

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00085970
Portfolio/Project Title:	Expanding the protected area system to incorporate acqua
Portfolio/Project Date:	2015-01-01 / 2020-10-10

Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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:

The project was implemented as per the approved P project Document and there were no changes in project scope and activities since the Sundarbans ecosystem is an ecological heritage and protected areas.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 SP Output 1.4.1: Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains. The project's M&E plan includes SP output indicator 1.4.1.2

Natural resources that are managed under a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime, a) Area of land and marine habitat under protection (hectares) and b) Area of existing protected area under improved management (hectares).

The project expanded the operational coverage of PAs. The project adapted its goal to designating new dolphin conservation sites, 3 new dolphin sanctuaries have been approved comprising 22 km² (core area) and 12.27 km² (buffer zone area).

The project formed seven DCTs who are working with the BFD in dolphin monitoring and patrolling activities. The alternative livelihoods support provided to 1,000 households has empowered women and reduced the pressure on the harvesting of natural resources.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MEPlan_EPASIIAE_2020_6621_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MEPlan_EPASIIAE_2020_6621_302.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:18:00 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:

Dolphin sanctuaries in Sundarbans using Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool(METT) shows the remarkable development(see attached METT report)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	37METTscoringReport2019CapacityScoreCard2019_6621_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/37METTscoringReport2019CapacityScoreCard2019_6621_303.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:04:00 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:

The project produced the following knowledge products and lessons learned were reflected in MTR and TE reports and final project report:

1. Aziz, A. A., 2019. Atlas of Ganges River Dolphin and Irrawaddy Dolphin in Bangladesh
2. Aziz, A. A., 2019. Conservation Action Plan for Ganges River Dolphin and Irrawaddy Dolphin of Bangladesh
3. Forest Department.2019. Capacity Scorecard Assessments, 2019
4. Chowdhury, R. M., 2019. Community-Based Resource Management Plan of three Wildlife Sanctuaries in Sundarbans
5. Hossain, Z., 2018. Baseline study of expanding the protected area system to incorporate important aquatic ecosystems project (EPSIIAEP) Community Development Centre (CODEC) 23 September 2018
6. Hoq, K.A., 2019. Biodiversity Sectoral Guidelines on Fishery and Aquaculture
7. Forest Department. 2018. Management Effectiveness Assessment of three wildlife Sanctuaries for Dolphin in the Sundarbans
8. Hossain, Z, 2019. Strategic Livelihood Sustainability Plan of Alternative Income Generation Activities (AIGAS) for the project beneficiaries of EPASIIAEP
9. IUCN, 2019. Fund Management Guidelines for Dolphin Conservation Team
10. Khan, M.H. and Aziz, A.A. 2018. Identifying Dolphin Hotspots in South-Western Bangladesh
11. Khan, M.H. 2019. Management Plan of Ganges River Dolphin in Halda River of Bangladesh
12. Khan, M.H. 2019. Population Status of Ganges River Dolphin in Halda Rivers of Bangladesh
13. Bangladesh Forest Department.2019. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice (KAP) Study among AIGA beneficiaries, Local fishers, Dolphin Conservation Teams, and school children
14. Limon, S.H. 2019. Biodiversity friendly Sectoral Guidelines on Tourism, Maritime and Industry
15. Forest Department & UNDP Bangladesh. 2020. Workshop Report on Assessment of three Dolphin Sanctuaries using METT (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool)
16. Forest Department & UNDP Bangladesh 2020: Report on the Monitoring of Populations at Dhangmari, Chandpai and Dudhmukhi Wildlife Sanctuaries of the Sundarbans
17. Rahman, M.M 2018: Research Gap Analysis (Biodiversity & Aquatic) in dolphin conservation of the Sundarbans

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	15DolphinmonitoringreportUpdate040720_6621_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/15DolphinmonitoringreportUpdate040720_6621_304.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:09:00 AM
2	2BangladeshDolphinActionPlan8X10_7Update_compressed_6621_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2BangladeshDolphinActionPlan8X10_7Update_compressed_6621_304.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:05:00 AM
3	11MANAGEMENTPLANFORTHEGANGESRIVERDOLPHIN4_6621_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/11MANAGEMENTPLANFORTHEGANGESRIVERDOLPHIN4_6621_304.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:06:00 AM
4	1AtlasoftheGangesRiverDolphin8X105_compressed_6621_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1AtlasoftheGangesRiverDolphin8X105_compressed_6621_304.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:06:00 AM
5	9DCTfundmanagementguideline_EPASIIAEP03012020_6621_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/9DCTfundmanagementguideline_EPASIIAEP03012020_6621_304.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:07:00 AM
6	8StrategiclivelihoodsustainabilityplanforAIGAs_20.1.202_6621_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/8StrategiclivelihoodsustainabilityplanforAIGAs_20.1.202_6621_304.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:08:00 AM
7	12PopulationstatusofdolphininHaldariver_6621_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/12PopulationstatusofdolphininHaldariver_6621_304.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:08:00 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:

Currently, BFD implementing 5 projects in the Sundarbans areas. There are 4 projects are in pipeline. No table among them are Extension and Development of Ecotourism Facilities in Sundarbans Project, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of South West Region of Bangladesh for Conserving Outstanding Universal Value of the Sundarban, SUROKSHA project, etc. UNDP is currently formulating a transboundary water project (Bangladesh, India & Sri Lanka) to address transboundary illegal wildlife poaching in the Sundarbans and Swatch of no Ground areas.. Please see the attached Terminal Evaluation report

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TEFINALReport_16April2020_pdf_6621_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/TEFINALReport_16April2020_pdf_6621_305.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:10:00 AM

Principled

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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 addressed gender equality in output, activities, and indicators. In livelihood and income-generating activities, women-headed households were considered. The final evaluation report also indicates some evidence on gender equality and women empowerment.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TEFINALReport_16April2020_pdf_6621_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/TEFINALReport_16April2020_pdf_6621_306.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:30:00 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 Substantial and 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 Substantial and 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, Substantial, 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:

No environmental and social risks were observed during project implementation, as it was a truly conservation project. Moreover, there was no major infrastructure and civil works in the projects. There were no resettlement and land acquisition issues.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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, Substantial, 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 Substantial or 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:

The project did not receive any petition or grievance from the communities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SESP-Dolphin_6621_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESP-Dolphin_6621_308.docx)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:39:00 AM

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 was 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 an M&E plan with baselines and targets. Progress data against indicators were regularly collected according to the frequency stated in the M &E plan. Both mid-term review and terminal evaluation were conducted following UNDP evaluation guidelines and GEF evaluation guidelines. Recommendations and lessons learned were taken for necessary adjustment, using key actions that were set up after these two evaluations.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MEPlan_EPASIIAE_2020_6621_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MEPlan_EPASIIAE_2020_6621_309.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:40:00 AM
2	PIMS4620_MTRfinal_Nov2019_6621_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS4620_MTRfinal_Nov2019_6621_309.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:40:00 AM
3	TEFINALReport_16April2020_pdf_6621_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TEFINALReport_16April2020_pdf_6621_309.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:41:00 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 governance mechanism was operated well, and all the PSC and PIC meeting was properly documented. The PSC and PIC meetings were conducted regularly and as and when required. The last PSC meeting minutes are attached.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PICMeetingminutes-signed_6621_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PICMeetingminutes-signed_6621_310.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:15:00 AM
2	4thPICMeetingminutesof23.6.18_Zoommeeting_6621_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4thPICMeetingminutesof23.6.18_Zoommeeting_6621_310.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:15:00 AM
3	FinalsignedscanWorkingpaper_1stPSC_EPASIIAEP_6621_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalsignedscanWorkingpaper_1stPSC_EPASIIAEP_6621_310.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:16:00 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:

The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders. The project management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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:

Adequate resources were not allocated to achieve the targeted results. The resource requirement was inadequate compared to the project scope and target as it was a medium-size project.

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 had an annual procurement plan which was quarterly reviewed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Dolphin_AWP2017_PDSignedonly_6621_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Dolphin_AWP2017_PDSignedonly_6621_313.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:21:00 AM
2	CopyofExpandingAquaticEcosystemProcurementPlan2017_Final_6621_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofExpandingAquaticEcosystemProcurementPlan2017_Final_6621_313.xls)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:20:00 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:

There were regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies. The latest M&E report is attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	DolphinMEPlan_07JUI2017_6621_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DolphinMEPlan_07JUI2017_6621_314.docx)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:23:00 AM
2	MEPlan_EPASIIAE_2020_6621_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MEPlan_EPASIIAE_2020_6621_314.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:44:00 AM

Effective

Quality Rating: **Exemplary**

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence:

The project was on track and delivered its expected outputs. Attached is the project completion report and TE report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TEFINALReport_16April2020_pdf_6621_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/TEFINALReport_16April2020_pdf_6621_315.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:24:00 AM
2	FinalRev.PCR_IMED_EPASIIAEP07.10.20_6621_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/FinalRev.PCR_IMED_EPASIIAEP07.10.20_6621_315.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:25:00 AM

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 were regular reviews of the work plan and budget. The latest annual work plan and budget are attached. Progress and work plan were reviewed by UNDP Country Office twice a year (mid-year review and end-of-year review).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Signed-AWP_2020_1stDec19_6621_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Signed-AWP_2020_1stDec19_6621_316.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:29:00 AM
2	Dolphin_AWP2017_PDSignedonly_6621_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Dolphin_AWP2017_PDSignedonly_6621_316.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:29:00 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:

Project targeted groups were systematically identified and engaged. The selection process of livelihood beneficiaries and report on Dolphin Conservation Team(DCT) formation is attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	8StrategiclivelihoodsustainabilityplanforAIGAs_20.1.202_6621_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/8StrategiclivelihoodsustainabilityplanforAIGAs_20.1.202_6621_317.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:30:00 AM
2	5Baselinestudyreportforlivelihoodbeneficiaries_6621_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5Baselinestudyreportforlivelihoodbeneficiaries_6621_317.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:48:00 AM

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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:

Yes, relevant stakeholders and national partners were fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation, and monitoring of the project. The community based stakeholders engagement plan is attached.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	4Community-basedNRMPlan04_6621_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/4Community-basedNRMPlan04_6621_318.pdf)	arif.faisal@undp.org	12/10/2020 5:32:00 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](#)⁸ 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:

The capacity and performance of the Forest Department are assessed. The HACT assessment report is attached.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

A project sustainability management plan is prepared, and a concept note is submitted to FD.(attached). A recently approved project titled 'Ecosystem-based management of ECA project' (a GEF6 pipeline project to be implemented by MoEFCC & UNDP) Halda river is included and hence dolphin in the Halda river will be conserved, and the ecosystem in Halda will be improved. UNDP Bangladesh has taken the initiative to submit a Transboundary project proposal to GEF, namely 'International Waters on strengthening transboundary cooperation for the conservation of marine species that could cover the Sundarbans and Bay of Bengal.' The knowledge products and the lessons/good practices from the EAPSIIAE Project will be adopted in these projects to manage aquatic ecosystems and biodiversity, considering the long-term conservation of the cetaceans.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Rev.DolphinConservationProjectII-Copy_6621_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Rev.DolphinConservationProjectII-Copy_6621_320.docx)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:53:00 AM
2	Bangladesh_SSCAF_Proposal_2018.06.05_6621_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Bangladesh_SSCAF_Proposal_2018.06.05_6621_320.docx)	arif.faisal@undp.org	1/3/2021 6:54:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The project was designed to reduce the dependency of the poor's through nature-based solutions and alternative income generation activities through promoting income generation, conservation awareness through partnerships with NGOs and local government, in addition to ensuring national funds for the PAs. There has been little concrete success in this area and on-going efforts are required to raise funds for conservation from a variety of sources.

Ensuring additional national funds for the project's PAs is a priority. Ideally, the Forest Department's Conservation oriented work should be incorporated in their regular work through the revenue budget. This requires the MoEFCC to work with the Ministry of Finance to establish separate budget lines for activities such as SMART patrolling.

There are some ideas around sustainable financing, which need to be further developed (e.g. a green tax on industries using Mongla port, which could be then be used to support conservation, or payment by tourists for dolphin sightings (e.g. 10 Taka, of which 5 Taka could go to CMEC or BFD for Dolphin conservation). Other mechanisms may also be possible, such as attracting Impact Investors and private sector support. While Bangladesh is not part of BIOFIN it could draw on the work of BIOFIN at the regional level plus other global sustainable financing initiatives, and the on-going work of Poverty-Environment Action (PEA, UNDP-UNEP) in Bangladesh which is focused on mainstreaming poverty and environmental issues into budgeting and finance.

Donor funding. There is reportedly a focus on donor funding for climate change, with limited finance being allocated to biodiversity conservation. Finance is needed to conserve wildlife in general, not just dolphins, although a national-wide dolphin project could be supported to build in the work in Sundarbans by this project.

A study could be undertaken to identify innovative sustainable financing options for the area, covering public and private financial mechanisms. This would include a review of cost-saving approaches for managing the area, which is important given the high cost of accessing the sites.

MoEFCC, FD and DoE, are all aware of the above recommendations and many of these have already been reflected in various national strategies and action plan, including the 8th Five Year Plan, Bangladesh National Conservation Strategy (2016-2031), National Environmental Policy (2018), ECA Management Rules (2018), National Sustainable Development Strategy (2010-2021), Bangladesh Country Investment Plan for Environment, Forestry and Climate Change (2016-2021), etc.

Bangladesh needs an amount of US\$2.4 billion for sustainable management of natural resources and there is a funding gap of US\$1.8 billion according to the country's investment plan prepared by the government. A biodiversity finance plan aligned with public, private, and international finances will be a leap forward in planning and implementing the nature-based solution, reduce the existing finance gap as well as support the implementation of these plans. Progress of such finances needs to be monitored through consistent, country-specific, and comparable finance tracking and reporting.

A strong political commitment from the 'Parliamentary Standing Committee on Environment' in implementing 'Planetary Emergency' (Declared in December 2019) will be complementary to all these activities.