

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Overall Rating:</b>           | Highly Satisfactory                                       |
| <b>Decision:</b>                 |   |
| <b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b> | 00075892  |
| <b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>  | Integrating Community-based Adaptation into Afforestation |
| <b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>   | 2015-07-01 / 2021-06-30                                   |

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- 3: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

**Evidence:**

ICBAAR project has repeatedly responded to the external environment and the changes in needs of the target groups of the project sites by reviewing and adjusting the project activities at times beyond the original target for the project outputs-

1. As per project commitment, ICBAAR has waterproofed 150 tube wells in the project sites. In 2020 ICBAAR has additionally conducted 48 PSF (Pond Sand Filter) repairing in Patharghata, Barguna, where tube wells are not feasible.
2. Project has allocated additional funds for livelihood interventions that were damaged by Amphan
3. ICBAAR also re-adjusted its original plan of implementing the 3FV model at the homestead level rather than in the forest land due to increasing demand and more useful use of 3FV for beneficiaries
4. ICBAAR extended support to extremely vulnerable homeless climate migrants by implementing cluster village interventions that include livelihood interventions
5. As per project documents, ICBAAR was initially responsible for 25 Km of Canal re-excavation for improved drainage. However, the project identified Sluice Gates repairing was a priority for improved drainage. After repairing 20 Sluice Gates, the project improved drainage for more than 50 Km along the embankment.

The project also extended support for cash transfer in remote islands during COVID-19 situations

| List of Uploaded Documents |   |                      |                      |
|----------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| #                          | File Name   | Modified By          | Modified On          |
| 1                          | 1stPSCmeetingminutesenglish_7671_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1stPSCmeetingminutesenglish_7671_301.docx) | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:50:00 AM |
| 2                          | 2ndPSCMeeting_English_7671_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2ndPSCMeeting_English_7671_301.doc)              | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:50:00 AM |
| 3                          | 3rdPSCmeetinginEnglish_7671_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3rdPSCmeetinginEnglish_7671_301.docx)           | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:50:00 AM |

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- 3: *The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

**Evidence:**

The project responded to SP Outcome 1: Advance Poverty Eradication in all its forms and dimensions and adopted multiple Signature Solutions:

1. ICBAAR contributed to keeping people out of poverty by providing alternative climate-resilient livelihood support to extremely poor in the remote coastal communities
2. ICBAAR adopted nature-based solutions for the development of resilience of coastal communities
3. ICBAAR interventions were designed to further strengthen crisis prevention and increased resilience through capacity enhancement of CPP, strengthening Greenbelt management, resilient livelihood interventions, etc.
4. ICBAAR interventions are female-focused and responsive to the needs of coastal women reflecting a result of 52% female beneficiaries. Women's empowerment and gender equality were inbuilt in the project implementation approach.

The project's M&E plan included SP output indicator 1.4.1.2 and reported the progress.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | ICBAAR-ProjectDocument2_7671_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAR-ProjectDocument2_7671_302.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAR-ProjectDocument2_7671_302.pdf</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:51:00 AM |

**Relevant****Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- Not Applicable

#### Evidence:

1. The target groups of the project have been selected as per beneficiary selection criteria mentioned in Annex-4 of the prodoc. Some beneficiaries are representing in the Upazila level Co-management Committee, and they are involved in the implementation and monitoring of project interventions. (Project Document uploaded above) . 52% of the total project beneficiaries are women, 3% of the total HH supported are female-headed, 3% of the total HH have at least 1 person with disability.
2. Systematic follow-up of at least 30% of the total beneficiary post-intervention to collect change and results data
3. Beneficiary and partner's feedback were collected to study changes through ICBAAR interventions in 2020

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_303">ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_303</a> ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_303">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_303</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:52:00 AM |

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

#### Evidence:

Lessons learned are a continuous process during project implementation. Regular feedback and group discussions are conducted with relevant partners and beneficiaries to improve ICBAAR supports and address their relevant concerns. As part of this process, one such workshop was held in 2019 with relevant stakeholders, and a series of the lesson learned workshops are being held internally and with relevant partners and stakeholders to sustain the knowledge systematically generated by the project and to discuss findings on project efficiency and effectiveness. The project has also developed manuals and guidelines with relevant partners. showcasing champions of change. (originally planned for 2020, shifted due to COVID-19)

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Lessonlearnedworkshpproceedings__7671_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Lessonlearnedworkshpproceedings__7671_304.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Lessonlearnedworkshpproceedings__7671_304.docx</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:56:00 AM |

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

**Evidence:**

Considering the Bangladesh coastal perspective, climate vulnerability is the prime concern, and to address this issue, community-based adaptation is the best approach to reduce the vulnerability. Accordingly, this project is being implemented to reduce coastal communities' vulnerabilities through diverse climate-resilient programmes and holds high demands from all relevant stakeholders. ICBAAR has been a platform for remotest communities to avail government livelihood and other supports. Therefore, there are huge scopes and demands to scale up a similar project in other countries' coastal regions.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_305.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_305.docx</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:58:00 AM |
| 2 | ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_305.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_305.docx</a> )  | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:58:00 AM |

**Principled****Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- 3: *The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

**Evidence:**

The project systematically collected gender-segregated evidence-based data for all project interventions-

1. Baseline Data and analysis before interventions
2. results data collection and analysis post interventions
3. Feedback data focusing issues concerning women

As per data gathered and analyzed, the project undertook interventions that proved to be more profitable for the female beneficiaries like, 2FVD, hanging vegetables. Piloting of Bio flock etc. As it was evident that female beneficiaries are able to invest more of her time in interventions closer to home.

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_306.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_306.docx</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:59:00 AM |
| 2 | ResultData2017AnalysisReport-V21_7671_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ResultData2017AnalysisReport-V21_7671_306.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ResultData2017AnalysisReport-V21_7671_306.docx</a> )  | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:59:00 AM |
| 3 | ResultData2018-AnalysisReport1_7671_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ResultData2018-AnalysisReport1_7671_306.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ResultData2018-AnalysisReport1_7671_306.docx</a> )  | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:59:00 AM |
| 4 | Annex-IResultData2019-AnalysisReport_7671_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex-IResultData2019-AnalysisReport_7671_306.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex-IResultData2019-AnalysisReport_7671_306.docx</a> )  | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:59:00 AM |
| 5 | ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_306.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_306.docx</a> )  | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 8:59:00 AM |

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

Social and environmental risks are tracked not only in the risk log but also during project implementation. In fact there was not much safeguards issues were observed during project implementation. In this case, implementation guideline has been developed for numerous cases (in Bangla) these issues are addressed. The final assessment is currently ongoing.

For all the livelihood interventions, environment-friendly and climate-resilient livelihood options were chosen and implemented. Organic fertilizers, specially project-produced vermicompost, were used. For some of the infrastructures like Adaptation Learning Centre (ALC) and raised earthen Killa (protection of livestock during a disaster), the engineer from the Architecture departments was engaged to design the infrastructure (ALC) using the locally available environment-friendly materials and, some cases non fired bricks where necessary. For earthen killa, soil binding, environment-friendly indigenous species have been planted, emphasizing any negative impacts to the environment. Accordingly, indigenous species have been chosen to avoid any negative environmental impacts for the coastal enrichment plantation.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAForDocuments/DraftICBA-ARprojectEnvironmentandSocialManagementFrameworkESMF_7671_307">DraftICBA-ARprojectEnvironmentandSocialManagementFrameworkESMF_7671_307</a> ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAForDocuments/DraftICBA-ARprojectEnvironmentandSocialManagementFrameworkESMF_7671_307">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAForDocuments/DraftICBA-ARprojectEnvironmentandSocialManagementFrameworkESMF_7671_307</a> .docx) | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/16/2021 7:29:00 AM |

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- 2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.
- 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

Project affected people have been actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. A project-level grievance mechanism is in place, and project-affected people are informed. For example, during the recent Cyclone 'Fani,' the beneficiaries were well informed earlier regarding the cyclone's effect. As not remarkable grievance was recorded, PMU did not need to address the issue as per SRM guidance.(therefore evidence not applicable)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| #                       | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. |           |             |             |

**Management & Monitoring**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- 3: *The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

#### Evidence:

The project has a comprehensive M&E plan where baselines, targets, and milestones are fully populated. Progress data (sex-disaggregated when applicable) against indicators are collected, analyzed, and reported regularly using credible data sources. The project field data analysis is regularly used to guide management decision-making. The project also analyzed follow-up data and feedback collected to measure project efficiency and effectiveness of the project interventions. Both MTR and TE have been conducted following the GEF evaluation guideline and UNEG standards.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | ICBAARMEPLAN_7671_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARMEPLAN_7671_309.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARMEPLAN_7671_309.docx</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 9:00:00 AM |

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

**Evidence:**

The project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) is functioning well as intended. The project has a monthly, quarterly, and annual reporting mechanism where all the results, risks, and opportunities are mentioned. Accordingly, these issues are discussed in the PB/PSC meeting, and management decisions are taken for further action.

Supervision and Monitoring by the relevant government and partner organizations were monumental in the reporting year due to travel restrictions. The jointly implemented project governance was one of the most effective successes of the project in 2020

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | 1stPICMeetingMinutues_English_7671_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1stPICMeetingMinutues_English_7671_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1stPICMeetingMinutues_English_7671_310.docx</a> )                                   | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 9:01:00 AM |
| 2 | 1stPSCmeetingminutesenglish_7671_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1stPSCmeetingminutesenglish_7671_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1stPSCmeetingminutesenglish_7671_310.docx</a> )   | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 9:01:00 AM |
| 3 | 2ndPICmeetingEng_7671_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2ndPICmeetingEng_7671_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2ndPICmeetingEng_7671_310.docx</a> )  | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 9:01:00 AM |
| 4 | 2ndPSCMeeting_English_7671_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2ndPSCMeeting_English_7671_310.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2ndPSCMeeting_English_7671_310.doc</a> )   | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 9:02:00 AM |
| 5 | 3rdPSCmeetinginEnglish_7671_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3rdPSCmeetinginEnglish_7671_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3rdPSCmeetinginEnglish_7671_310.docx</a> )  | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 9:02:00 AM |
| 6 | OrganogramofICBAARProgramsimplementation1_7671_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/OrganogramofICBAARProgramsimplementation1_7671_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/OrganogramofICBAARProgramsimplementation1_7671_310.pdf</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 9:02:00 AM |

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

**Evidence:**

Discussion on project risks is a continuous process of the project since it is jointly implemented with government partners. Risks were identified together with relevant partners. Especially in the PB/PSC meeting, mitigation measures were discussed to implement the activities efficiently and maintaining the quality. (Risk log updated in ATLAS)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Minutesinenglish-20210310T042311Z-001_7671_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutesinenglish-20210310T042311Z-001_7671_311.zip">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutesinenglish-20210310T042311Z-001_7671_311.zip</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 6:54:00 AM |

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes  
 No

**Evidence:**

The adequate resource was mobilized. The project was flexible in allocating funds for higher social and qualitative benefits in discussion and PSC recommendation.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| #                       | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. |           |             |             |

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- 3: *The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

The project maintained an updated procurement plan along with Implementation plan which are reviewed quarterly by the Cluster to find out the operational bottlenecks to procure inputs in a timely manner and addressing them through appropriate management actions

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_ICBA-AR_22-01-2020_New_7671_313">AWP_ICBA-AR_22-01-2020_New_7671_313</a> (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_ICBA-AR_22-01-2020_New_7671_313.xls)                      | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 5:17:00 AM |
| 2 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofAWP_2021_ICBA-AR_13_12_2020_7671_313">CopyofAWP_2021_ICBA-AR_13_12_2020_7671_313</a> (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofAWP_2021_ICBA-AR_13_12_2020_7671_313.xls) | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 5:17:00 AM |

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- 3: *There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)*
- 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

**Evidence:**

The project monitors and analyzes costs/ expenditures against intended results and maintains cost efficiency measurements post interventions. Based on the analysis, actual necessity, and field situations, the project develops work plans of partners, and the fund is often relocated for the highest outcome, i.e., additional funds were made available for Livelihood interventions.

The project has collaborated with other UNDP projects during climate disasters in the coastal Bangladesh, including collaboration with the UNDP-LOGIC project during Amphan to prepare shelters with COVID-19 related precautions in 2020.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name   | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_314 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_314.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_314.docx</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 2/22/2021 9:04:00 AM |

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

Despite the delayed initiation of project implementation, all activities under each component/outcome have reached intended targets. In most areas, the project has overachieved the targets. It includes supporting more than 8,600 HH through Livelihood Interventions, 50km of Improved drainage along the embankment, and 48 PSF repairing in addition to 150 raised tube wells for waterproofing

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| #                       | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. |           |             |             |

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: *Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)*
- 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

**Evidence:**

There have been regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project is on track to achieve the desired results and inform course corrections if needed, especially in the PB meeting. Especially based on field situation and actual necessity, some budgets are always reviewed as and when necessary.

As per MTR recommendation and PSC decisions, project activities were redesigned under Outcome 2, instead of the original plan to support 2500 FRPG members to avail benefit-sharing from the coastal forestation, which was found unrealistic; 20 FRPG of 600 members were formed. As per the MTR recommendation, this decision by PSC also reduced the total beneficiary target from 10,500 to 8,600.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | AWP_ICBA-AR_22-01-2020_New_7671_316 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_ICBA-AR_22-01-2020_New_7671_316.xls">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_ICBA-AR_22-01-2020_New_7671_316.xls</a> )                                  | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 5:22:00 AM |
| 2 | CopyofAWP_2021_ICBA-AR_13_12_2020_7671_316 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofAWP_2021_ICBA-AR_13_12_2020_7671_316.xls">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofAWP_2021_ICBA-AR_13_12_2020_7671_316.xls</a> )             | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 5:23:00 AM |
| 3 | Minutesinenglish-20210310T042311Z-001_7671_316 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutesinenglish-20210310T042311Z-001_7671_316.zip">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutesinenglish-20210310T042311Z-001_7671_316.zip</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 5:24:00 AM |

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- 3: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

The project has reached target groups being systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and emphasizing vulnerable women-headed households to ensure results are achieved as expected. The beneficiaries were selected following standard criteria set in the project document (Annex-4).

1. 52% of the project livelihood beneficiaries are female. 49% of the total beneficiary were housewives before project intervention. 239 (3%) Households amongst them are female-headed
2. The beneficiary HH have an average size of 4.7 members with an average earning member of 1.15; meaning 1 person earning for 4/5 people
3. 232 (3%) of the household has at least one member with physical disabilities.
4. 381 (4%) of the Household heads had to change their occupation due to climate change over the last 10 years
5. The daily expense per member of the HH is on an average 71.48 BDT (people living on less than \$1.90 a day is considered below the poverty line), Specially during the rainy season and around late autumn for around 3 months on an average more than 70% of the HH experiences food shortage where they must skip 1 or for many 2 meals per day.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_317 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_317.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAARCRLbeneficiariessocio-economicbaselinecondition_7671_317.docx</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 5:29:00 AM |

**Sustainability & National Ownership****Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

Relevant and concerned stakeholders and national implementing partners, such as Forest Department, Department of Agriculture Extension, Department of Fisheries, Department of Livestock, Bangladesh Water Development Board, Bangladesh Forest Research Institute, Ministry of Land, Department of Disaster Management, NGO, and Co-management Committees are fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation, and monitoring of the project activities. They are playing their roles as per the project document.

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Minutesinenglish-20210310T042311Z-001_7671_318 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutesinenglish-20210310T042311Z-001_7671_318.zip">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutesinenglish-20210310T042311Z-001_7671_318.zip</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 7:39:00 AM |
| 2 | CMCgazette_English_7671_318 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CMCgazette_English_7671_318.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CMCgazette_English_7671_318.docx</a> )  | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 7:40:00 AM |

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)<sup>8</sup> adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 2: *Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

#### Evidence:

ICBAAR has a fixed target per partner (2500 for Department of Agricultural Extension, 2500 for Department of Fisheries, 2500 for Department of Livestock, 500 3FV, and 600 FRPG climate-resilient livelihoods support). During and post interventions, the project regularly monitored the changes in partner's capacity and performance to draw a complete picture of accessibility of target beneficiaries. The project has analyzed this data to make regular management decisions like implementing beyond target with the Department of Agricultural Extension due to high rate of return, implementing 360 3FV models at the homestead level.

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_319.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ICBAAREfficiencyEffectivenessStudy_7671_319.docx</a> ) | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 6:46:00 AM |

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)*
- 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

#### Evidence:

Project sustainability initiatives are almost complete as per plan. ICBAAR has developed multiple manuals and guidelines jointly with relevant partners to document the knowledge and changes to do business as usual due to project interventions. Phase-out transition is being carefully monitored also to identify potential areas for future projects with relevant partners.

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By          | Modified On          |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuidlineCRC_7671_320.pdf">GuidlineCRC_7671_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuidlineCRC_7671_320.pdf)</a>  | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 6:26:00 AM |
| 2 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuidlineCMC_7671_320.pdf">GuidlineCMC_7671_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuidlineCMC_7671_320.pdf)</a>  | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 6:27:00 AM |
| 3 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuidlineALC_7671_320.pdf">GuidlineALC_7671_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuidlineALC_7671_320.pdf)</a>  | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 6:29:00 AM |
| 4 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuidlineKilla_7671_320.pdf">GuidlineKilla_7671_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuidlineKilla_7671_320.pdf)</a>  | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 6:33:00 AM |
| 5 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Mangrove_Manual_English_FullBook_7671_320.pdf">Mangrove_Manual_English_FullBook_7671_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Mangrove_Manual_English_FullBook_7671_320.pdf)</a> | arick.proma@undp.org | 3/10/2021 6:35:00 AM |

### QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

During the last decade, policy efforts pushed to mainstream climate change adaptation across sectors with new paradigms and projects to respond to short-, medium-, and long-term effects of climate change, knowledge generation and building institutional capacities and implementation of climate initiatives. ICBAAR project strategy involved multiple government departments in the whole planning and implementation process. The government partners involvement throughout the planning and implementation process provided platforms for communities to build better relationships with relevant department. ICBAAR also displayed flexibility in delivering sustainable innovative interventions in response to their needs. Project has also reviewed and undertaken additional interventions for sustainability of community involvement in forest protection through CMC like construction of Community Resource Centers, Adaptation Learning Centre, climate resilient cluster villages, sluice gate and PSF repairing etc in response to actual need of the coastal regions.

According to the social, environmental and political context, the ICBAAR's objectives and components are very relevant. Since 2018, the government is putting efforts into forward looking actions with the Delta Plan 2100, a long-term strategy aiming to achieve a safe, climate resilient and prosperous Delta by 2100, ensuring water and food security, economic growth and environmental sustainability. ICBAAR is playing a significant role in contributing to the Country plan. Highly ambitious goals such as these are not achieved in a short duration, the main aim of project such as ICBAAR was to get the wheel of change moving. More capable and responsive Government counterpart, involved community, better preparedness for climate hazard and overall strengthened coastal communities are signs of the said wheels turning.

