



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

**PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project**

**TYPE OF TRUST FUND: LDCF**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

|   |  |                              |              |
|---|--|------------------------------|--------------|
| Project Title: Integrating Community-based Adaptation into Afforestation and Reforestation Programmes in Bangladesh |  |                              |              |
| Country(ies):   | Bangladesh   | GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup> | 4700         |
| GEF Agency(ies):  | UNDP   | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 4878         |
| Other Executing Partner(s):   | Ministry of Environment and Forests / Bangladesh Forest Department   | Submission Date:             | Sept 3, 2013 |
| GEF Focal Area (s):   | Climate Change   | Project Duration(Months)     | 48           |
| Name of Parent Program (if applicable):   | n/a  | Agency Fee (\$):             | 565,000      |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul> |                              |              |

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

| Focal Area Objectives      | Expected FA Outcomes   | Expected FA Outputs   | Trust Fund | Grant Amount (\$) | Cofinancing (\$)  |
|----------------------------|--|---|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| CCA-1                      | Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas | Output 1.1.1: Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks  | LDCF       | 700,000           | 8,000,000         |
| CCA-1                      | Outcome 1.3: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas      | Output 1.3.1: Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability | LDCF       | 4,950,000         | 39,000,000        |
| (select)                   |  |   | (select)   |                   |                   |
| (select)                   |  |   | (select)   |                   |                   |
| (select)                   |  |   | (select)   |                   |                   |
| (select)                   |  |   | (select)   |                   |                   |
| (select)                   |  |   | (select)   |                   |                   |
| (select)                   |  |   | (select)   |                   |                   |
| (select)                   |  |   | (select)   |                   |                   |
| (select)                   |  |   | (select)   |                   |                   |
| <b>Total project costs</b> |  |   |            | <b>5,650,000</b>  | <b>47,000,000</b> |
|                            |  |   |            |                   |                   |

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

| <b>Project Objective:</b> Reduce vulnerability of communities to the adverse impacts of climate change through participative design, community-based management and diversification of afforestation and reforestation programmes |                   |   |  |                   |                          |                                   |
|---|-------------------|---|--|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Project Component</b>  | <b>Grant Type</b> | <b>Expected Outcomes</b>  | <b>Expected Outputs</b>  | <b>Trust Fund</b> | <b>Grant Amount (\$)</b> | <b>Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)</b> |
| Integration of community-based adaptation principles and actions into the design and rollout of new and ongoing afforestation programmes  | Inv               | 1. Vulnerability of communities in new afforestation and reforestation sites reduced through diversified livelihood options and more effective greenbelts | <p>1.1 Community-based adaptation and livelihood diversification measures are integrated with baseline afforestation and reforestation activities in 4 districts</p> <p>1.2 Diversified trial plantations of up to 10 mangrove and non-mangrove varieties established in 4 districts to increase the adaptive capacity of greenbelt structures on accreted lands</p>   | LDCF              | 3,240,000                | 35,000,000                        |
| Increasing community participation and involvement in forestry-based adaptation planning  | Inv               | 2. Strengthened community involvement in, and ownership of, forestry-based adaptation and climate risk reduction programmes                               | <p>2.1 Existing systems of participatory natural resource management applied to strengthen the climate resilience of coastal afforestation/reforestation programmes</p> <p>2.2 A forest product benefit sharing agreement between coastal communities and national government is developed and adopted</p> <p>2.3 Awareness and capacity of local communities and government staff to promote coastal greenbelt co-management and benefit sharing improved</p> | LDCF              | 640,000                  | 8,000,000                         |
| Improving Early Warning and disaster preparedness of communities in all afforestation and reforestation sites   | Inv               | 3. Communal livelihood assets in afforestation and reforestation sites are protected from extreme climate   | 3.1 Strengthened CPP network capacity for effective early warning communications for extreme climate events in coastal afforestation sites   | LDCF              | 1,500,000                | 2,000,000                         |

|  |  |  |   |          |                  |                   |
|--|--|--|---|----------|------------------|-------------------|
|  |  | events through effective early warning and preparedness planning | 3.2 Communal livelihood assets in new afforestation and reforestation sites are protected from extreme climate events through dedicated disaster preparedness and risk reduction measures (such as freshwater supply infrastructure, safe havens for livestock and improved drainage) |          |                  |                   |
| Subtotal                                   |  |  |   |          | 5,380,000        | 45,000,000        |
| Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup> |  |  |   | (select) | 270,000          | 2,000,000         |
| <b>Total project costs</b>                 |  |  |   |          | <b>5,650,000</b> | <b>47,000,000</b> |

**C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)**

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

| Sources of Co-financing        | Name of Co-financier (source)                           | Type of Cofinancing | Cofinancing Amount (\$) |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Others (Multidonor Trust Fund) | Bangladesh Climate Change Resilience Fund (BCCRF)       | Grant               | 35,000,000              |
| Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)     | USAID Climate Resilient Ecosystems & Livelihoods (CREL) | Grant               | 10,000,000              |
| GEF Agency                     | UNDP Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme (CDMP) | Grant               | 2,000,000               |
| (select)                       |   | (select)            |                         |
| (select)                       |   | (select)            |                         |
| (select)                       |   | (select)            |                         |
| (select)                       |   | (select)            |                         |
| (select)                       |   | (select)            |                         |
| (select)                       |   | (select)            |                         |
| <b>Total Co-financing</b>      |   |                     | <b>47,000,000</b>       |

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

| GEF Agency | Type of Trust Fund | Focal Area     | Country Name/ Global | (in \$)          |                             |             |
|------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
|            |                    |                |                      | Grant Amount (a) | Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup> | Total c=a+b |
| UNDP       | LDCF               | Climate Change | Bangladesh           | 5,650,000        | 565,000                     | 6,215,000   |
| (select)   | (select)           | (select)       |                      |                  |                             | 0           |
| (select)   | (select)           | (select)       |                      |                  |                             | 0           |
| (select)   | (select)           | (select)       |                      |                  |                             | 0           |
| (select)   | (select)           | (select)       |                      |                  |                             | 0           |
| (select)   | (select)           | (select)       |                      |                  |                             | 0           |

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

|                              |          |          |  |           |         |           |
|------------------------------|----------|----------|--|-----------|---------|-----------|
| (select)                     | (select) | (select) |  |           |         | 0         |
| (select)                     | (select) | (select) |  |           |         | 0         |
| (select)                     | (select) | (select) |  |           |         | 0         |
| (select)                     | (select) | (select) |  |           |         | 0         |
| <b>Total Grant Resources</b> |          |          |  | 5,650,000 | 565,000 | 6,215,000 |

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

| <b>Component</b>           | <b>Grant Amount (\$)</b> | <b>Cofinancing (\$)</b> | <b>Project Total (\$)</b> |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| International Consultants  | 47,375                   |                         | 47,375                    |
| National/Local Consultants | 162,075                  |                         | 162,075                   |

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The fundamental climate change-induced problem that the project seeks to address remains unchanged, namely to ensure that coastal afforestation in Bangladesh realises its full adaptive potential by addressing key underlying drivers of coastal greenbelt degradation and loss. However, the baseline projects and the problem that LDCF-financing seeks to address have undergone some change.

The baseline projects presented at the PIF stage were: ‘Poverty Reduction through Social Afforestation’ programme; Resilient Participatory Afforestation and Reforestation Project (CRPARP) financed through Bangladesh Climate Change Resilience Fund (BCCRF); and Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme (CDMP).

However, the baseline projects have changed to the following: Resilient Participatory Afforestation and Reforestation Project (CRPARP) financed through Bangladesh Climate Change Resilience Fund (BCCRF); Comprehensive Disaster

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

Management Programme (CDMP); and USAID-funded Climate Resilient Ecosystems and Livelihoods Programme (CREL).

The justification for the change is presented below:

During the course of project preparation it became clear that far greater adaptation benefits could be generated by aligning the project with the recently-approved BCCRF Climate Resilient Participatory Afforestation and Reforestation Project (CRPARP), which is to be implemented by the Bangladesh Forest Department (BFD)/ Ministry of Environment and Forest (MoEF), than by seeking to complement Poverty Alleviation through Social Forestry. This decision by the MoEF was based on the following reasons.

First, while the BCCRF project has taken on board some of the important lessons arising from the first LDCF project (see Annex B, Response to Council Comments), it continues to focus primarily on establishing new greenbelts rather than on the longer-term management of the greenbelts. A good indication of this is the fact that only 10% of the US\$ 35 million budget is allocated for alternative and additional livelihood opportunities to reduce anthropogenic pressures on the coastal forests and that even smaller fraction of the budget for enrichment planting. Diversification of mangrove greenbelts is viewed purely as a means to enhance the natural resilience of coastal forests rather than as strategy to generate multiple benefits, including tangible benefits for local communities. The MoEF concluded that the livelihood diversification strategies and enrichment plantations that are currently envisaged in the BCCRF financed CRPAR project are not sufficient to address the underlying causes of anthropogenic pressure, and thus LDCF finance can greatly increase the overall adaptive value of the \$35million baseline investments. Closely aligned timing of the CRPAR project and LDCF projects also presented an additional advantage in integrating the climate-resilience principle of LDCF investments into the baseline, as opposed to the Poverty Alleviation through Social Forestry Project which will end in December 2013.

Second, the CRPAR project will be undertaking afforestation over 5,700 ha of newly accreted lands, including 5,000 ha in the some of the most vulnerable coastal districts. In contrast, the targets of the Poverty Alleviation through Social Forestry Project included only 300 ha of afforestation on newly accreted Char land and 50 ha of second rotation afforestation on existing Char lands to fill gaps that have emerged after the initial plantation, with the remainder of afforestation primarily along main roads, feeder roads, railways and embankments. This essentially means that the additional adaptive benefits that LDCF resources will bring in would be greater by an order of magnitude if the project builds on the CRPAR project, rather than spreading resources thinly across the CRPAR project and the Social Forestry project.

As noted above, the underlying climate-change induced problem that needs to be addressed in relation to coastal afforestation and reforestation in Bangladesh remains unchanged. As climate risks intensify, coastal greenbelts will become an increasingly critical first line of defence against climate change impacts. However, in order to achieve the long-term sustainability of Bangladesh's coastal greenbelt, it is essential to integrate both the creation of alternative and additional livelihood opportunities and new climate resilient planting practices into coastal afforestation programmes in a mutually reinforcing manner. Therefore, MoEF has decided during the project preparation phase that LDCF investments should be used to complement and enhance the adaptive value of the new CRPAR investments in the coastal zone as on their own, these will not be sufficient to address the underlying causes of coastal forest degradation and loss and will therefore perpetuate the 'business as usual' scenario of coastal afforestation in Bangladesh.

Another change from the PIF stage was the inclusion of the USAID-funded Climate Resilient Ecosystems and Livelihoods Programme (CREL) in the baseline projects. A thorough baseline assessment revealed that USAID has an extensive experience, through the past Nishorgo, MACH and IPAC projects, in supporting the design and implementation of community-based natural resources management and benefit-sharing agreements and that through the new CREL project they are continuing their support. Within the context of introducing a benefit-sharing agreement into coastal forests, which is the first endeavor in the country, the MoEF concluded that the LDCF resources should be built on the extensive experience that USAID has amassed in the last 10 years in this area. Apart from leveraging the their experience, the partnership with the CREL project offers an entry point through which lessons from the LDCF project, such as know-hows in better stewardship of coastal forests or improved understanding of the types of tangible

benefits from more mature, diversified forests, can be shared with the vast network of Co-Management Committees that are assisted in the CREL project.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

There is no change to the additional cost reasons. However, as noted above in A.4, the baseline project into which the LDCF project will be integrating community-based adaptation and livelihood diversification measures is MoEF's new CRPAR project and not its earlier Poverty Alleviation through Social Forestry Project as proposed at the PIF stage.

Also the number of the target districts was presented as 19 at the PIF stage. This was based on Due to this change in baseline project, the number of target districts and upazilas has been reduced from the earlier 19 districts and 20 upazilas as CRPAR project will only be working in nine coastal districts and undertaking afforestation and reforestation in four of these. Thus, the LDCF project will be targeting the same four districts where CRPAR project is undertaking coastal afforestation and reforestation. The scope of the LDCF project and the scale of intended benefits remains unchanged, however. If, anything project impact and benefits may well be greater than by working with the original baseline project, given that the CRPAR project intends to undertake afforestation over a significantly larger area of newly accreted lands and significant increase in efficiency of delivering benefits can be expected within more concentrated target areas. Additionally, as the CRPAR project will be implemented in parallel with the LDCF project, there is far greater potential for creating synergies as well as replication and scale up of LDCF project results, particularly through regular exchange and collaboration with the Aranayk Foundation, which will be implementing the alternative livelihoods component of the CRPAR project.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Most of risks identified during the PIF stage are still valid. However, after detailed assessments of stakeholder capacity, baseline stakeholder assessment resulted in a refined set of risks, summarized in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Project Risk Log**

| # | Description   | Impact & Probability | Countermeasures / Management Response   | Owner           |
|---|---|----------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1 | Inadequate co-ordination among key stakeholders may impact project implementation   | P = 1<br>I = 4       | Detailed delineation of roles and responsibilities for all key stakeholders to be engaged in the project is outlined and agreed in the project document and will be ensured through national steering committee, project board and field level coordination committees.   | Project manager |
| 2 | Implementation of some adaptive options may be hampered due to lack of coherence in national policies around land tenure issues | P = 3<br>I = 4       | <p>Though the first LDCF project has created avenues to ensure access to accreted coastal lands for vulnerable populations and helped the GoB to issue a Government Order in this regard, these are still not well reflected in national policies. Within the first LDCF project's life, a new law addressing this issue is expected to be vetted by the government.</p> <p>During the course of the first LDCF project, the issue pertaining to land availability was one of the major challenges. However, MoEF's strong commitment to the project results and UNDP's continuous support/negotiations to relevant government agencies (especially Ministry of Land) ensured that sufficient allocation of lands for project activities. While the same commitment can be expected in the proposed LDCF project, land scarcity is inherent in Bangladesh and continues to be real.</p> <p>In addition, a new project (expected to be operational by end of 2013) is currently under formulation by UNDP CO to specifically</p> | Project manager |

| # | Description  | Impact & Probability | Countermeasures / Management Response  | Owner           |
|---|--|----------------------|--|-----------------|
|   |  |                      | address all policy conflicts related to natural resource management in Bangladesh.   |                 |
| 3 | Formal recognition of Forest Resource Management Groups by government  | P = 2<br>I = 3       | Though there are currently similar groups available in inland forests, introduction of comparable community-based institutions in coastal forests is a new endeavor. Moreover, these institutions need to be adapted to the coastal context. The project proponent's efforts during the project preparatory phase to establish a formal partnership with USAID's CREL project and the CBACC project was precisely to overcome this risk by leveraging the former's extensive experience on forming such groups elsewhere and the latter's experience of working in coastal Bangladesh  | Project manager |
| 4 | Delay in the introduction of benefit sharing arrangements in coastal forests   | P = 2<br>I = 5       | There are already provisions for benefit sharing arrangements in participatory forest in Bangladesh. Lessons learned from these mechanisms will be explored to devise an agreed benefit sharing arrangement between government and local communities.  | Project Manager |
| 5 | Delay in project implementation due to uncertain political environment may lead to slow project delivery   | P = 2<br>I = 5       | Currently there is uncertainty around the national election process and transition to the next government. UNDP CO will closely observe the political situation to find the suitable time to initiate and operationalize the project.  | UNDP CO         |
| 6 | Existing power dynamics at the local level prevents adequate adaptive benefits to be delivered to the most vulnerable (as identified in the UNDP Environmental and Social Screening Procedure)                         | P = 2<br>I = 4       | <p>This is one of the very dimensions of the underlying causes of vulnerability for coastal communities that the project will address.</p> <p>The establishment of FRMGs will provide a platform for vulnerable community members to express their concerns and in turn CMCs will provide an equal footing for them to discuss issues related to coastal forest resources with government agencies, local elites, and NGOs.</p> <p>However, the challenge of altering the deeply-rooted power dynamics is acknowledged and the project has earmarked budget to carry out an assessment in early Year 3 of the project implementation to gauge the effectiveness of beneficiary targeting as well as qualitative assessment on the empowerment of these vulnerable groups in FRMGs and CMCs.</p>  | Project Manager |
| 7 | High staff turnover in Bangladesh Forest Department affects continuity of, and support for, project activities, particularly at field level in terms of transfer of Divisional Forest Officers and other key personnel | P=3<br>I=3           | Institutional memory loss will be reduced through several project strategies. First the project approach involves building on strong relationships with key government stakeholders in different sectors at the local level, including the relevant departments of the Ministry of Land, Agriculture and Water Resources amongst others as well as with a range of development partners and CBOs. These community development associates and CBOs will act as a bridge to maintain continuity where there is change in local BFD officials. Furthermore, the Co-Management Committees established at upazila level will also act as a repository of institutional memory that can be easily shared with new BFD officials. Additionally, a key legacy of the CBACC project is that is generated considerable awareness within BFD generally about the need and options for strengthening the resilience of coastal green belts. Thus, there is higher probability that incoming officers will already be familiar with the approaches tested under CBACC. Most will also be familiar with Bangladesh's experiences of co-management through various USAID projects. Thus, they will only have to learn the specific details of this project's interventions. However, every individual is different and the project team will have to invest in developing good relations whenever there is any change of key BFD staff in the target project areas. | Project Manager |
| 8 | Inertia among key stakeholders,  | P=2<br>I=5           | The project will build on and continue to strengthen the high political and public visibility that has already been created by   | Project Manager |

| # | Description   | Impact & Probability | Countermeasures / Management Response   | Owner |
|---|---|----------------------|---|-------|
|   | particularly government and communities, limits adoption of a more proactive and diversified approach to climate risk management strategies |                      | CBACC for community-based adaptation and livelihood-support activities in the coastal zone through media reports, videos, ministerial communications and other means of dissemination. Dissemination of project successes and lessons will be used as a mechanism to provide positive feedback to the government officials and local communities involved to further motivate them to remain or become engaged. The CBACC's project's achievements will also be used to demonstrate the potential benefits of some of the new approaches proposed in this project. Last but not least, the strategic partnership with CREL, will also help mitigate this risk, given USAID's extensive experience of anticipating and addressing these kinds of problems when working with government agencies and local communities. |       |

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

N/A



## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

### **B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.**

A wide range of stakeholders will be involved in the project, tailored to the specific needs of the three project components. A crucial component of PPG activities was to consult on the detailed design of stakeholder engagement, which is outlined below. Key stakeholders to be engaged include a range of government line ministries to implement and support the project implementation, NGOs, civil society, and local communities including some of their interest/community groups. In general, stakeholder engagement in the project implementation begins at the inception workshop, which will be held in the capital. Government departments, NGOs/CSOs and citizens will be invited to the workshop, and the focus of the project, the timing of site visits and stakeholder consultations, types and nature of adaptation investments, and expectations from stakeholders engaged will be (re)presented. During the first visit to the target sites, site-level inception workshop will be organized in each district covering the same topics.

Each component of the project has its own stakeholder groups:

Outcome 1 will be delivered through the Forest Department who will be responsible for delivering all Outcome 1 activities, deploy staff in the various activities during project implementation and report on activities and expenditure.

The activities are to complement the community resilience component of the BCCRF Project of World Bank. The Project will also engage other relevant government Department and NGOs to implement livelihood diversification activities under this component. Forest Resource Management Groups (FRMGs) will be the main interface for the project staff at the site level; fishers, farmers, women and youth will be the main direct beneficiaries from the forest dependent communities, although the project is expected to permeate all segments of the communities.

Total beneficiaries targeted through this outcome for alternative climate-resilient livelihoods diversification is 10,500 households. Moreover, FD with advice from BFRI will implement 650 hectares of mixed species model plantation where the community will be involved in the form of labour, nursery raising and patrolling guards, as and when required.

Outcome 2 will be delivered through the MoEF with on-the-ground assistance from the FD. These agencies are all central to embedding the project's interventions into existing legal and regulatory framework for forest management. On the site level, the main stakeholders include the communities themselves, the local forest dependent community groups and relevant NGOs which will act as a service provider related to the training, capacity building and awareness raising Output of the Component.

There will be 40 Forest Resource Management Groups (100 – 150 users in a group) formed under this component. Several trainings will be organized for these groups including leadership, participatory planning and management, sustainable harvest of forestry resources, etc. Moreover, with representation from the FRUGs, 5 CMCs will also be formed in 5 upazilas (remaining 2 upazilas has the CMCs already with support from first LDCF project) to support co-management of forestry resources. Training and capacity building works are planned for the committees. Development of the NTFP based benefit sharing model will be generated out of the CMC engagement.

Outcome 3 will be delivered through the MoEF while working closely with the Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief and its Cyclone Preparedness Programme (CPP) and Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme (CDMP) Phase II. On the site level, the project will work closely with the CPP Volunteer Network and the officials from relevant government departments at district and upazila level e.g. District Relief and Rehabilitation Officer (DRRO), upazila level Project Implementation Officer (PIO), Upazila Agriculture Officer, Fisheries Officer, Livestock Officer, etc. This will necessarily include regular consultations with communities through community meetings to seek views and ensure clear dialogue. The project Output focusing on the protection of communal livelihood assets (Output 3.2) will focus more on the construction of raised earthen platform for livestock, improvement of tubewells, wells and ponds to ensure safe drinking water during extreme events.

There is large number of cyclone shelters not having any shelter for communal assets including livestock. The project has planned construction of 10 earthen raised platform and ponds which will serve around 10,000 persons taking refuge

in the shelters during cyclone. The output will consider drainage improvement for 25 km earthen embankment, that has eroded and often overtopped, and 150 safe water sources to the community.

Informal stakeholder engagement may take place at any time and any location within the operational terms and guidelines set out by the project at start of implementation. All activities on the site level will be carried out through the assistance of the Forest Department (FD) with support from Department of Fisheries (DoF), Department of Livestock (DoL), Department of Agriculture Extension (DAE), Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO)'s office.

These are the official conduits for all site level activities and working through these channels will ensure smooth implementation and cooperation from local leaders. On the site level Union Parishad representatives will be integral to all interventions. The communities, and particularly the FRMGs comprised of fishers, farmers, women, youth and elders, will be involved in all decision-making through regular meetings. The project intends to run regular meetings incorporating educational videos, the outcomes of the participatory monitoring videos and other mechanisms to stimulate discussions and derive steering for the project. This will ensure that the interventions remain in touch with community stakeholder aspirations at all stages of the project. In addition, events that are designed to promote information sharing about the adaptation effectiveness of investments, such as annual events to demonstrate National Environment Day, Disaster Risk Reduction Day, are expected to provide additional stakeholder engagement benefits. In Bangladesh, due to its unique geographical circumstances, workshops and training activities in the site level are a vital opportunity not only for the sake of capacity building, but also for exchanging information across the sites and maintaining the engagement throughout the course of the project. Those workshops and training activities that will be undertaken through the project lifetime are shown below in Table 1. Inevitably, due to the logistical challenge, some of the workshops/trainings will be jointly organized with multiple objectives covering different elements of the three Components.

**TABLE 2 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT WORKSHOPS AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES**

| <b>Outcome/<br/>Outputs</b> | <b>Title</b>   | <b>Timing</b>                                 | <b>Objective</b>  | <b>Location</b>                   | <b>Target Participants</b>  |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| All                         | Initial formal meeting with all relevant stakeholders            | Year 1 (Inception for the following 6 months) | Establishing the presence of the project                          | Dhaka and all Project Districts   | Gov't policy and decision makers, NGOs, Local govt officials, all community   |
| Outcome 1                   | Alternative adaptation options for forest dependent households   | Year 1 – 3                                    | Household capacity building for adaptation (10,500 households)    | 7 upazilas                        | Project beneficiary households  |
| Outcome 2                   | Local institutions development and capacity building             | Year 2 – 4                                    | Capacity building of 40 Forest Resource Management Groups (FRMGs) | 7 upazilas                        | FRMG members with special emphasis on women (targeting 33% <sup>5</sup> )     |
| Outcome 2                   | Co-Management Committee (CMC) formation and capacity development | Year 1 – 4                                    | Capacity building of 5 Co-Management Committee (CMC)              | 7 upazilas                        | CMC members with special emphasis on women (targeting 33%)                    |
| Outcome 2                   | Forest resource benefit sharing mechanism                        | Year 2 – 4                                    | Workshops at Local, Regional and National level                   | Upazila, District, National Level | Relevant stakeholders at Users/7 Upazila level (700 participants), 4 District |

<sup>5</sup> This target follows what was adopted in USAID's initiatives in promoting similar groups  
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-December 2012.doc

| Outcome/<br>Outputs | Title                                | Timing     | Objective                          | Location                               | Target Participants  |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
|                     |                                      |            |                                    |  | Level (600 participants), 1 national Level (200 Participants)  |
| Outcome 3           | Volunteers training on CC adaptation | Year 2     | Train CPP volunteers including TOT | 6 Upazilas (no volunteer in 1 upazila) | 6,000 volunteers in the project upazilas (60% of the 10,000 existing volunteers)                       |
| All                 | Lessons Learnt Workshop              | Year 3 & 4 | Share Lessons from the project     | Dhaka                                  | 2 workshops with relevant govt officials, policy makers, CSOs, universities and research organizations |

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Coastal greenbelts perform multiple functions. A thick mangrove forest belt along the coastal zone can greatly reduce the impacts of cyclones, high winds and storm surges, particularly in the more exposed parts of the delta. Mangroves also trap sediment and contribute to new land accretion (thereby countering trends in erosion and sea level rise) as well as providing a range of other valuable ecosystem services, such improved productivity of local fisheries and the provision of fuel, fibre, fodder and other products.

Engaging with community-based afforestation and disaster risk reduction measures, community members in each vulnerable target district will not only benefit directly from cash-for-work and seeds-for-work approaches applied by the baseline project, but also from climate change adaptation benefits that persist long after project completion. At the local level, communities will benefit from increased resilience to climate related disasters through timely reception of early warning information; improved access to natural capital, such as forest, food and fiber plots, aquaculture ponds and livestock rearing facilities; improved human capital through involvement in forestry-related and non-forestry-related training activities in climate risk management; improved access to physical capital through climate-proofing of communal infrastructure; and improved financial and political capital as a result of greater community mobilization through Co-Management Committees and an innovative benefit-sharing agreement for coastal forests. These activities will enhance human security to climate change and increase the number of local economic and social development opportunities.

Similar to the benefits communities are deriving from Bangladesh's first NAPA follow-up project (CBACC), both men and women will be engaged in nursery and forest management activities. For example, engagement of women in the project activities in two districts of Barguna and Bhola recorded 46.37% and 42.6%, respectively, and activities that render land ownership and resilient income generation activities involved more than 40% women beneficiaries in all project sites. The same principle and strategy of mobilization of women, encouragement, and preferential selection into project activities, all of which run through the CBACC project will be adopted in the proposed project intervention.

More specifically, through a series of investments and technical assistance envisaged across three Outcomes of the proposed project, it will deliver tangible adaptive benefits to:

- 10,500 households (or approximately 50,000 individuals) through diversified alternative livelihood strategies in coastal afforestation/reforestation sites

- 500 households through the FFF model
- 2,500 households through resilient agricultural techniques and crop varieties
- 2,500 households through diversified livelihood support specifically targeting fishing households
- 2,500 households through diversified/resilient livestock rearing practices
- 2,500 households through other innovative resilient livelihood strategies such as apiculture and honey processing, seedbeds nursery, floating vegetable cultivation, cultivation and marketing of flowers
- 2,500 individuals (or 50% of the total members of Forest Resource Management Groups) obtain access to coastal forest benefits through benefit-sharing agreement
- 6,000 CPP volunteers are trained on climate change induced disasters and DRR benefits of coastal greenbelts
- Approximately 21,000 individuals through protection of communal livelihood assets
  - 5,000 individuals' livelihoods safeguarded through installation of drainage facilities through coastal embankments
  - 15,000 individuals' livestock find safe havens through construction of killas (raised earthen platforms) next to evacuation shelters
  - 200 households through improvement/climate-proofing of freshwater infrastructure

At national level, socioeconomic benefits will be enhanced through the integration of community-based approaches into ongoing and planned afforestation and reforestation frameworks and investment programmes. A forest product benefit sharing agreement between government and local communities (under Outcome 2) will ensure that there are economic incentives for the management and nurturing of new greenbelt plantations. By promoting active community engagement across all Outcomes, this project will improve public ownership, reduce conflict and create a culture of integrated land and resource management. This will address the need for greater community engagement outlined in the Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan.

Finally, through engagement and training of community-based organisations, the project will develop institutional capacity at the local level, which will support communities' political engagement, advocacy and participation in participatory, forward-looking risk management. This will greatly be assisted by UNDP's long-standing track record working with CBOs in the project areas on a variety of livelihood support and disaster management tasks.

### B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Several alternative options for achieving the intended Project Objective and Outcomes were considered before finalizing the proposed Project Strategy. These included the following:

a) Relocation was considered and immediately ruled out given Bangladesh's high coastal population density and acute land shortages.

b) Hard infrastructure to protect lives and livelihoods such as coastal embankments. This option was deemed less cost effective for a number of reasons. As described earlier under Outcome 3 (Section 2.4) building 1 km of embankment with proper drainage facilities costs approximately \$230,000/km. In other words, building protective coastal embankment infrastructure in seven upazilas in four districts would cost many times more than the entire budget for this project. Indeed, at this cost, the project budget would only stretch to cover 24 km of new embankment. Furthermore, as seen earlier, embankments alone are unlikely to provide sufficient protection to vulnerable communities in coastal Bangladesh due to the country's highly dynamic coastlines that result in land accretion on the seaward side of embankments, prompting many to move to these highly exposed areas due to acute land shortage and other socioeconomic pressures.

c) The third alternative that was considered was to continue with the status quo, i.e. rely on coastal greenbelts and existing embankments for protection against extreme climate events. This option offers a combination of both 'hard' and 'soft', or rather natural, infrastructure that enables the GoB to protect communities outside embankments with greater flexibility. However, the last 50 years of the GoB's experience in extensive afforestation and reforestation

programs have amply demonstrated the deep-rooted difficulties of relying solely on this approach. Most importantly, this approach fails to sufficiently address the many underlying causes of vulnerability among coastal communities and the drivers of coastal deforestation. Unless such drivers are addressed as an integral element of ongoing afforestation/reforestation programmes, the natural coastal greenbelt will continue to lose its integrity and effectiveness as a natural protective buffer.

After considering these alternatives to achieve the same objective, it was concluded that the approach proposed in this proposal is most cost-effective as it leverages major on-going baseline investments on coastal afforestation, community participation in natural resource management and community-based early warning systems to deliver a more integrated, effective and sustainable solution to coastal adaptation in Bangladesh. The project thus involves a carefully planned mix of 'soft' and low-cost infrastructural solutions to managing climate risks that are complementary to each other and to the existing baseline. 'Soft' interventions include targeted capacity development to increase local livelihood resilience and stewardship of local forests; building new synergies between key actors in the coastal zone to promote more strategic and efficient use of resources, and changing the local incentive structure that currently contributes to coastal forest degradation. Livelihood diversification, low-cost infrastructural investments and expanded early warning systems for extreme weather events, which will strengthen local resilience, have each been explicitly linked to improved stewardship of local coastal forests, which will further increase local adaptive capacity.

A major difference between the proposed approach and alternative approaches is that the project's strong emphasis on capacity development and empowerment of vulnerable communities through multiple strategies that will be far more effective to in terms of increasing overall adaptive capacity in the long run rather than relying solely on hard or soft infrastructural solutions. Additionally, the close relationship with the LDCF-funded CBACC and the project's strategic partnerships with CRPAR project, USAID and CDMP-II is already generating numerous synergies that are likely to continue through the course of project implementation and contribute further to the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project approach. For example, the natural infrastructure established by CBACC, i.e. the new areas of afforestation and the diversified plantations, as well as the relationship established with BFRI (and other key partners) will directly benefit activities undertaken in this project under Outputs 1.2 and 2.2 in particular and reduce the time spent in searching for appropriate sites and building new relationships. Similarly, CDMP-II's agreement to conduct follow-up trainings to CPP volunteers, not only enhances the baseline capacity of the volunteers (which tends to be weak with just one one-off training) but also presents an important delivery vehicle for project to link disaster preparedness with the coastal greenbelts more tangibly and explicitly under Output 3.1. These synergies are being realised because UNDP is supporting both projects and sees value in doing this. The project will also build on existing capacity development approaches and materials developed by USAID to deliver Output 2.3 in particular, while both CRPAR project and CDMP-II beneficiary selection criteria will form the basis for beneficiary selection in this project.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

The project will be monitored through the following M&E activities. The M&E budget is provided in the table below. The M&E framework set out in the Project Results Framework in Part III of this project document is aligned with the AMAT and UNDP M&E frameworks.

#### **Project Start**

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 3 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The **Inception Workshop** should address a number of key issues including:

Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis-à-vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and

responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.

Based on the project results framework and the LDCF related AMAT set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document, and finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.

Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.

Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.

Plan and schedule PB meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PB meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An **Inception Workshop report** is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

#### **Quarterly:**

Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.

Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).

Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.

Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

#### **Annually:**

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)

Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).

Lesson learned/good practice.

AWP and other expenditure reports

Risk and adaptive management

ATLAS QPR

#### **Periodic Monitoring through site visits:**

UNDP CO and the UNDP GEF region based staff will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

#### **Mid-term of project cycle**

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation expected to be in May 2015. The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for

enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The LD/SCCF AMAT as set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document) will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

### End of Project

An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PB meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP-GEF guidance. The terminal evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term review, if any such correction took place). The terminal evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The LD/SCCF AMAT as set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document) will also be completed during the terminal evaluation cycle. The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response, which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

### Learning and knowledge sharing:

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. There will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

### Audit:

The Project will be audited in accordance with UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies

### M&E workplan and budget

| Type of M&E activity  | Responsible Parties  | Budget US\$<br><i>Excluding project team staff time</i>         | Time frame  |
|---|--|---|---|
| Inception Workshop and Report   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Manager</li> <li>▪ PMU</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF</li> </ul>  | Indicative cost: \$5,000  | Within first two months of project start up   |
| Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members</li> <li>▪ PMU</li> </ul> | To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.                | Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required. |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oversight by Project Manager</li> <li>▪ PMU</li> <li>▪ Implementation teams</li> </ul>  | To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. | Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans                |
| ARR/PIR   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Manager</li> <li>▪ PMU</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RTA</li> </ul>  | None  | Annually  |

| Type of M&E activity   | Responsible Parties   | Budget US\$<br><i>Excluding project team staff time</i>              | Time frame   |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP EEG</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| Periodic status/ progress reports  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Manager and team</li> </ul>  | None   | Quarterly  |
| Mid-term Evaluation  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Manager</li> <li>▪ PMU</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>  | Indicative cost:<br>\$29,000   | At the mid-point of project implementation.                    |
| Terminal Evaluation  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Manager</li> <li>▪ PMU</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>  | Indicative cost :<br>\$43,250  | At least three months before the end of project implementation |
| Synthesis of major achievements & Lessons learned report   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ BFD</li> <li>▪ CMCs/FRMGs</li> <li>▪ Key Project Cofinancing Partners (BCCRF CRPARP /USAID CREL /CDMP)</li> <li>▪ UNDP-GEF RCU</li> </ul> | \$10,000   |  |
| Audit  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ Project Manager</li> <li>▪ PMU</li> </ul>   | Indicative cost per year: \$3,000 (\$12,000 total)                   | Yearly   |
| Visits to field sites  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate)</li> <li>▪ Government representatives</li> </ul>  | For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget | Yearly for UNDP CO; as required by UNDP RCU                    |
| <b>TOTAL indicative COST</b><br>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses |   | US\$ 99,250<br>(+/- 5% of total budget)                              |  |




**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**  
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

| NAME           | POSITION  | MINISTRY                          | DATE (MM/dd/yyyy) |
|----------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Mesbah ul Alam | Secretary | MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & FORESTS | 09/12/2011        |
|                |           |                                   |                   |
|                |           |                                   |                   |

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

| Agency Coordinator, Agency Name   | Signature   | Date (Month, day, year) | Project Contact Person   | Telephone    | Email Address          |
|---|---|-------------------------|--|--------------|------------------------|
| Adriana Dinu, Officer-in-Charge, and Deputy Executive Coordinator, UNDP/GEF |  | Sept 3, 2013            | Yusuke Taishi<br>Regional Technical Specialist<br>-<br>LECRDS,<br>UNDP | +66819493997 | yusuke.taishi@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).

|  | Indicator   | Baseline  | End of Project Targets  | Source of verification   | Risks and Assumptions  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Project Objective<sup>6</sup></b></p> <p>Reduce vulnerability of communities to the adverse impacts of climate change through participative design, community-based management and diversification of afforestation and reforestation programmes</p> | <p>Differential survival rate of new coastal mangrove plantations with and without associated integrated livelihood diversification support</p> <p>% of community members (gender disaggregated) who feel 'ownership' of coastal mangrove forest resources measured through change in score obtained through simplified adaptation of Knowledge, Attitude &amp; Practices (KAP) survey method</p> | <p>There is no linking of coastal afforestation /reforestation with livelihood support</p> <p>'Ownership' will be defined in the process of adapting KAP methodology for monitoring this indicator. A gender-disaggregated baseline will be established during the inception phase of the project</p> | <p>The survival rate of mangrove forests linked to livelihood support in CRPAR project afforestation sites is at least 15% higher than in afforestation sites without linked livelihood support</p> <p>30% improvement in the sense of ownership towards coastal mangrove resources</p> | <p>Periodic monitoring</p> <p>PIR report<sup>7</sup></p> <p>MTR<sup>8</sup></p> <p>TE<sup>9</sup></p> <p>Administration of KAP survey</p> <p>MTR</p> <p>TE</p> | <p><u>Risks</u></p> <p>Survival rate of new coastal plantations in BCCRF sites is negatively impacted by non-anthropogenic factors or other new threats not addressed in the project</p> <p>Economic shocks and/or, environmental disasters further aggravate local poverty and vulnerability making it much more difficult or impossible to alter existing incentive structure that currently leads to coastal forest degradation and loss or to increase local ownership of coastal mangrove plantations</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Livelihood support in target project sites combined with</p> |

<sup>6</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

<sup>7</sup> Annual UNDP-GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR)

<sup>8</sup> Mid-Term Review (MTR)

<sup>9</sup> End of project Terminal Evaluation (TE)

|  | Indicator   | Baseline   | End of Project Targets   | Source of verification  | Risks and Assumptions  |
|--|---|--|--|-------------------------|--|
|  |   |  |  |                         | benefits from forests will be sufficient to alter underlying incentive structure that currently results in degradation and loss of coastal mangrove plantation   |
| <p><b>Outcome 1</b><sup>10</sup></p> <p>Vulnerability of communities in new afforestation and reforestation sites reduced through diversified livelihood options and more effective greenbelts</p> | % of targeted households that have adopted resilient livelihoods under existing and projected climate change [AMAT 1.3.1.1] | Currently, livelihood strategies are not meaningfully integrated into coastal afforestation / reforestation programs, reducing the resilience of both livelihoods and coastal forest resources | At least 70% of 10,500 target households living adjacent to BCCRF coastal afforestation / reforestation sites have adopted resilient livelihoods introduced in the project | PIR Report<br>MTR<br>TE | <p><u>Risks</u></p> <p>Slow local uptake of new knowledge and skills results in slow rate of adoption of resilient livelihoods</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Local elite capture of livelihood diversification support and other related social conflicts are effectively addressed</p> <p>Livelihood diversification strategies introduced by the project generate enough benefit for local communities to be prepared to take on greater responsibility for the stewardship of coastal mangrove plantations</p> |

<sup>10</sup> All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.  
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-December 2012.doc

|   | Indicator  | Baseline   | End of Project Targets   | Source of verification  | Risks and Assumptions   |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Outputs Supporting Outcome 1</b>   |  |  |  |   |   |
| 1.1. Community-based adaptation and livelihood diversification measures are integrated with baseline afforestation and reforestation activities in 4 districts                            |  |  |  |   |   |
| 1.2. Diversified trial plantations of up to 10 mangrove and non-mangrove varieties established in 4 districts to increase the adaptive capacity of greenbelt structures on accreted lands |  |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Outcome 2</b><br><br>Strengthened community involvement in, and ownership of, forestry-based adaptation and climate risk reduction programmes  | Regulatory reform and fiscal incentive structures introduced that incorporate climate change risk management [AMAT 1.1.1.3]  | Currently there is no regulatory mechanism in place to provide sufficient incentives, through the security of future stream of benefits, to protect coastal forest resources | A formal government policy on benefit sharing agreement pertaining to coastal forest resources is in place                               | Existence of the policy   | <u>Risks</u><br><br>Delays to formally adopt a policy for benefit-sharing result in limited time for demonstrating impacts<br><br><u>Assumptions</u><br><br>Tangible economic benefits are generated from coastal forests as a result of forest diversification and co-management, which are a sufficient incentive to improve local stewardship of coastal forests |
|   | Number of Forest Resource Management Group (FRMG) members (gender-disaggregated) who gain access to coastal forest resources underpinned by a formal benefit-sharing agreement | Currently, benefit-sharing agreement pertaining to coastal forest resources does not exist and hence any benefits extracted from coastal forests are not legally permitted   | By the end of the project, at least 2,500 FRMG members (or 50% of all FRMG members) will have obtained access to coastal forest benefits | Official record pertaining to the access of forest resources<br><br>PIR Report<br><br>MTR<br><br>TE | Sufficient capacity for co-management and benefit-sharing is developed by the project resulting in local communities including women being able to engage effectively in Forest Resource Management Groups and,   |

|   | Indicator  | Baseline  | End of Project Targets   | Source of verification                            | Risks and Assumptions  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
|   |  |   |  |   | through their representatives, in Co-Management Committees   |
| <b>Outputs Supporting Outcome 2</b>   |  |   |  |   |  |
| 2.1. Existing systems of participatory natural resource management applied to strengthen the climate resilience of coastal afforestation/reforestation programmes                           |  |   |  |   |  |
| 2.2. A forest product benefit sharing agreement between coastal communities and national government is developed and adopted  |  |   |  |   |  |
| 2.3 Awareness and capacity of local communities and government staff to promote coastal greenbelt co-management and benefit sharing improved  |  |   |  |   |  |
| <b>Outcome 3</b><br>Communal livelihood assets in afforestation and reforestation sites are protected from extreme climate events through effective early warning and preparedness planning | The number of CPP volunteers trained for climate risks, disaster preparedness, and the benefits of coastal forests for climate risk mitigation | There are currently some 10,000 CPP volunteers in the 7 target project upazilas (50,000 in total in 27 coastal upazilas covered by CDMP). However, the existing CPP training methodology does not contain any elements pertaining to climate risks or benefits of coastal mangrove forests on mitigating such risks | By the end of the project, at least 6,000 volunteers (representing 60% of the existing CPP network in the project target sites) are trained on additional elements on climate change and disaster preparedness | QOR <sup>11</sup><br><br>PIR<br><br>MTR<br><br>TE | <u>Risks</u><br><br>Extreme climate events are worse than projected in terms of frequency and/or intensity and CPP network becomes too overstretched.<br><br><u>Assumptions</u><br><br>Extreme climate events occur at similar frequency and levels of intensity as in recent past and in line with short-term climate projections.<br><br>Additional communication equipment, gear and training increase capacity of CPP volunteers sufficiently to deliver effective early warning |
|   | The number and   | Only around 50% of  | By the end of the project, the   | QOR <sup>12</sup>                                 |  |

<sup>11</sup> Quarterly Operational Report

|  | Indicator  | Baseline   | End of Project Targets  | Source of verification          | Risks and Assumptions   |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|---|
|  | types of communal livelihood assets safeguarded from the potential impacts of extreme and localized climate events | <p>existing length of coastal embankment (or 1250 km of a total of 2,500 km) currently has adequate drainage provision.</p> <p>There are currently only 300 killas compared to nearly 3,500 cyclone shelters most of which do not have killas nearby or provision for housing livestock within the shelter.</p> <p>Baselines on the number of freshwater supply infrastructure will be updated during the project inception phase and established for specific target districts and upazilas</p> | <p>following investments are complete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 25 km of embankment is equipped with sufficient drainage channel</li> <li>• At least 10 killas are constructed providing additional safe havens for livestock</li> <li>• At least 150 sets of freshwater supply infrastructure is safeguarded from floods</li> </ul> | <p>PIR</p> <p>MTR</p> <p>TE</p> | <p>response for extreme climate events in target coastal afforestation /reforestation sites</p> <p>Sufficient land and access to land can be obtained near existing cyclone shelters without killas in target upazilas</p> <p>Design and construction of killas, climate-proofing of freshwater supply and infrastructure provision of drainage in areas of localized flooding within the embankment are technically sound.</p> |

**Outputs Supporting Outcome 3**

3.1. Strengthened CPP network capacity for effective early warning communications for extreme climate events in coastal afforestation sites

|  | <b>Indicator</b> | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>End of Project Targets</b> | <b>Source of verification</b> | <b>Risks and Assumptions</b> |
|--|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 3.2. Communal livelihood assets in new afforestation and reforestation sites are protected from extreme climate events through dedicated disaster preparedness and risk reduction measures (such as freshwater supply infrastructure, safe havens for livestock and improved drainage) |                  |                 |                               |                               |                              |

**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).

**COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS**

Country/Region: Bangladesh

Project Title: Integrating Community-based Adaptation into Afforestation and Reforestation Programmes in Bangladesh

GEFSEC Project ID: 4700

GEF Agenc(ies): UNDP

Anticipated project financing (\$ million): PPG : 0.5 GEF Project Grant : 5.65

Total Project Cost: USD 52,650,000

GEF Agency Contact Person: Yusuke Taishi

| Review sheet comments  | Reply  | Reference to Document   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>1. The PIF describes a baseline situation where there is an absence of mainstreaming of climate risks into national level forest policy. Why don't the newly developed forestry projects, such as the baseline project for this PIF (Poverty Alleviation through Social Forestry) or Phase IV of the Char Development and Settlement Project, incorporate the lessons and experience from the ongoing LDCF project?</p> | <p>While the degree of mainstreaming of climate risks into new forestry projects is in general still insufficient, this has been gradually changing, which is partially attributable to the work of the first LDCF project, CBACC. However, CBACC only began implementation on the ground in mid-2009. Thus, meaningful sharing of experiences, successfully demonstrated strategies and lessons could only start being shared much later, once the project had been under implementation for at least a year, i.e. by mid-2010. The Poverty Alleviation through Social Forestry Project was already under implementation.</p> <p>CDSP IV was designed in the course of 2009, before the CBACC project had generated any major results to share. Hence, there was little opportunity for CBACC to influence the design of these projects, as it was not in position to begin showcasing promising results until 2010.</p> <p>On the other hand, CBACC has influenced the design of the BCCRF-funded Climate Resilient Participatory Afforestation and Reforestation Project (CRPARP), which is the most recent government afforestation project and the baseline project of the proposed LDCF project. For example, the CRPAR project, though small, has a budgetary provision for enrichment plantation using 12 mangrove species. This represents a major initial shift in</p> | <p><u>1.5 Long-term solution and barriers to achieving the solution</u></p> <p><u>2.3 Design principles and strategic considerations</u></p> <p>These two sections of the project document describe about the underlying pressures that exert on coastal forests from different sources and how the current afforestation and reforestation approach is not sufficient to remove such pressures and thus build resilience</p> |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>the way coastal afforestation and reforestation is undertaken from the conventional single-species driven plantation approach to a more long-sighted, multi-species approach. This change in approach and the selection of the 12 species of mangroves for enrichment planting can be directly attributed to the sharing of lessons and experience from the CRPAR project. Similarly, the integration of livelihood diversification strategies within the CRPAR project with 10% of the project budget allocation is partly a result of the CBACC project's advocacy work. The importance of such strategies was prominently expressed by a senior government official from the Forest Department during the Project Appraisal Committee meeting of the second LDCF project (see Annex 11 for the minutes of the meeting).</p> <p>CBACC is also influencing future approaches to coastal greenbelt development and management through its policy-based advocacy work. The issuance of the government standing order in 2011, which stipulates that 50% of coastal mangrove plantations are to remain as permanent greenbelts, was, to a certain extent, the result of the work demonstrated in the CBACC project and represents an important policy achievement.</p> <p>Examples such as these demonstrate how the first demonstration LDCF-supported CBACC project, is having an impact on both coastal land use policy and coastal forestry programs design.</p> <p>At the same time, it must be recognized that effecting the kinds of policy and socio-cultural changes that are required to integrate climate risks into national coastal forestry policy in Bangladesh is a complex process and therefore likely to take time. Inevitably, change in this context is likely to be incremental in nature, as it requires a major shift in existing patterns of governance over coastal land and other resources. Thus, these policy changes can only take place gradually, through continuous efforts in advocacy, sharing of experience and know-how in order to persuade local planners and policy makers of new strategies for strengthening coastal resilience. Thus, while</p> | <p>through coastal green belts.</p> <p>Also as discussed in response to the next comment, the project envisages organizing series of workshops both at the national and local levels to facilitate the mainstreaming of climate resilient afforestation and reforestation by sharing successful lessons.</p> |
|--|---|--|

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>the small allocation of funds within the CRPAR project for enrichment plantation and livelihood diversification, for which the CBACC’s contribution should be partially acknowledged, is an important initial shift from business as usual approach, the magnitude of the attention currently paid to these “new” approaches is insufficient to address the scale and multifaceted sources of pressures that are currently exerted on coastal forests (e.g. limited livelihood opportunities, encroachment, etc).</p> <p>One of the underlying principles of this project has been, therefore, to integrate the notion of climate resilience more holistically into the BCCRF-funded afforestation program by further strengthening the resilient livelihood component as well as the enrichment plantation component of the programme.</p>  |   |
| <p>2. The PIF also posits that a “critical mass” of sub-national projects will raise awareness of the viability and benefits of participative adaptation approaches among local authorities. If the project succeeds in raising awareness, will this guarantee an uptake and integration of community-based adaptation approaches into district-level investment programs and plans? A good litmus test is to determine whether or not the last LDCF-funded project regarding afforestation was successful in achieving this goal. If it was not, we would like to see the project elaborate on how it can create an institutional legacy by contributing to climate policy mainstreaming, both on the national and sub-national scales.</p> | <p>Experience from the first LDCF project indicates promising signs of a greater uptake and scaling of community-based adaptation approaches if continuous awareness raising and dissemination of lessons and experience are carried out in larger geographical areas. For example, a salt-tolerant rice variety (BR47) was disseminated, as part of a CBACC’s resilient livelihood pilot, in Naltona Union Parishad in Barguna district. Convinced by the successful results from the pilot, the district Department of Agriculture Extension extended its support, with the public fund, to more than 1,000 ha of agricultural land from the 38 ha that was piloted through CBACC.</p> <p>There are also less dramatic, but equally promising cases where local government are offering equipment and gears to community members to replicate some of the livelihood investments pilot tested in CBACC.</p> <p>Although his kind of ad hoc replication does not guarantee that such investments will be voluntarily replicated at a much greater geographical scale, it does show the power of disseminating successful strategies, or creating greater opportunities for leveraging district resources for climate</p> | <p><u>2.4 Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs &amp; Proposed Activities</u></p> <p>See Indicative Activities under Output 1.1 that include national and local level workshops. They are primarily aimed at disseminating successful implementation of adaptive livelihood options</p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>risk reduction interventions.</p> <p>In this project, institutionalization of coastal climate risk reduction will be promoted by a suite of publicity materials (brochure, videos and documentaries, posters, factsheets, etc) and organizing national and local workshops and events where successful demonstrations of alternative livelihood measures are shared and disseminated to wider stakeholders. Moreover, two high-level coordination body – Project Board and National Steering Committee (Outcome Board) – both of which will have representatives from various ministries, will be used as a platform on which to sensitize senior level government officials (See Annex 9 for compositions of these bodies). The potential for uptake, replication and scale-up is also greatly enhanced by the close alignment with the CRPAR project, which will be working in 9 coastal districts, further facilitating wider sharing and exchange of successful strategies</p> <p>In addition, a co-financing partner of this project, USAID-funded CREL project, will be carrying out a value chain analysis for 29 crops and NTFPs, production of which will also be promoted in the LDCF project. The national and local level workshops organized by the LDCF project will take into considerations the findings from these assessments as much as possible so that the additional economic benefits, apart from adaptive benefits, can also be demonstrated.</p> |  |
| <p>3. A key element of the project is developing forest product benefit sharing agreements and institutional cooperation agreements and codes of practice between community-based organizations (CBOs) and the Forest Department. The PIF notes some general references to training for CBOs and vulnerable communities, but is much more specific on the kinds of training that will be offered to national and sub-national</p> | <p>During the PPG phase, a partnership between the LDCF project and USAID-funded CREL project was established. This was primarily to leverage a decade of experience within USAID in developing the capacity of CBOs to participate effectively in natural resource management and benefit-sharing schemes. USAID has developed and tested several capacity building tools including training modules, including one that has been tested in the coastal zone, in the Sundarbans.</p> <p>While further testing of these modules was envisaged during project preparation, the delay in finalizing the project target sites vis-à-vis the CRPAR project intervention sites (which was finalized in July 2013)</p>   | <p>A summary of the training modules that have been used in the USAID’s initiatives is included in XXX</p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>officials. Can the project elaborate on the training it will provide to non-government stakeholders to support the key outcomes mentioned above?</p>   | <p>prevented the MoEF to pilot test the feasibility of such training modules in specific target communities. This will now be done during the inception phase of the project.</p> <p>However, among the MoEF and USAID, there is an adequate level of confidence that the methodology, which has also been tested in Sundarbans, will be applicable, with relatively minor adjustments if needed.</p> <p>A summary of a training module that was used in the USAID IPAC project is presented in Annex 13.</p>  |  |
| <p>4. Component 3 (Risk Reduction from Extreme Climate events) is allocated about a quarter of the total project cost. The project has a clear ability to develop a systematic connection between new afforestation /reforestation programs in coastal areas and the delivery of disaster prevention activities (i.e. through flood-proofing of communal infrastructure; establishment of flood-proof agriculture plots; safe havens for livestock; and contingency protocols in times of extreme weather). However, the role of the project in the establishment of early warning systems is less clear. Overall, the connection between this project and activities under the Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme could benefit from further elaboration.</p> | <p>The project will not be establishing a new early warning system. Rather, it is building on the baseline project of UNDP-CDMP (which itself is expanding on extensive work of the Cyclone Preparedness Programme) to strengthen the existing capacity of the CPP volunteer network in disseminating early warning information. As explained in the baseline section of Outcome 3 (and footnote 87), many parts of coastal areas are very remote and early warning infrastructure that exists in other parts of the country, such as a text message-based warning, is not available and conventional word-of-mouth or hand-held speaker based early warning are the most viable option. Hence, the focus of the project is to build capacity of the existing CPP network for enhanced early warning dissemination capacity.</p> <p>Consultations with relevant stakeholders revealed, however, that the links between the existing CPP network and coastal forest afforestation, reforestation and subsequent stewardship are practically and notionally non-existent, although there is a significant overlap in their ultimate objectives. Hence, through LDCF resources, members of Forest Resource Management Groups will be encouraged and trained to be part of the CPP volunteer network. CPP volunteers, in turn, will receive additional trainings on climate risks and the role that coastal mangrove forests play in mitigating potential impacts of cyclones.</p> | <p>The links between the overall objective of this project and Output 3.1 are described, inter alia, in:</p> <p><u>Section 1.5.5</u> – existing barrier that explains how the overall objective of resilience building is currently hampered by the weak capacity of early warning dissemination to protect lives and livelihoods.</p> <p><u>Outcome 3 baseline and adaptation alternative section</u></p> |

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>13</sup>**

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

Concerns that may affect project implementation were fully reviewed during the PPG stage and it was updated in the Risk Log in Annex 8

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

| PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>50,000</b>                 |  |                                    |                                |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i><b>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</b></i> | <i><b>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</b></i> |                                    |                                |
|  | <i><b>Budgeted Amount</b></i>                | <i><b>Amount Spent To date</b></i> | <i><b>Amount Committed</b></i> |
| Technical definition and capacity needs assessment       | 15,000                                       | 14,848.00                          |                                |
| Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation    | 10,000                                       | 8,851.55                           |                                |
| Stakeholder consultations                                | 15,000                                       | 4,165.21                           | 14,883.24                      |
| Financial planning and co-financing definition           | 10,000                                       | 2,696                              | 4,556                          |
|  |  |                                    |                                |
|  |  |                                    |                                |
|  |  |                                    |                                |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>50,000</b>                                | <b>30,560.76</b>                   | <b>19,439.24</b>               |

<sup>13</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

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

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

N/A