p>Maps are now included showing location of two pilot ECAs.</p> <p>List of acronyms included</p> <p>- <u>An ecosystem-based management framework</u> for ECAs represents a multi-sector and multi-stakeholder integrated management approach that recognizes the full array of interactions within an ecosystem, including humans, rather than consider single issues, species, or ecosystem services in isolation. This approach intends to work across sectors and interests to manage species and habitats, economic activities, conflicting uses, and the sustainability of resources within ECAs and allows for consideration of resource tradeoffs that help protect and sustain diverse and productive ecosystems and the services they provide.</p> <p><u>Sustainable Financing Mechanisms.</u> The intent of Output 1.4 <b><i>Sustainable financing strategy for ECAs developed and implemented</i></b> is to provide funding for a 15 month study and consultations is to examine a variety of sources other than just MoEFCC, such as Agriculture, Fisheries, Tourism, Mining and other polluting industries, Water Resources and Waste Management to identify linkages and potential opportunities for partnerships and investments. In terms of restoration costs, the study will identify a range and viability of a number of financial sources such as technical assistance projects (grants), low interest loans from multi-lateral banks, investments from the private sector, and payments for ecosystem services (PES) to support these activities. In the case of the Halda River the costs of clean up from industry and sewerage is compensated by huge economic (and social) benefits. For example, Chittagong’s public water supply from Halda River will not be subject to ever increasing costs to clean up, aquatic plant and animal life will become more diverse and, together with the water itself, safer for human and livestock consumption and so on. The intent of the study is to assess all options and their costs and benefits in order to raise awareness of the net benefits of restoration initiatives in order to help secure the necessary financial investments. Recent national legislation also provides for a variety of funding mechanisms that may also be relevant to this Strategy. These include the Ecology Management Fund that has yet to be established under the 2016 ECA Management Rules; Biodiversity Conservation Fund under the 2017 Biodiversity Conservation Act; Bangladesh Climate Change Trust Fund under the 2010 Climate Change Trust Fund Act; and the Disaster Management Fund under the 2012 Disaster Management Act and applying the “Polluter pay principle”</p> <p>Once the strategy has identified a suite of funding resources and mechanisms that can be deployed to restore ECA to favorable ecological conditions to make economic argument for clean up.</p> <p>It was never the intent at PPG stage to identify specific financial mechanisms (as this would entail major studies, assessment and economic cost-benefit analysis and consultations to define a few suite of mechanism for piloting).</p>	<p>For maps refer Figure 3 and Annex 15 of UNDP Project Document</p> <p>For list of acronyms refer Page 5 and 6 of UNDP Project Document and first time an acronym is used in GEFCEO ER it is elaborated.</p> <p>For definition of ecosystem-based management framework refer Section III “Strategy” Paragraph 40 and footnote 24 and Section VI “Results Framework Agreement” Indicator 5 in UNDP project Document and Table B (Footnote 3) and Annex A Indicator 5 of GEFCEO ER</p> <p>For information of Sustainable Financing Mechanisms refer Output 1.4 in Section IV of UNDP Project Document (pp.37-38)</p>
---	---	---

2. Overall, STAP feels that the project logic is incomplete, with confusion between and within Outputs and Outcomes, and a project objective that is more ambitious than what the project actually sets out to do. In fact, there are significant risk that Outputs will not add up to Outcomes.	<p>The PPG team is comfortable with the current objective of the project. The intent of the project is to establish the capacity and enabling conditions to develop “ecosystem-based framework” for managing ECAs and pilot it in two ECAs. The only workable approach to management of ECAs is to address it through an integrated multi-sector and multi-stakeholder approach that recognizes the full array of interactions within an ecosystem, including humans, rather than consider single issues, species, or ecosystem services in isolation and define resource use tradeoffs as a cost-effective approach to management of ECAs. Working on a single issue approach is not cost-effective, neither offers a chance of addressing the range of concerns of ECAs.</p> <p>The PPG Team feels that there is a logical and cost-effective strategy to the design of the project. Project design and sequencing of project activities ensures that foundational activities are completed first, to the extent feasible, or in parallel, such as (i) establishing governance and coordinating mechanisms at the national and sub-national levels; (ii) legislative and regulatory changes clarifying responsibilities of ECA planning, management and oversight; legislative and regulatory changes to facilitate to mainstreaming biodiversity into sector and environmental planning; and (iii) capacity improvements developed to provide the necessary groundwork for later demonstration of ecosystem-based management planning in the two pilot ECAs and beyond (in Component 2); The project includes subsequent documentation, dissemination of best practices for scaling up under Outcome 3 and feedback mechanisms to influence further policy and legislative changes, as appropriate</p>	Refer UNDP Project Document Section IV
3. Other specific comments include that monitoring systems occur under Components 2 and 3	The monitoring Output 2.2.4 in the PIF has been integrated into Component 3	Refer UNDP Project Document Section IV ( <i>p.30</i> ) and GEFCEO ER Table B
4. Raising ECA profile, plus website, plus modular training program is also unlikely to lead to institutional capacity	Thank you for the comment. The intent of the project is to create the necessary institutional structures at national, district, upazila and union levels and provide them the tools and capacity for actual on-the-ground implementation (rather than just conduct modular training) so that skills development and capacity will be built on learning-by-doing rather than classroom training exercises. Where necessary technical support will be provided to support implementation of key activities. Awareness and communication activities are not activities by themselves but will be used to reinforce and build on investments on the ground	Refer UNDP Project Document Section IV for the list on practical investments that will be supported by the project to build institutional capacities across the different administrative levels as well as VCGs



<p>5. The list of pilot activities (2.2.3) is not likely to add up to either GEBs or sustainable livelihoods as claimed in the project title</p>	<p>The intent of the project is to facilitate the development of an ecosystem-based management framework for the two pilot ECAs that would culminate in the preparation of a 5-year management plan for each ECA that establishes desirable favorable ecological condition to be reached when each of a number of critical biotic and abiotic indicators selected by a technical advisory panel reach levels which are judged to allow full ecosystem functioning. This is a long-term goal that will set in motion a series of actions that could ultimate contribute to achieving this objective. Given the small size of the project and the short implementation period, it is anticipated that under Output 2.2.3 (now Output 2.3) to pilot test and demonstrate a few sustainable fisheries, agriculture and livelihood activities, while working with industry and other development sectors to reduce effluents discharges into the systems. The financial strategy will identify future resources required to replicate these approaches in the entirety of the ECAs (post-project) with the intent on the longer-term achieving the desired favorable ecological conditions, including GEB and broader livelihood benefits.</p>	<p>Refer UNDP Project Document Section IV, Output 2.3 (p.44)</p>
<p>6. Another claim with no technical backing at all is “sustainable financing mechanisms” as mentioned above. There is no information n how this will be achieved</p>	<p>The DoE’s mandate (under the 2010 Amendment to the Environment Conservation Act of 1995) is to deliver an effectively managed network of ECAs, particularly given their degraded condition and the need to first invest in their restoration. The financial strategy (Output 1.4) will consider opportunities arising from the <i>7<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan</i>, with the MoEFCC budget set to double to 9.6 Billion BGT by 2020 to ensure that at least core funding from government is sufficient to cover DoE’s oversight of the ECA network (running costs), including compliance monitoring. The <i>Five Year Plan</i> goes much further than core expenditures and calls for a new approach to industrial pollution and waste management, with zero discharge of industrial effluents, restoration of urban wetlands and protection of at least 15% of a wetland in peak dry season.</p> <p>The Strategy will focus on the core role of DoE with respect to ECAs, based on the assumption that management is delegated to the District authorities. Thus, DoE’s core role is both technical, in terms of prescribing measures necessary to restore wetlands and maintain them in <i>favorable ecological condition</i> and monitoring their ecological status, and one of enforcement to ensure compliance with targets agreed by the management authority. Applying the ‘polluter pays’ principle will also a key part of that role</p>	<p>Refer UNDP Project Document Section IV, Output 1.4</p>

<p>7. The feasibility of tacking twelve discrete outputs under such challenging circumstances needs to be carefully assessed. STAP recommends that during the PPG phase efforts focus on scaling the project down to what is achievable, and on developing the following core elements:</p> <p>§ Performance criteria for protected areas including (1) ecosystem health and diversity; (2) financial viability; (3) socio-economic indicators and (4) management indicators.</p> <p>§ Institutional arrangements for tracking these criteria and holding land managers to account, including financial arrangements where possible</p> <p>§ A limited number of pilot activities in manageable pilot sites</p>	<p>The number of Outputs is 11 and we are in agreement with STAP that the scope of the project should be reduced. Accordingly, the project now includes 2 rather than 3 ECA demonstration sites, excluding the rather complex Cox’s Bazar-Teknaf Peninsula ECA.</p> <p>The intent of the project is to facilitate the development of an ecosystem-based management framework for the two pilot ECAs that would culminate in the preparation of a 5-year management plan for each ECA that establishes desirable favorable ecological condition to be reached when each of a number of critical biotic and abiotic indicators selected by a technical advisory panel reach levels which are judged to allow full ecosystem functioning. The ecological framework will define ecosystem conditions that would include: (i) ecosystem health and diversity, (ii) socio-economic indicators, (iii) management indicators; (iv) financial indicators, plus monitoring systems to track progress in moving towards the desired targets. ECA managers will share responsibility for achieving these targets.</p> <p>The activities within the pilot ECAs are limited in scope and locations so as not to spread investments widely through the ECA. Investments will be targeted at selected locations in the ECA based on a three-tiered evaluation process was employed to facilitate the identification of the priority locations within the ECAs. The first tier entails the use of biological criteria to identify the best “umbrella” sites within each pilot ECA, namely those sites that are representation of a suite of vulnerable species and habitats (based on species irreplaceability, habitat connectivity and ecological permanence and having representative bio-indicators). Once these important biological sites are identified, these were subjected to a second tier evaluation in terms of threats (where there are clear and present dangers related to land-use changes and land use conflicts) and drivers of wetland degradation. The third tier included the assessment of the demonstration potential and socio-economic aspects of the proposed priority locations in terms of resource use conflict reduction, enabling policy environment and potential trade-offs. Direct on-the-ground interventions will focus on promoting environmental sustainable fisheries, agriculture and livelihood practices that will cover only around 1,000 beneficiaries so as to demonstrate an impact on the ground</p>	<p>Refer UNDP Project Document Figure 3 (showing location of 2 ECA sites) Annex E (GEF Core Indicators) of GEFCEO ER</p> <p>Section IV, Outputs 2.2 and 2.3 and Paragraph 90 of UNDP Project Document defines the process for establishing favorable ecological conditions (<i>pp.41-44</i>)</p> <p>Section IV Output 2.3 of UNDP Project Document defines the key (but limited) pilot activities that will be supported through the project (<i>pp.44-46</i>)</p>
---	---	--

<p>8. The project's emphasis on developing monitoring systems and holding people accountable to them is an excellent approach for what is a small project tackling a huge issue. However, even this needs to be significantly clarified</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment. While, the PPG agrees that it is a large issue to deal with, it is nevertheless important. Monitoring will initially focus only on the two pilot ECAs. The ecosystem-based management framework (and associated management plans for the 2 ECAs) with identify specific favorable ecological condition to be achieved that is directly related to a number of critical biotic and abiotic indicators selected by a technical advisory panel and the levels which are judged to allow full ecosystem functioning"</p> <p>The project will support DoE in its establishment of an <b>ECA Management, Monitoring and Compliance Unit (ECA MMCU)</b> that will focus on benchmarking of the status of ECAs and identifying what measures need to be taken to restore them to 'favourable' conditions (or better) and setting targets within specific timeframes. In parallel national standards for ECAs in terms of the water and habitat/ecosystems quality will be established. The intent is that these standards become law (regulations) framed under the ECA Management Rules. The MMCU can monitor compliance, report non-compliance. Given the complexity of this effort, it would only initially focus on the two ECA pilot sites and only be extended sometime in the future (once adequate and sustainable financing options have been identified) to other ECAs in the country. The intent is to start small, learn and build on this experience before it is more widely applied</p>	<p>Refer UNDP Project Document Section IV Outputs 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 (<i>pp.49-51</i>)</p>
<p>9. In addition, there is little accurate site level information on the number of people who will be affected. While the project builds on earlier UNDP experiences in Bangladesh, there is no direct reference in the document to knowledge and learning from other projects, including from GEF projects</p>	<p>There is substantial information now provided on the key resources uses and environmental problems in the two proposed ECA sites.</p> <p>The number of fishermen is 150 and number of agricultural farmers is around 30 that operate around the Morjat Baor that the project will directly work with.</p> <p>In the case of the Halda River (proposed ECA), the number of fishermen operating in the river is about 350 that the project will target. The catchment of the Halda River is large, and while the project will help develop an ecosystem-based management plan for Halda river and determine the favorable ecological conditions that need to be achieved on the longer term, on-the-ground activities that the project will focus will relate to establishing sustainable fisheries, wetland resources harvest, sustainable agriculture and livelihood activities as means to improve economic and ecological conditions for local communities that depend on the river resources. The design of these activities (including institutional structures) build on experiences of the past that are described in response to German Council comment 1 below.</p>	<p>Refer Annex 15 "Profile of target ECAs" and Annex 20 "Preliminary Environmental Assessment: Halda River and Morjat Boar of UNDP Project Document</p>

10. The STAP feels that the project objective is too broad (ecosystem-based framework x ecologically critical areas = conservation of GEBs + local livelihoods) could fit virtually any problem issue. The project objective will be more accurate if it is focused on developing an effective biodiversity monitoring system and accountability/transparency for ECAs. A well-targeted and discrete project would have a higher likelihood of success than suggested by the current overly ambitious title.	Please see response to STAP Question 2 above	Refer UNDP Project Document Section IV
Comments from Germany		

<p>1. The proposed project aims at developing, institutionalizing and implementing management plans (including sustainable financing mechanisms, livelihood support, EHI monitoring system and compliance monitoring) for 3 pilot ECAs. This appears overly ambitious given the project timeframe and budget. At the moment, ECA is rather a concept that mainly exists <i>de jure</i> under DoE and has not yet been fully institutionalized at local level. Germany suggests further focusing available resources to reduce the risk of over-ambitiousness. Germany regards the following fields of intervention as most important: coordination, sustainable financing as well as strengthening institutional and technical capacities of relevant actors including ECA structures (see bullet point below).</p>	<p>As discussed in response to STAP Question 7 above, the number of ECA sites have been reduced from 3 to 2. Similarly, as discussed in Question 7 above, the activities proposed within the pilot ECAs are limited in scope and locations so as not to spread investments widely through the ECA.</p> <p>In addition, the PPG team feels that the ECA concept has been operationalized in some ECAs as discussed below:</p> <p>(i) Under the Coastal and Wetland management project, governance structures were established in 4 ECAs (namely, Cox’s Bazar, Hakaluki Haor, Sonadia Island and St Martin’s Island) where 72 Village Conservation Groups were established and micro-grants provided to all VCGs. In addition, institutional structures, such as ECA coordination committees were established at Union, Upazila, District and national levels. The ECA management structure established in the above 4 ECAs are now incorporated into the ECA rules (2015)</p> <p>(ii) Under the Community-Based Fisheries project, 130 community-based organizations were established in 116 water bodies, including a few in ECAs and being recipients of micro-grants</p> <p>(iii) The Nishargo project introduce co-management approaches for sustainable natural resources management and biodiversity conservation, including in 2 ECAs</p> <p>Overall, there is good experience in Bangladesh to community-managed conservation including in a number of ECAs, on which the project will build on to incorporate an ecosystem-based approach to planning and management of ECAs that recognizes the need for a multi-stakeholder and multi-sector approach that takes into consideration the diverse needs from the ECAs, that integrates (i) multi-sectoral and multi-sector coordination; (ii) strengthening institutional structures at national, district, Upazila and union levels as well as Village Conservation Groups; (iii) the need to diversity financing beyond the government to include the private sector (industry, housing, etc.), strengthen sustainable community resource use and livelihood improvements to enhance local incomes; (iv) capacity and skills development for all players; and (v) monitoring and enforcement. All of these actions are essential to ensuring an integrated and multi-sector and multi-stakeholder approach to improved management of ECAs, which the project design tries to address.</p>	<p>In terms of strategy for the project refer Section III of UNDP Project Document, namely paragraphs 40-44</p>
---	---	---

<p>2. The selected three pilot sites are currently in different stages of putting the ECA approach into practice. Considering the ECA approach in general and the newly proposed / designated ECAs in particular, institutional development geared towards the establishment of ECA structures and mechanisms, including policy framing and clarification of roles and responsibilities, are needed before built-on interventions can be taken on board. Germany requests that the project specifies how this will be done through the proposed intervention at site level.</p>	<p>Please refer response to Question 1 above from German Council Member above.</p> <p>The Project strategy entails a sequencing of project activities that ensures that foundational activities are completed first, to the extent feasible, or in parallel, such as (i) establishing governance and coordinating mechanisms at the national and sub-national levels; (ii) legislative and regulatory changes clarifying responsibilities of ECA planning, management and oversight; legislative and regulatory changes to facilitate to mainstreaming biodiversity into sector and environmental planning; and (iii) capacity improvements developed to provide the necessary groundwork for later demonstration of ecosystem-based management planning in the two pilot ECAs and beyond (in Component 2). On-the ground interventions in target ECAs will build on foundation activities established under Component 1 and subsequent documentation, dissemination of best practices for scaling up under Outcome 3 and feedback mechanisms to influence further policy and legislative changes, as appropriate</p>	<p>Refer Section III (in particular paragraphs 40 and 41) of UNDP Project Document</p>
---	---	--

<p>3. ECAs are multi-stakeholder landscapes. Although DoE holds the official mandate for ECAs, management and planning issues of the areas cannot be addressed through DoE alone. This includes land use planning. Even though roles for the different line ministries have been outlined in the proposal, Germany suggest clarifying how the ministries will be concretely involved on the ground and what their interest would be</p>	<p>This is a very valid question. While DoE has the overall mandate for ECAs, planning and management of ECAs requires coordination and support from a number of government sector agencies (fisheries, forests, water resources, industry, etc.), private sector and industry, NGOs and local communities.</p> <p>As discussed under Component 1, designing a financially viable, ecosystem-based management framework for Ecologically Critical Areas (ECAs) requires (i) an effective multi-level integration between national, District, Upazila, Union and community levels in terms of ecosystem-based ECA planning and management, (ii) an effective consultation and coordination between different institutional levels and sectors at the national and sub-national levels in support of conservation and sustainable management of ECAs, (iii) an enhanced integration of biodiversity conservation outcomes in national and district, Upazila and Union social and economic development planning; (vi) an enhanced means to integrate local people's knowledge and traditional resource management systems into integrated ecosystem-based management, and (v) an expanded national-level coordination mechanism and procedures to include District, Upazila and Union and sector representation.</p> <p>This will entail (i) Consultations and collaboration with all relevant sectors (including private sector, industry, etc.) and stakeholders (including NGOs and local communities) to arrive at a common vision for the ECA (Output 1.1); (ii) A participatory planning process that enables all stakeholders and sectors (including private sector and industry) to engage in shaping the vision for the site and contributing to the delivery of their part of the agreed vision is fundamental to the success and effectiveness of any management plan (Output 2.2); (iii) modalities or working practices for ECA committees at each of their respective levels (district, upazila and union) of local administration, with roles, responsibilities and reporting requirements (templates) clearly defined (Output 1.2); (iv) establishing a Stakeholder Forum, comprising representatives from all bodies with vested interests in the site (i.e. communities, government administrations and agencies, research institutes, colleges/universities, private sector, NGOs, other projects operating in the area) to facilitate coordination on the long-term (Output 2.2); (v) Improving mechanisms for communication between and within all levels of governance, from/to national government to/from Union Parishads and VCG (Output 3.1); etc.</p>	<p>Refer Section IV (in particular Component 1, Outputs 1.1 and 1.2; Component 2, mainly Output 2.2 and Component 3, Output 3.1 of UNDP Project Document</p>
---	---	--

<p>4. The project includes Cox's Bazar-Teknaf Peninsula ECA as one of the pilot sites. This site also constitutes a protected area (Teknaf Wildlife Sanctuary) that according to national legislation follows a co-management approach. Germany would like to emphasize that coordination with the existing community based and participatory structures is vital. Duplication and the establishment of parallel structures should be avoided. Germany therefore requests to elaborate on the envisioned coordination mechanism with the co-management structures in Teknaf.</p>	<p>Given the requirement to down-size the project to a manageable level, the Cox's Bazar – Teknaf Peninsula ECA is excluded from the project site. The project will now concentrate in 2 ECAs and here to the extent feasible, the project will work through existing community organization and participatory structures rather than create new ones. Where necessary existing community organizations would be strengthened through training and skills development to implement project activities</p>	<p>Refer UNDP Project Document Figure 3 (showing location of 2 ECA sites) and Annex E (GEF Core Indicators) of GEFCEO ER</p>
<p>Comments from US</p>		



<p>1. There are risks to this project, especially if the government is not able to provide adequate resources or capacity—the proposal accounts for this risk and could provide more details</p>	<p>This is a very relevant question that the project seeks to find other financing means to compensate for limited government financing. Under Output 1.4 Sustainable financing strategy for ECAs developed and implemented the project will support a 15 month study to examine a variety of sources other than just MoEFCC to ensure adequate resources for management of ECAs (as described in response to STAP Question 1 above).</p> <p>Additionally, enhancing private-public partnerships as in the case of the Halda River, there is a definite opportunity to work with the private sector through the Chittagong Chamber of Commerce &amp; Industry (CCCI) and establish a platform, such as a Halda River Impact Group, that will work collaboratively to reduce their impact on this river and its catchment through demonstrating operating practices, processes and management schemes that result in positive outcomes for both business and the aquatic environment (Output 1.2 and 1.3 and Annex 18).</p> <p>Application of a ‘polluter pays’ principle is acknowledged but not widely expressed in Bangladesh environmental legislation but the 1995 Environment Conservation Act enables the Director General to determine compensation from persons causing environmental damage and for them to take corrective measures.</p> <p>The project also entails under Output 2.1 to (i) identify and evaluate potential PES opportunities, particularly in relation to public water supplies for Chittagong City and the fisheries and (ii) undertake an economic valuation of the benefits generated from functioning ecosystems and, in the case of dysfunctional ecosystems, the unrealized opportunity costs. Such demonstration and studies will help make the economic case for more private and public financing (beyond the MoEFCC) to support management of ECAs.</p> <p>Further Output 2.2 will help demonstrate sustainable economic activities (fisheries, agriculture and livelihoods) that can have a positive impact on ECAs as a means to facilitate replication and uptake.</p>	<p>Refer Table 3 of UNDP Project Document (<i>pp. 31-32</i>) and Table 2 of GEFCEO ER for more details of management of this risk</p>
--	---	---

## ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i><b>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</b></i>	<i><b>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</b></i>		
	<i><b>Budgeted Amount</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Spent To date</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Committed</b></i>
Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews	75,000	46,434	28,566
Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Pro doc, CEO ER, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes	37,500	23,217	14,283
Component C: Validation Workshop and Report	37,500	23,217	14,283
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>150,000</u></b>	<b><u>92,868</u></b>	<b><u>57,132</u></b>

#### ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

## Annex E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet



Core Indicator 3	Area of land restored				(Hectares)	
		Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetland restored <sup>16</sup>	30,398 <sup>17</sup>	11,025			
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored					
		Hectares				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 3.2	Area of forest and forest land restored					
		Hectares				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 3.3	Area of natural grass and shrublands restored					
		Hectares				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored					
		Hectares				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
	Proposed Halda River ECA	10,825	10,825			
	Morjat Board ECA	200	200			
	Cox's Bazar – Teknaf Peninsula ECA <sup>18</sup>	20,373	NA			
		31,398	11,025			
Core Indicator 11	Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment				(Number)	
		Expected		Number Achieved		
				MTR	TE	
	Female	NA	300			
	Male	NA	700			
	Total	NA	1,000			



---

<sup>16</sup> In terms of improved water quality by 10-15% on account of project interventions

<sup>17</sup> Area of wetland targeted reduced to 11,025 ha on account of reduction of target ECA sites from 3 to 2 on basis of STAP recommendation to make project more manageable. In addition “restored” would mean specifically resulting in 11,025 ha of wetlands being managed in compliance with criteria that will result in favorable ecological condition being achieved (rather than the actual restoration of the wetlands within the time frame of the project). The key point here is that management measures are in place and being complied with, to the extent that the wetland will be restored but this may not be within the life of the project.

<sup>18</sup> ECA site dropped from project

GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template – August 29, 2018

#### ANNEX: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Influencing models			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transform policy and regulatory environments		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Convene multi-stakeholder alliances		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate innovative approaches		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deploy innovative financial instruments		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Sector		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Capital providers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Financial intermediaries and market facilitators	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large corporations	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SMEs	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individuals/Entrepreneurs	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Grant Pilot	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Project Reflow	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Communities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academia	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions and Workers Unions	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type of Engagement		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Dissemination	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communications		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness Raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Education	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Campaigns	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Behavior Change	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity, Knowledge and Research			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Generation and Exchange		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Theory of Change	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indicators to Measure Change	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Innovation		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge and Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Management	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Innovation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Engagement Plan		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Equality			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Mainstreaming		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries	



		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women groups	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex-disaggregated indicators	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender-sensitive indicators	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender results areas		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access and control over natural resources	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation and leadership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access to benefits and services	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge generation	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal Areas/Theme			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Programs		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Commodity Supply Chains ( <sup>18</sup> Good Growth Partnership)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodities Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Screening Tools
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Conservation Value Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Carbon Stocks Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Soybean Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Oil Palm Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Beef Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Resilience (climate and shocks)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Production Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agroecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land and Soil Health
			<input type="checkbox"/> Diversified Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Land and Water Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small and Medium Enterprises
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Genetic Diversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Gender Dimensions
			<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-stakeholder Platforms
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Restoration
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodity Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Land Use Planning
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Landscapes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Cities	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated urban planning
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban sustainability framework
			<input type="checkbox"/> Transport and Mobility
			<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings
			<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal waste management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Green space
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Biodiversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Energy efficiency
			<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal Financing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Global Platform for Sustainable Cities
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Resilience
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity		





		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected Areas and Landscapes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Protected Areas
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal and Marine Protected Areas
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Productive Landscapes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Productive Seascapes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Natural Resource Management
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Extractive Industries (oil, gas, mining)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Forestry (Including HCVF and REDD+)
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tourism
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & agrobiodiversity
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fisheries
			<input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure
			<input type="checkbox"/> Certification (National Standards)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Certification (International Standards)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Species	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Illegal Wildlife Trade
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threatened Species
			<input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife for Sustainable Development
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Wild Relatives
			<input type="checkbox"/> Plant Genetic Resources
			<input type="checkbox"/> Animal Genetic Resources
			<input type="checkbox"/> Livestock Wild Relatives
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Invasive Alien Species (IAS)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mangroves
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sea Grasses
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rivers
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lakes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical Rain Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical Dry Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Temperate Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Grasslands
			<input type="checkbox"/> Paramo
			<input type="checkbox"/> Desert
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial and Accounting	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Payment for Ecosystem Services
			<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conservation Trust Funds
			<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Finance
		<input type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Protocol to the CBD	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety
			<input type="checkbox"/> Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing
	<input type="checkbox"/> Forests		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest and Landscape Restoration	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest	<input type="checkbox"/> REDD/REDD+
			<input type="checkbox"/> Amazon
			<input type="checkbox"/> Congo
			<input type="checkbox"/> Drylands
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Land Management	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem Approach
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community-Based NRM



			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Agriculture
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Pasture Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Fire Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Drought Mitigation/Early Warning
		<input type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation Neutrality	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land Productivity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land Cover and Land cover change
			<input type="checkbox"/> Carbon stocks above or below ground
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security	
	<input type="checkbox"/> International Waters		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ship	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Aquifer
			<input type="checkbox"/> River Basin
			<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Basin
		<input type="checkbox"/> Learning	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances	
		<input type="checkbox"/> SIDS : Small Island Dev States	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pollution	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances
			<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from Wastewater
		<input type="checkbox"/> Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan preparation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Action Plan Implementation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large Marine Ecosystems	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Aquaculture	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Marine Protected Area	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mangrove
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
			<input type="checkbox"/> Seagrasses
			<input type="checkbox"/> Polar Ecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Constructed Wetlands
	<input type="checkbox"/> Chemicals and Waste		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Mercury	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Artisanal and Scale Gold Mining	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Power Plants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Industrial Boilers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cement	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Ferrous Metals Production	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ozone	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sound Management of chemicals and Waste	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Waste Management	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste
			<input type="checkbox"/> e-Waste
		<input type="checkbox"/> Emissions	



		<input type="checkbox"/> Polychlorinated Biphenyls	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Eco-Efficiency	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pesticides	
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Vector Management	
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Other	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Emissions	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Open Burning	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Best Available Technology / Best Environmental Practices	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Green Chemistry	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance
			<input type="checkbox"/> Least Developed Countries
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small Island Developing States
			<input type="checkbox"/> Disaster Risk Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sea-level rise
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Resilience
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Information
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem-based Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Programme of Action
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Plan
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector
			<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Complementarity
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community-based Adaptation
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Livelihoods
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land Use
			<input type="checkbox"/> Energy Efficiency
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Urban Systems and Transport
			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Energy
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities
		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Endogenous technology
			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Needs Assessment
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
		<input type="checkbox"/> United Nations Framework on Climate Change	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nationally Determined Contribution
			<input type="checkbox"/> Paris Agreement
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance (Rio Markers)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Development Goals
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 1
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 2
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 1
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 2

# **ANNEX G: changes to the original project concept and rationale**

No significant changes, except the following:

Issue	PIF	GEFCEO	Justification
Project Duration	6 years	5 years	Reduced on account of the tight budget and in keeping with the experience of past GEF projects in Bangladesh, namely e.g. Coastal and Wetland Biodiversity Management Project (CWBMP) and Community-based adaptation to climate change through coastal afforestation (ICBAAR) project.
Outputs	Output 2.2.4. “Monitoring systems designed and operational”	Moved as Output 3.2 “ECA Management, Monitoring & Compliance Unit established within DoE”	Moved based on the recommendation of STAP that monitoring was in both Component 2 and 3 in PIF. The Output 3.2 will help establish a ECA Management, Monitoring & Compliance Unit established within DoE” to specifically include a permanent institutional arrangement for the information and monitoring system.



# Submitted to GEF Secretariat Review

[Go To Home](#)