



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5456</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Bangladesh</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Ecosystem-based approaches to Adaptation (EbA) in the drought-prone Barind Tract and Haor "wetland" Area</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$5,200,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$17,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$22,300,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Fareeha Iqbal</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ermira Fida</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes; Bangladesh is an LDC and has completed its NAPA preparation.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes; an OFP endorsement letter dated April 11, 2013 is attached with the submission.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes, the funding requested for this project is available for Bangladesh under the principle of equitable access.	

	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>More detail requested. The project is aligned with LDCF results framework objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3. It would be helpful, however, to see which of the 3 CCA objectives each component corresponds to.</p> <p>Recommended action (June 27, 2013): If possible, please indicate in PIF Section A.1 which CCA objective each component corresponds to.</p> <p>August 7, 2013: Yes. The CCA objectives have been identified for each component.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes. The project aims at building resilience to climate change through ecosystems-based measures in the drought-prone Barind Tract and the Haor Area wetland, both of which have been identified in Bangladesh's NAPA as critical areas that are highly vulnerable to adverse climate change impacts. The Haor Area wetland has also been identified as a priority in Bangladesh's Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan in terms of its significance for the fisheries sector.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Yes. The Barind Tract is drought-prone and suffers dry spells that are expected to be exacerbated by climate change. The 3 baseline projects in this area aim at arresting desertification, greening the area, and improving livelihoods. They are being implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture and include an Irrigation</p>	

<p>Project Design</p>		<p>and reduce pressure on groundwater), a Seed Project (to reduce shortage of quality rice and wheat seeds and provide training on seed processing, storage), and a Communication Network Project (to construct feeder roads to remote areas and plant trees alongside the roads).</p> <p>For the Haor Area, the PIF does not clearly specify a baseline project(s) but explains that a series of initiatives have been undertaken in this wetland by the Government of Bangladesh that focus mainly on construction of hard infrastructure -- which have altered the hydrologic and flooding regime, adversely affecting fisheries and agriculture. The GoB has acknowledged the need for an integrated and sustainable approach to address the environmental challenges being faced. Climate change is expected to significantly alter rainfall patterns and quantity, including heavier and more erratic rainfall during monsoons that could damage the infrastructure measures of the baseline projects.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Not entirely. (1) More details are requested on the research component of 'developing post-graduate and post-doctoral research programmes' on EbA. (2) Please see comment for Item 16 regarding component 2.1 (vulnerability/impact assessments).</p> <p>Recommended action (June 27, 2013):          (i) Please discuss the post-graduate and post-doctoral research programs: what will they entail, how many students will be involved, who will supervise, and how will the research efforts be sustained? (ii)</p>	

		<p>16.</p> <p>August 7, 2013:  Yes; further details have been provided. This component will support two PhD students and a post-doctoral student to undertake research focused on specific climate risks and to provide technical guidance to reduce these risks. The research will be supervised by professors at local universities.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>(a) Yes, adaptation benefits are identified. Baseline investments in the Barind Tract and Haor Area are potentially vulnerable to climate change. The LDCF project, through the implementation of EbA approaches, can build resilience in this regard, thereby improving the hydrology, ecosystems and livelihoods of the areas.</p> <p>(b) Yes, for PIF stage the incremental reasoning is appropriate. Climate change is expected to reduce the efficacy and envisioned benefits of the baseline projects in the Barind Tract and Haor Area. The LDCF funding aims at ensuring that their benefits are realized despite climate change.</p> <p>In the Barind Tract, the LDCF project will do this by building technical capacity and awareness of EbA, policy strengthening, and improving the quality and availability of freshwater (RWH, groundwater replenishment, drought-resilient/mixed-farming systems).</p> <p>In the Haor Area, the LDCF project will focus on sustainably managing core ecosystem areas for fish breeding, ecological agriculture and mixed</p>	

		<p>By CEO endorsement:</p> <p>(i) Please explain in more detail the specific improvements the LDCF project will bring to the baseline projects. The table on p. 19 is useful but does not give specifics. (For example, what are the specific 'additional' measures that will be taken to make the Seed Project climate-resilient -- will the LDCF provide improved/different seed, or will it make improvements to irrigation that will render the Seed Project more resilient?). Also, please provide an indication of how many villages/ beneficiaries/ infrastructures will gain from the LDCF improvements to the baseline projects.</p> <p>(ii) Please demonstrate that consideration was given to the possible impacts of climate change on the selected LDCF activities, so that they are indeed 'EbA', and not business-as-usual natural resources management.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:</p> <p>a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and</p> <p>b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement stage:</p> <p>(i) Please provide details on how CSOs and communities will be engaged in designing and implementing the project.</p> <p>(ii) Is it possible to provide quantifiable indicators on CSO engagement in the LDCF project? (iii) How will the needs of marginalized communities be</p>	

	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Not entirely. (1) Websites and informational platforms/databases can sometimes be created by projects only to end up being difficult to use and without regular maintenance/ updating after some time. This is particularly the case when its maintenance is just an added-on task for a person with an already full workload. This potential concern arises with regard to Component 3. (2) How will communication lines be kept open between planners and community households? There do not seem to be extension workers involved in the project. This concern arises in the context of long-term sustainability of the project.</p> <p>Recommended action (June 27, 2013):  (i) Please explain how the 'central EbA information base' that will be created as part of Component 3 will be sustained so that it can have real long term value and not fall into disuse/lack of management.  (ii) Please discuss how community members can receive continued support/assistance over the long-term should they run into problems with EbA implementation/maintenance.</p> <p>August 7, 2013:  The additional information provided is adequate. (i) The database will be maintained by an IT expert based at MoEF; (ii) Sustained community support will be ensured through open communication lines with government staff as well as high levels of collaboration and exchange across the LDCF project and other development projects in the 2 project areas.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes. It will coordinate with several relevant ongoing initiatives in the country, such as the LDCF 'Community-based Adaptation Through Coastal Afforestation in Bangladesh' project, the IUCN-led 'Ecosystems for Life' initiative, the GoB-led 'Community-based Sustainable Management of Tanguar Hoar' project, and others.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>-- Innovativeness: EbA is a promising, low-cost and generally low-regrets way of building resilience to adverse impacts of climate change, and seems a relevant approach in this case. If climate change is adequately considered, researched and factored into EbA activity selection and design, they have potential to be innovative.</p> <p>-- Sustainability: The project has significant capacity-building elements (awareness-raising, training) at all levels that are likely to foster sustainability. UNEP has ample capacity building experience.</p> <p>-- Scale-up: While the selection of individual EbA activities to be implemented at various locations will depend on local circumstances, the EbA approach itself can be scaled up for various landscapes that are at risk of adverse climate change impacts.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project</p>		

	approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Not quite. (1) More details are requested on financing of the vulnerability assessments in Component 2.1. (2) The LDCF funding amount for Component 1 (mostly stocktaking and capacity building) seems high at \$742,857, compared to the \$3.7 million requested to cover all investment activities (Component 2). Co-financing for the investments (Component 2) is adequate and appropriate at \$13.8 million.</p> <p>Recommended action (June 27, 2013):  (i) Please provide further information on how Component 2.1 (vulnerability assessment) will be financed. LDCF resources are intended to finance investments, whereas the vulnerability/ impact assessment looks more appropriate for PPG support. Will this sub-component be covered solely by PROVIA support? (ii) We would suggest reducing the LDCF amount for Component 1 so that a higher share can support EbA investments and community training.</p> <p>August 7, 2013:  Explanation provided is satisfactory for item (i); although PROVIA will guide the V&amp;A assessments, LDCF resources will be needed for vulnerability assessments that will help determine the specific locations and EbA approaches. Also, as suggested in (ii), some LDCF resources have been diverted away from Component 1 to support Component 2.</p>	



	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>Not quite. Indicative co-financing totaling \$17 million will be provided by the UNEP and the Government of Bangladesh. This would mean a co-financing to LDCF ratio of 3.26 : 1.</p> <p>UNEP's share towards co-financing appears low at \$2 million (of which \$500,000 is in-kind support). This comes to 38% of the amount requested for the LDCF grant, which does not seem commensurate with UNEP's role</p> <p>Recommended action (June 27, 2013): We request UNEP to provide a co-financing grant amount that is appropriate for its role in implementing the project.</p> <p>August 7, 2013: Yes. The Agency co-financing being provided is sufficient</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes; it stands at 4.7% of the total LDCF grant requested.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>Yes, PPG has been requested and is within the norm.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		

	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>June 27, 2013: Not yet. Revisions are requested based on comments provided for Items 4, 7, 11, 16 and 17.</p> <p>August 7, 2013: Yes. The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Items 8 and 10.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	June 27, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 07, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**