



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Community-based Management of Tanguar Haor Wetland in Bangladesh

Basic Information

GEF ID

10702

Countries

Bangladesh

Project Title

Community-based Management of Tanguar Haor Wetland in Bangladesh

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6563

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Paul Hartman

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes, the project is aligned with GEF Focal area elements in Table A.

Cleared

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

No.

Outcomes and outputs in Table B related to alternative and clean sources of energy for cooking (e.g. LPG), & lighting (e.g. SHS, solar mini/nano grid) are not eligible for financing from BD or LD resources and should be removed from the PIF. Similarly no GEF financing should be directed toward urban pollution control.

In addition, improved livelihoods should be shown as necessary to achieve a broader environmental goal, but not, as it now appears, as a stand-alone and the first measurement of the component on ecological management.

10/21/20

a) The agency has stated that funding of activities related to identifying alternative energy sources will be sourced through co-financing and not through GEF grant. Please work to secure this funding during the PPG phase and ensure that no GEF TF financing is put towards these activities in the CEO ER.

b) The agency has stated that investments in industrial pollution control will not be funded through the GEF grant, instead sourced from private sector. Please work to secure this private sector investment during the PPG phase and ensure that no GEF TF financing is put towards these activities in the CEO ER.

c) The role of sustainable nature-friendly livelihoods options in reducing unsustainable use of wetland resources has been sufficiently clarified in the PIF.

The components in Table B and as described in the PIF are now sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear.

Cleared

Agency Response

12 Oct 2020:

Thank you for the feedback and we fully take note of the ineligibility of GEF grants for alternative sources of energy and pollution abatement under the BD and LD FA. The project is proposing a wholistic approach given the different types of threat to the Haor's ecosystem. While GEF resources will not be used for supporting these interventions, we feel the need to retain as part of the overall project approach in view of the following reasons:

(a) Provision of alternative sources of energy is particularly relevant to the conservation of the ecology of the Tanguar Haor as it is directly linked to the overuse of wetland resources (e.g. fuelwood from freshwater swamp forests, reeds, grasses and drywood). The project will assess the feasibility of alternatives in terms of energy for cooking (LPG) and lighting (e.g. solar mini/nano grid, solar home systems, etc). Options of funding of alternative energy sources will be sourced through existing government or private sector programs (INDOL) and not through GEF grant, recognizing that such sources of alternative energy are critical to improve Haor's ecosystem.

(b) In terms of management of industrial pollution, which is observed to be a significant contributor to wetland degradation and to the loss of wetland productivity. The project is including this as a wholistic approach where it will provide access to information and good practices

that demonstrates the cost and benefits of pollution control. Any investments in industrial pollution control will not be funded through the GEF grant, instead sourced from private sector.

(c) The ECA Management Rules recognizes that establishing favorable environmental conditions in a wetland through integrated ecosystem management approach requires management of anthropogenic challenges to reverse changes in land use, reduce land degradation and salinity, ensure sustainable harvest of fish and wetland resources, promote sustainable agriculture and improved livelihoods, reduce use of wetland resources as sources of energy, reduction of IAS and management of climate impacts. Establishment of favorable environmental conditions in wetlands thus requires promotion of sustainable nature-friendly livelihoods options to reduce unsustainable use of wetland resources.

Please refer to: Outcome 1 & 2 have been amended slightly. Table B and footnote (p.1-2); Output 2.3 narrative (p.24); and Output 2.6 (p.25).

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

While GEFSEC does not impose minimum thresholds for Co-Financing or Investment Mobilized, we note that the project doesn't include any sources of investment mobilized, only recurrent expenditures from the government. We encourage the agency to further explore if any such financing is available and to include this if possible.

10/21/20

Expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing are adequately documented and consistent with the requirements. We encourage the agency to seek additional sources of investment mobilized during the PPG phase.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 Oct 2020:

This is now revised as we anticipate significant part of the co-financing to be in the category "Investment Mobilized" in terms of complementary and supportive activities related to wetland conservation that will be funded by the government.

Please refer to Table C (p.5)

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes, GEF financing in Table D is in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

Cleared

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes, resources are available from the STAR allocation.

Cleared

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes, resources are available from the focal area allocation.

Cleared

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes, the PPG is within allowable cap.

Cleared

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

No, the methodology for GHG estimate hasn't been clearly presented in the project document. Please include this.

10/21/20

A description of the methodology for estimating GHG has now been included in the PIF and is sufficient.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 Oct 2020:

GHG estimate has been revised with the upward revision of the intervention area. Brief description on the methodology for estimating GHG has been also presented.

Please refer to: notes under Table F (p.6-7) and Annex D (p.60).

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes. The project is properly tagged with the appropriate keywords.

Cleared

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes, this has been clearly laid out with a helpful situational analysis diagram provided in addition to the text. We suggest that the ToC be strengthened during the PPG phase to identify causal links between the project outputs and outcomes, and the long term impact that is sought.

Cleared

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

The baseline projects are well described but a clearer baseline scenario description that summarizes the current state of play and more sharply identifies where additional needs exist requiring incremental support would be clarifying. While some of this is captured in Table one, a narrative summary in the baseline scenario section is also required.

10/21/20

A description on the baseline scenario has been included and the baseline is now appropriately described.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 oct 2020:

Thank you for the feedback. A description on the baseline scenario has been included as advised.

The GEF 7 project will further build on the existing baseline activities to demonstrate an innovative and financially viable ecosystem-based management framework for the Tanguar Haor (based on ECA rules and experiences available in the country), but more importantly empower local resource users to plan and manage the wetland resources through co-management arrangements. This mandates local communities (in particular fisher folk and wetland resource collectors) to take responsibility for decision-making in managing their respective parts of the wetland.

Please refer to Part II on page 15 and a new table 1 (p.17-20).

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes, the alternative scenario describes expected outcomes and components of the program.

Cleared

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

No. While the PIF lays out the Government of Bangladesh's defined actions of the UNCCD's Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) framework that are relevant to the project, the contribution of the project demonstrated in the PIF are very minimal relative to the LD FA investment, and as such aren't particularly supportive to the countries LDN targets. In addition, if possible it would be good to see the LDN tool embedded into the planning frameworks of the project.

10/21/20

The project's contribution to the country's LDN targets has been clarified and the estimated results the project will generate in support of these has been increased slightly. However, when looking at the investment required to generate these results, the costs appear an considerable outlier with other projects supported by this focal area. Please review and provide a more realistic target or further justification.

10/27/20

A further explanation of the LDN targets and restoration costs has been provided. If the agency estimates a cumulative LDN benefit of 1,911 ha, its unclear why the indicator 4 target remains set at 500ha. With the understanding that the estimate at PIF stage will be validated during the PPG, it would seem this target would better reflect the agency's estimate. Please revise or explain.

11/02/20

Core Indicator 4 has been revised and is reflective of the additional impact expected from the project as estimated by the agency. We encourage the agency to review this further during the PPG phase.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 October 2020

10 OCTOBER 2020:

Bangladesh LDN targets are:

- Target 1): To improve soil fertility and Carbon stock in 2000 km² of cropland area by 2030.
- Target 2): To reduce land use/ cover conversion in 600 km² of forest area by 2030.
- Target 3): To reduce waterlogging in 600km² area by 2030.
- Target 4): To reduce soil erosion in hilly areas in 600km² area by 2030.
- Target 5): To protect non-saline land areas from salinity intrusion in 1200 km² in coastal zone area by 2030.
- Target 6): To reduce river-bank erosion @100ha/year covering 100 km² areas by 2030

In keeping with the LDN targets, the project aims to reduce conversion of freshwater evergreen swamp forests and the rehabilitation of around 400 ha of degraded forests (Target 2) & to improve soil fertility and Carbon stock in 500 ha of degraded croplands (Target 1).

As part of the effort to develop a conservation management plan for the Tanguar Haor (Output 2.2), the project will support assessment of natural resource conditions in Tanguar Hoar (Output 2.1), that will entail understanding the status and trends in biodiversity and wetland resources, including freshwater swamp forests, extent of land and agricultural land degradation, extent of soil erosion, soil fertility and soil carbon loss, etc. Such an assessment will provide the basis and inform actions for biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, improving crop and soil fertility, etc. and contribute towards the Country's LDN targets and importantly integrate LDN tool into planning framework.

Please refer to: Table B and footnote 1 as well as Outcomes 1 and 2 that recognize specifically the LD linkages. Also refer to Table F and Annex B (GEF Core Indicators) and Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 (Page 23 and 24).

UNDP, 23 Oct 2020:

Thank you for the comment

While efforts were made to estimate a realistic target for direct LDN investments under the project (500 ha of degraded agricultural land), it would be useful to take into account that the co-management approach intended to achieve favorable environmental conditions in the wetland being promoted through the project will bring significant other LDN benefits. The Tanguar Haor is a dynamic wetland system that is built on the various hydrological - climatic interactions that defines its biological and ecological value that should be recognized as benefitting from the project.

In more specific terms, the wetland has a permanently ponded area of around 3,943 ha, and it draws in biological and ecological value through an intricate network of interlinked terrestrial-aquatic systems (that is governed by flooding and drainage from the wet to dry seasons) that include around 349 ha of rivers/streams and associated riverine banks that crisscross the wetland, another 475 ha of reed banks, and extensive drawdown of fallow lands of which 587 ha represents pasture/grazing areas that is exposed and grazed in the dry season. This intricate system and its associated parts are all vulnerable to degradation through bank and gully erosion, wave action, overgrazing and land and vegetation clearing.

The establishment of a co-management regime through the participation of resource users is intended to bring favorable ecological conditions within the wetland and its constituent parts and support efforts to reduce stream bank erosion and degradation, reduce grazing pressure, reduce sedimentation and promote protection of reed banks. Hence, the cumulative LDN benefits extend beyond the direct restoration of 500 ha of degraded agricultural land (and the protection benefits from the restoration of 400 ha of evergreen swamp forests). The integrated co-management approach will also facilitate stabilization of stream/river banks (349 ha), reed banks (475 ha) and

The integrated co-management approach will also facilitate stabilization of stream/river banks (349 ha), reed banks (475 ha) and sustainable use of the drawdown pasture/grazing areas (587 ha) of the wetland that are all necessary to maintain the biological, ecological and economic value of the wetland. This makes a net additional benefits of 1,411 ha in addition to the 500 ha degraded agricultural land

restored and 400 ha of degraded evergreen swamp forest restored, making a net benefit of 1,911 ha (excluding the BD benefits of 400 ha of evergreen swamp forest restoration) of LDN benefits. Additionally, during the PPG stage, the project will seek to identify options for enhancing the direct LDN targets through other co-financing sources.

Lastly, according to studies conducted by IUCN, the World Resources Institute as well as case studies curated by the CBD, the global average cost of land restoration ranges from \$300 to \$3,800 per ha based on the local labor and material cost, geographic location and types of ecosystems. The proposed project will invest a total of approximately USD 1.2 million and is expected to provide a cumulative LDN benefit of 1,911 ha as described above. Therefore, the cost of LDN benefit for the project is USD 628 per ha. This is well within the per ha cost range (actually it is on the lower end, which is found to be reasonable).

Please refer Section 4 Page 28 and explanation for the core indicators Table F (page 7) of the PIF.

2 Nov 2020:

Thank you for the additional comments. We have now revised the figure for CI 4 to 1,911 hectares and this will be further reviewed at the PPG stage.

Please refer to CI 4 in table F, Table B (outcome indicator f, page 4) and Annex B (pg.53-58)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes, the incremental reasoning is properly described.

Cleared

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

No

1. Please clarify the cost per hectare of BD benefits as what is presented indicates a high cost per ha.
2. The targets generated through LD funding of 200ha of wetland restoration and 300ha of area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems are extremely low relative to the size of the GEF investment and co-financing. These estimates should be reviewed and revised
3. GHG mitigation estimate also appears low based on the investment. Please review this estimate.
4. Further clarification is required as to why only 30% representation of women as project beneficiaries is determined to be sufficient and reasonable.

10/21/20

1. The agency has clarified the rationale for high estimated cost of BD benefits. We encourage a further reassessing of these and generating more cost effectiveness vis-a-vis activities to BD benefits generated. Please include additional hectareage that will be directly impacted by work under this project. This includes implementation of policy that is supported directly by GEF funds, project co-finance or government expenditures within the period of the project, etc.
2. The LD targets have been increased minimally, and the high operational costs associated with working in this remote area has been explained. If the estimate is accurate, the cost per hectare of generating these benefits calls into question the value of this project relative to other LD FA investments the country might choose to make. Project co-finance or government expenditures directly supportive of project outcomes within the period of the project should also be considered in this estimate. Further revision or justification is required.
3. GHG targets have been increased and a sufficient explanation of these were generated has been provided.
4. Further details on the gender context in the project area has been provided. Given this clarification and the additional plans indicated to include women in project activities, the agency should review and revise this target.

10/27/20

1. Further justification of the Biological value of Tanguar Hoar has been included. While the BD value of this wetland is not in question, as the project will take efforts to promote scaling up of learning from the Tanguar Haor to some or all of the other 13 ECAs in the country, it would seem logical to expect that efforts made to develop policies, share techniques, tools and community approaches, etc with other ECAs would improve their management effectiveness. This in turn should generate an increased estimate of BD results at PIF stage that is then verified during the PPG. Please revise or explain.
2. Per the comment in question four above, we encourage a review of the logic of not increasing indicator 4 results to align with the LDN benefits estimate provided.

3. The gender target increase hasn't been changed in the portal version of the PIF. Please revise indicator 11 in the portal to reflect the increased participation of women referenced in the agency's response.

11/02/20

Indicator results have been revised and are reflected in the portal. We encourage these to be revisited during the PPG phase.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 October 2020:

1. Tanguar Hoar is located in a fragile area where communication is only feasible during the winter season. In such situation, mostly transportation of materials is possible only through waterways (e.g. country boat, speed boat, etc.). That is why operation cost is comparatively higher in Tanguar Hoar than in the plains. At this juncture, we have no clear costs of the proposed activities, which will need to be defined at PPG stage once an assessment is undertaken on the condition of the biodiversity related activities, extent of degradation and options for rehabilitation to determine the most cost effective options.

2. The extent of targets for swamp forest rehabilitation and SLM (rehabilitation of degraded productive lands, including agriculture and crop lands) have been increased to 400 ha and 500 ha respectively. This will be verified during the PPG stage in particular, to identify co-financing from government to further increase these targets

3. GHG target has been increased based on the new extents for wetland swamp forest restoration and SLM. A total of 578,391 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent will be mitigated through the enhanced management of the protected area, sequestration resulting from the restoration activities, and improved practices in the agricultural activities. The relative lower total GHG benefits per investment dollar is due to the land cover in the protected areas (total of 9,727 ha), which is mostly covered with low carbon sequestration potential aquatic vegetation and a water body.

4. In the project area in greater Sylhet district, people are generally conservative and religious in nature. The culturally and politically determined contexts of Sylhet area actually guide women's control over tangible and intangible natural resources that is found to be generally unfavorable. However, during PPG stage effort will be made to identify opportunities to enhance women's participation particularly in tasks that they are more directly engaged in such as homestead development, agroforestry, aquaculture, poultry and duck rearing, fish processing specific livelihood investments directly targeting women. Through, these targeted efforts, we hope to achieve a higher target than 30%, but this will be confirmed following further analysis at the PPG stage. The project will also seek to create women sub-committees, as part of the village institutions so as to focus more direct interventions on women specific needs.

Please refer to: 1) Table F and Annex B (GEF Core Indicators) for new figures on SLM targets & GHG estimate; 2) Refer Section 3 (Pages 36-38) on gender equality and women's empowerment.

UNDP, 23 Oct 2020:

1 Thank you for the comments

11. Thank you for the comments.

The 9,727 ha Tanguar Haor has a unique biological value and was declared a Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar site) in 2000. It meets three of the criteria necessary for its declaration of a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention, namely: (i) a wetland considered internationally important if it supports vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered species or threatened ecological communities; (ii) a wetland that is internationally important if it regularly supports 20,000 or more waterbirds; and (iii) a wetland is considered internationally important if it regularly supports 1% of the individuals in a population of one species or subspecies of waterbird. In 2001, at least 2,500 Baer's Pochard (*Aythya baeri*) (Red List status: Critically Endangered) were estimated, which represents 50% (estimated global population of 5,000) and 90,900 (2002) Ferruginous Pochard (*Aythya nyroca*) (Red List status: Near Threatened) which represent 90% of the global population estimate (100,000) of this species. The protection of this valuable ecosystem is thus unquestionable. The value of the project from a BD perspective, is not considered only from the perspective of restoration of 400 hectares of evergreen swamp forest alone (which is critical for maintaining the biological value of the wetland), but also the establishment of favorable ecological conditions in the wetland through direct co-management by the communities that will ensure restoration/preservation of the biological value of the entire wetland area of 9,727 ha and its constituent parts (that includes 735 ha of existing evergreen swamp forests, 475 ha of reed vegetation, 3,943 ha of aquatic vegetation habitat and riparian areas and 260 ha of seed banks), all of which are the direct BD benefits generated through the project and contribute to maintenance of the biological and ecosystem value of the wetland. During PPG stage, further assessments will be undertaken to identify potential additional habitat restoration work that could be supported with co-financing from the government.

Please refer to Part II Page 9 (biological value), Table 2 (Page 28-29) and notes under Table F of the PIF.

2. Please refer to response to comment in Question 4 above.

4. As suggested, we have increased the participation of women to 50%. In order to achieve this target, at the PPG stage, efforts will be made (through the gender analysis) to identify specific means to enhance women's participation in decision making, enhance women's capacity through specially tailored training programs, livelihood and investments that specifically target women and improving women's representation in project related activities.

Please refer to explanation for core indicator under Table F and Section 3 – Gender equality and women's empowerment (Page 40)

2 Nov 2020:

1. The effort at scaling up is now reflected, including improved management effectiveness in 2-3 ECAs in the country (covering around 3,000 ha) as a result of an effective policy, techniques, tools and participatory approaches developed and tested at Tanguar Haor. The exact extents to be covered (in other ECAs) through the scaling up approach will be defined at PPG stage.

Please refer to CI 1 in Table F and the explanation (page. 7) and Annex B (pg.53-58), Output 3.3 description (pages 27-28)

2. CI 4 has been revised to 1,911 ha as suggested to align to LDN benefits.

Please refer Table F and Annex B.

3. The gender target has been corrected in the Portal.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

No. The initial description of sustainability and scaling up are sufficient but should be further developed in the CEO ER. While the description of innovation touches some novel concepts through private sector partnerships and sustainable financing, further consideration and details on the innovations of the project is required.

10/21/20

A description of innovation has been provided. The agency should explain how this approach and other efforts in Tanguar Haor will be scaled-up for impact beyond a single wetland.

10/27/20

A clearer description of how project innovations will be scaled has been provided. The agency should assess and estimate the benefits that will be generated through the scaling from the Tanguar Haor to other ECAs in the country.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 Oct 2020:

The intent of this approach is to promote and establish a community-decision making and management process for the wetland and is further elaborated in the PIF as suggested.

Please refer to Part II (section 7) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up (p. 29-31) and Table 2 (p.27-28).

UNDP, 23 Oct 2020:

The project will make special effort during the life of the project (in addition to the preparation of a replication and scaling up strategy) to promote scaling up of learning from the Tanguar Haor to other ECAs in the country (covering around 380,000 hectares in 13 ECAs). The GEF project will promote an innovative community ecosystem-based co-management approach to wetland management (as discussed in Section 7 under "Innovation") that is premised on establishing and demonstrating a conservation-oriented natural resource-based economy within and around the wetland and testing sustainable financing mechanisms, with emphasis on private sector partnerships with local communities. This will be a new approach in Bangladesh that will have potential for replication. To facilitate uptake of this intervention to other ECAs in the country, the project will open some of the training opportunities to staff of other ECAs in the country, as well as support study visits and provide technical support to these ECAs as part of the effort to build interest and support for replication. Additionally, the PMU will work with the MOE and local governments to identify sources of government and private sector funding, micro-capital grants and self help groups to initiate and promote replication in other ECAs.

Refer Output 3.3 (Page 27) and Section 7 "Scaling Up" (Pages 32-33)

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Maps have been included but geo-referenced information has not been detailed. Please provide this.

10/21/20

Geo-reference information has now been provided.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 Oct. 2020:

The Tanguar Haor is located in the northeastern part of Bangladesh, between 25°12'10.572" and 25°5'47.989" north latitude; 90°58'49.426" and 91°10'0.018" east longitude.

Please refer to new Maps 1b) which includes the coordinates in the map as well as presented as text – (p. 33 and 34)

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

No. A detailed summary of key stakeholders is provided and a summary of how future stakeholder engagement will take place, but information hasn't been provided on stakeholder engagement to date or a justification of why engagement hasn't occurred. Please provide this.

10/21/20

A justification of why only minimal engagement has occurred as a result of the COVID 19 lockdown has been provided and is sufficient. We expect to see significant stakeholder engagement in the PPG phase to be reflected in the CEO ER.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 Oct 2020:

During the PIF stage, on account of the countrywide lockdown and travel ban due to COVID19 situation extensive consultations were not possible in the Tanguar Haor areas. In this regard, the PIF preparation process was based on secondary information and previously conducted research on community perceptions and opportunities. Additionally, consultations were held with the Department of Environment, GEF Focal Point and local provincial agencies. One visit was undertaken to Tanguar Haor, but due to the rainy season, consultation with the local communities was limited. UNDP Country Office reviewed a number of research studies that assessed community perception regarding the status and resource availability at Tanguar Haor as well as their perception of options for reversing negative trends. In particular, these studies provide the basis for the PIF. Now that the lockdown is being gradually lifted, the Country Office is planning to shortly visit Tanguar Haor for validation of the situation in the Tanguar Haor and develop options for further developing the project at PPG stage.

Please refer Section 2 (p.35)

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

10/06/20

No. While the indicative plans on gender are laid out, very little detail is provided on gender context other than the conservative religious nature of district where the project will take place as a footnote to justify why 30% women representation has been deemed adequate female representation in the project. Without further localized gender context it's difficult to determine if this estimate is reasonable.

10/21/20

As mentioned in response to comment six above, further details on the gender context in the project area and plans for engagement have been provided. Given this, the agency should again review the gender target.

10/27/20

The gender target has been increased. Please ensure this is reflected this in the portal.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 Oct 2020:

Included a discussion on the different roles and access to resources of men and women at the Tanguar Hoar and accordingly key aspects that the PPG will focus on to ensure that men and women have greater responsibility in decision making, access to resources, benefit sharing and investment opportunities.

Please refer to Section 3 (p.36-39)

UNDP, 23 Oct 2020:

As suggested, we have increased the participation of women to 50%. In order to achieve this target, at PPG stage, efforts will be made (through the gender analysis) to identify specific means to enhance women's participation in decision making, enhance women's capacity through specially tailored training programs, livelihood and investments that specifically target women and improving women's representation in project related activities.

13 Oct 2020:

Included a discussion on the different roles and access to resources of men and women at the Tanguar Hoar and accordingly key aspects that the PPG will focus on to ensure that men and women have greater responsibility in decision making, access to resources, benefit sharing and investment opportunities.

Please refer to Section 3 (p.36-39)

2 Nov 2020:

21 OCT 2020.

The revised gender target is corrected in the portal.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

A case for private sector engagement is laid out. It should however be made clear that efforts to combat industrial pollution will be funded through co-financing as these initiatives are outside of GEF BD & LD FA Strategies.

10/21/20

The agency has indicated that GEF resources will not be used to finance industrial pollution abatement.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 Oct 2020:

Due to COVID situation in the country, UNDP CO Team had informal discussions with the private sector, that will be further confirmed during the PPG stage, including consultations with Sylhet Chambers of commerce and Industry and Sylhet Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce and Industry to seek options for financing measures from private sector to combat industrial pollution. GEF resources will not be used to finance industrial pollution abatement

Please refer to section 4 (p.38)

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent

the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Project risks have been presented including measures to mitigate these, but please consider/address the following:

1. COVID 19 has been identified as a risk. In addition to what is provided with regard to this risk, please indicate if the proposed project can help in reducing the risk of emerging infectious diseases in the future, while increasing the resilience of the ecologic and socio-economy systems.
2. While Climate Change is identified as a risk, please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:
 - a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).
 - b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.
 - c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).
 - d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

(STAP publication: <https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>)

10/21/20

1. Covid-19 implications have been built into the design addressed in several sections throughout the PIF. The PIF now contain a complete COVID risk and opportunities analysis.
2. A basic climate risk screening based on available climate data has been included. This will need to be strengthened during the PPG phase.

Cleared

Agency Response

13 Oct 2020:

1. Specific management and mitigation measures to address risks and opportunities provided by Covid19 and potential future pandemic are

now discussed in detail, in terms of potential for slow start-up and change of government priorities and impacts on vulnerable communities, as well as opportunities promoted by the project to reduce vulnerabilities.

Please refer revised Risk 11 in Table 4 (Page 42)

2. The management and mitigation of climate risks are revised in the Risk Table and included in other sections:

Refer revised Risk 7 in table 4 (p.40-41)

(a) Based on available data, the climate projections for the Tanguar Hoar is discussed in the Threat Section including community perceptions of potential impacts, potential mitigation measures and interventions that will form the basis of design of the project interventions during the PPG stage.

(b) Information on projections for Bangladesh are provided. As for the Tanguar Hoar, in particular, there is limited quantifiable information on projections into the future, but anticipated that there will be increase in floods and droughts, river erosion, changes in temperature and rainfall, etc. This is be further investigated at PPG stage

Climate risks are anticipated to cause a decrease in crop production, affect fisheries and fish productivity, loss of forest ecosystem, loss of biodiversity, loss of cultivable land, loss of personal belongings, increases in water borne diseases, etc.

Refer Section on threats –Climate Change impacts (pages 11-12)

(c) At PPG stage further assessments will be undertaken to consider climate change impacts on project activities in short-term and longer-term and to ensure that measures are reflected in project design to support climate-proofing and resilience of project activities and impacts as much as possible. It will also assess institutional capacity and information needs to enhance resilience to potential climate change impacts. Proposed project activities will be screened using the climate screening tool developed by the World Bank and any identified climate change adaptation and mitigation actions for the proposed project activities will be incorporated in the project ESMF. The project design will include specific measures to zone the parts of the wetland for various uses, including creation of fish sanctuaries, swamp forest conservation, various community productive activities such agriculture, agroforestry, conservation of riparian areas so as to enhance resilience through appropriate silvicultural and conservation practices. The sustainable resource management and livelihood activities, will focus to the extent possible on promoting climate-smart agricultural and crop practices, protection of river-wetland connectivity to reduce flooding, forest protection to reduce severity of droughts, prevention of siltation of wetland to ensure water availability, etc

Included in the Risk Table 4 (Risk 7) regarding plans for risk assessment and management at PPG stage (p. 40-41).

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?

Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes. An initial arrangement for coordination of the project has been laid out and is sufficient.

Cleared

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes. Alignment with national strategies and plans, and relevant conventions has been cited

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and

relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations, and contribute to the projects/programs overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes. An initial KM approach has been outlined and is sufficient.

Cleared

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes. An ESS screening template and Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist have been uploaded that identify potential risks and propose measures to address these that will be further developed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

Yes, the project has been endorsed by the GEF OFP as detailed on the GEF database.

Cleared

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/06/20

No. The PIF is not recommended for clearance. Please address the comments provided.

10/21/20

No, the PIF is not recommended. Please address remaining comments.

10/27/20

No, the PIF is not recommended. Please address the remaining comments above. In addition, please revise the tick boxes in section 2 to respond to the following comment:

The PIF mentions that due to COVID19, during the PIF stage, extensive consultations were not possible in the Tanguar Hoar areas and the PIF preparation process was based on secondary information and previously conducted research on community perceptions and opportunities. While the situation is understandable and the PIF foresees ample consultations during the PPG phase, please note that these cannot be considered consultations with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities or civil society organizations. Therefore, please remove the ticks to the boxes in section 2.

11/02/20

All remaining comments have been addressed sufficiently. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Given the effects of the COVID lockdown, it's understandable that the agency was only able to undertake one visit to the Tanguar Haor wetland project site that resulted in limited interaction with local actors. However, it will be critical during PPG to generate more robust estimates of GEBs. The estimates should factor in project impacts on adjoining landscapes, opportunities to scale innovations and learning

to other ECAs, and the results of policy changes among other factors.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/6/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/27/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/2/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

OBJECTIVE AND KEY INTERVENTIONS: Through the “Community-based Management of Tanguar Haor Wetland in Bangladesh (10702), the UNDP seeks \$4,050,913 in GEF financing. The project aims to promote sustainable use of wetland resources by local communities to conserve globally significant biodiversity, improve ecosystem services and secure local livelihoods in Tanguar Haor, Bangladesh. The project is structured around three components: (1) Integrated ecosystem co-management framework for management of Tanguar Haor; (2) Strengthened community management of wetland resources; and (3) Knowledge Management, M&E, Communication and Gender Mainstreaming. Project interventions will further strengthen an integrated ecosystem co-management approach for the Tanguar Haor through appropriate institutional and financial resource arrangements. This will be done through empowering local resource users to manage the wetland resources through co-management arrangements, where local communities take responsibility for managing parts of the wetland. GEF financing of the project is estimated to leverage \$17.2m in co-financing.

CONTEXT, BASELINE, INCREMENTAL REASONING: In the northeast of Bangladesh lies the Tanguar Haor, a unique freshwater wetland ecosystem covering 9,727 hectares, known for its many species of fish and as a staging and over-wintering area for at least half a million migratory birds, supports the lives of the lives of about 60,000 mostly poor inhabitants around its periphery, of which around 95% are dependent on the wetland for their livelihoods through fishing, fish trading, boating and agriculture. The haor basin, within which Tanguar

dependent on the wetland for their livelihoods through fishing, fish trading, boating and agriculture. The haor basin, within which Tanguar Haor sits, was declared a Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar site) in 2000 on account of its rich biodiversity, and its harboring of many nationally and globally threatened species. Growing human population and increasing vulnerabilities

of rural communities to climate change impacts is leading to increased pressures on natural resources, causing widespread degradation of ecosystems through changes in land use and hydrological regimes, over-exploitation and pollution of aquatic and terrestrial habitats, and invasion by alien species, all of which contribute towards the loss of native species diversity.

With the declaration of the haor basin as the country's second RAMSAR site, the government committed to preserve the ecosystem and floral and faunal diversity of the Tanguar Haor. The leasing of the wetland was halted and its management was brought under the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC). As a result, MoEFCC undertook an initiative to establish a community-based management system in Tanguar Haor during a three-phased project (December 2006–August 2016). However, this effort needs substantial strengthening and commitment to strengthen the role of the community in planning and management of the wetland.

The GEF incremental investment will be fundamental to financing the interventions necessary to promote a long-term approach to sustain favorable ecological conditions in Tanguar Haor. GEF financing will support technical assistance, training and best practices to enable specific actions towards effective freshwater evergreen swamp forest conservation and ecological and species restoration, effective conservation and monitoring of threatened species and wetland resource harvest, and the implementation of biodiversity-friendly wetland resource use and livelihood practices as part of a strategy for the conversion and substitution of existing resource use and polluting activities that threaten the biodiversity and ecology of the Tanguar Haor.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT: The project is aligned directly with the provisions of The Bangladesh Environment Conservation Act, 1995 and its 2010 Amendment Act that concerns the declaration and planning of ECAs under the remit of the Department of Environment, along with the Department's mandate to control pollution. The project will contribute significantly to achieving at least half of the 20 national targets identified in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. It will support six national targets of the Sixth National Report to CBD (2019), as well as Bangladesh's voluntary national Land Degradation Neutrality targets to UNCCD. Finally, key relevant national Aichi targets (11, 12, 14, 15, 18) will be supported by the project

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT BENEFITS: GEBs resulting from the project include 13,000 ha of terrestrial protected areas under improved management for conservation and sustainable use; 400ha of land restored; 1,911 ha of landscapes under improved practices, and 578,391 metric tons of CO₂e mitigated. The project will target 3,000 direct beneficiaries.