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# **Overview of the reporting period (October ‘17 – March ‘18)**

During the October 2017 to March 2018 reporting period NUPRP achieved some notable results despite the Government not having officially approved NUPRP’s implementation activities yet. The delay in the signing of the DPP has led to obvious limitations to the programme’s operational capacity and ability to produce impacts on the ground. In spite of these limitations the Programme has been steadily laying a strong foundation for full implementation, which is anticipated to happen during the next six-month reporting period (April ’18 – September ’18). The reporting period is thus characterized by achievements in the completion of a number of assessments, a focus on the capacity building of community partners, the creation of a vast database of registered Programme beneficiaries, improvements in the team’s management capacity, and the successful completion of the DFID Annual Review.

NUPRP achieved an ‘A’ during the 2017 Annual Review, in part due to lowered expectations for achievable results, but also due to significant programmatic achievements. Where it was possible to actively engage with towns and cities NUPRP was able to establish a firm foothold in seven cities and in these cities complete mapping and data collection initiatives, re-activate community organizations, develop relationships with local stakeholders and Mayors, and prepare each city with a targeted Poverty Reduction Strategy. The 2017 Annual Review demonstrated that Output Coordinators and Town Managers have a clear vision and methodology in place for implementing NUPRP and are ready to move forward once DPP approval is granted.

Some of the key achievements during this period are the following: for Output 1 a number of assessments that support Local Governments’ response to poverty have been prepared, for example an assessment of all the projects being conducted in each city that can assist improved coordination. For Output 2 an ambitious capacity building training programme has been initiated in nine cities in which modules have been prepared for CDCs and Town Federations, and they have already received a number of training sessions. For Output 3, Wards with the highest concentrations of poverty were focused on to identify eligible SEF grant beneficiaries, and community groups (Federations and CDCs) have been engaged to support the selection process. For Output 4 a set of implementation guidelines have been developed to orient the Vacant Land Mapping process, and a database and set of maps have resulted from two cities. In addition the CHDF Assessment Report was also completed. NUPRP has spent $ 1.1 M during the period October 2017 – March 2018.

In addition NUPRP has used this period to further strengthen management practices, improve internal communication, and continuously train the Team to enhance performance. The programme held quarterly team meetings in October and December 2017, with a mind to reviewing progress and identifying issues as they emerge in the field. The result of these initiatives has been improved and standardized reporting, better understanding by Team members of Programme activities, and more responsiveness from HQ to evolving needs in the field. Such practices will support effective implementation of activities once the DPP has been approved.

# **Output 1: Improved coordination, planning and management in program towns and cities**

Between October 2017 and March 2018, the key activities under this component included the preparation of Ward Poverty Atlases, the completion of an assessment of donor efforts at the city-level, the preparation of Poverty Reduction Strategies, and the drafting of urban poverty profiles. There have been several challenges including: (i) the motivation of local government officials in some cities to actively engage in the process in the absence of an approved DPP; (ii) the scaling-back of field activities due to the limited availability of funds, and; (iii) hampered activities in some cities, most notably Barisal and Khulna, due to the upcoming elections. Despite these challenges, the programme has been able to successfully engage with elected representatives (Mayors and Ward Councillors) and communities in most of the cities.

# **Highlights for the period October 2017 – March 2018**

**Prepared Ward Poverty Atlases for six cities**

During the reporting period NUPRP prepared Ward Poverty Atlases for six cities -- Chandpur, Mymensingh, Barisal, Khulna, Chittagong and Sylhet. These atlases follow on from mahalla mapping and urban poor settlement mapping. They are intended to 1) educate Ward Councillors, and Community Organisations about poverty conditions in the mahallas and poor settlements in terms of infrastructure, education, water, sanitation, and health. (2) Visualise the poverty status of poor settlements, and (iii) facilitate the beneficiary selection process for SIF and SEF interventions.

The Ward Poverty Atlases were used by stakeholders (Ward Councillors, Federations and Clusters) to facilitate beneficiary selection during Ward-Level workshops. Facilitators presented the comparative poverty situation of each Wards’ different mahallas which helped communities to make more informed and rational decisions about which communities concentrate poverty and should be prioritised in terms of Program support.

**Finalized the ‘Coordination Committees and Standing Committees Assessment’ Report for twelve cities**

The Coordination and Standing Committees are city-level multi-stakeholder platforms that can potentially bring together stakeholders to discuss and resolve poverty-related issues. They should be active and involve citizens together with government representatives. In mid-2018 NUPRP conducted an assessment of these various coordination committees, such as the Town- and Ward-Level Coordination Committees, in all twelve first-phase cities to understand whether or not they were functioning, and who was attending them. Of particular interest to NUPRP are the Standing Committees on Slum Development and Poverty Reduction, Disaster Management, and Women and Children. The report was finalised during the reporting period.

**Completed mapping of donor efforts in nine cities**

In an effort to avoid duplication between different development organizations, and promote city-level collaboration, NUPRP conducted a mapping initiative of donor efforts in nine of the first-phase cities -- Barisal, Chandpur, Chittagong, Dhaka North, Khulna, Mymensingh, Narayanganj, Sirajganj, and Sylhet. The exercise aims to: (i) identify projects that are similar in nature to NUPRP; (ii) identify the scope, scale and geography of such projects; and (iii) identify the areas of potential coordination.

The assessment identified 65 projects/records across the 9 cities, this provides ample opportunity for coordination. Local Government will lead coordination efforts, aided by the guidance and support of NUPRP, and using existing coordination structures where they exist. This assessment will be continuous, so when new projects are identified or initiated they will be added to the database and can be integrated into the Local Government’s efforts to coordinate them.

**Prepared city-level Poverty Reduction Strategy for Seven Cities**

During the reporting period Poverty Reduction Strategies were prepared in seven cities, namely Barisal, Chandpur, Chittagong, Khulna, Mymensingh, Narayanganj, and Sylhet. Poverty Reduction Strategies aim to help local governments offer objective, effective, and importantly apolitical, poverty reduction interventions in the city based on the analysis of city-level poverty data. The Strategies are based on a few inputs: Poverty data (i) collected through participatory poverty mapping (mahalla and poor settlement mapping), and (ii) the prioritization of poverty indicators identified through City Context Workshop (Ward-level indices were derived for (a) overall poverty index (b) aggregate infrastructure index (c) aggregate livelihood and wellbeing index, and (d) aggregate land tenure and housing index). This information helps to guide the city authority and NUPRP in making investment decisions at the Ward level guided by need and the concentration of poverty levels.

In each of the seven cities for which the Poverty Reduction Strategy has been prepared, wards have been categorized into four different classes: 1st priority wards (critical development wards), 2nd priority wards (very low developed wards), 3rd priority wards (low developed wards), and 4th priority wards (relatively well-developed wards). The budget will be distributed taking into consideration the classification.

**Urban Poverty Profiles drafted for three cities**

Urban Poverty Profiles (UPP) have been drafted in three cities during the reporting period, namely Chittagong, Mymensingh and Chandpur. These are intended as an information resource for community organizations and Local Government officials and they have three objectives: (1) to provide stakeholders with a city-scale guide that explains and demystifies urban poverty, (2) to inform discussions about planning for the city’s slums, and (3) to support communities to identify and advocate for needed actions. For Local Governments the UPP will help officials understand and contextualize the needs of the poor, and locate where problems are most acute. The UPPs draw on several sources of information including poverty mapping, city context workshops, and the urban profile validation workshops.

# **Progress towards LF targets**

The following table presents progress towards NUPRP’s current September 2018 milestones.

| **September 2018 LF milestone** | **Progress** | **Remark** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 1.1:** Number of Municipalities and City Corporations actively involving the poor in climate resilient and pro poor planning  **Milestone: 12** | Based on a scorecard of 5 criteria this indicator was achieved in 4 towns/ cities (Chandpur, Chittagong, Mymensingh, and Narayanganj) in December 2017.  Due to delays in the DPP approval process, there have been no recent activities related to this indicator. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 1.2:** Number of Municipalities and City Corporations coordinating with stakeholders to improve / increase services focusing on the poor (through active involvement of standing committees, WLCC/ WC, TLCCs / CSCC) (Cumulative)  **Milestone:** 6 | Based on a scorecard of 3 criteria this indicator has been achieved in 5 towns/ cities (Chandpur,  Chittagong, Faridpur, Patuakhali, and Sirajganj) in December 2017.  Due to delays in the DPP approval process, there have been no recent activities related to this indicator. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 1.3:** Number of towns/ cities with Strategic Urban Resilience Plans drafted (pro-poor and climate resilient) (ICF KPI 13)  **Milestone:** 10 | Due to delays in the DPP approval process, progress in developing SURPs has been hampered.  Significant progress has however been made in preparing ‘chapters’ of the SURPs, including: 1) poverty mapping completed in 7 cities 2) pro-poor economic development strategy for 9 cities drafted, and 3) capacity building strategy for community organization completed for 9 cities  Few other activities like CCVA, pro-poor climate resilient infrastructure development strategy, strategy to increase municipal revenue etc. will be started once DPP is approved. These will then be incorporated within the SURPs. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |

The following table presents a summary of achievements (for the reporting period and cumulatively) for key activities/ indicators.

| **Indicator** | **Achieved between October – March 2018** | **Cumulative achievement**  **(as at March 2018)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of cities/ towns in which urban poor settlement mapping completed | 0 | 7 cities |
| Number of city context workshops completed | 0 | 5 cities |
| Number of towns/ cities in which priority wards have been identified | 7 cities | 7 cities |
| Ward Poverty ATLAS prepared | 6 cities | 6 cities |
| Assessment of Coordination Committees and Standing Committees completed | 0 | 12 cities |
| Mapping city-level donor efforts completed | 9 cities | 9 cities |
| Urban Poverty Profile (UPP) drafted | 3 cities | 3 cities |

# **Constraints during the period**

Key constraints related to Output 1 during the reporting period are presented in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Constraints** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Actions taken** |
| Not all town team members could be recruited | High | HQ staff made frequent field visits to support Output 1 related activities such as Mahalla and urban poor settlement mapping. In addition, local government staff were also motivated to engage with mapping processes. |
| Delay in DPP approval restricted activities related to public engagement | High | Outdoor activities related to public engagement have been reduced. More time was given in small groups in the communities. Individual meetings were mainly promoted instead of large group meeting for assessments such as ‘donor efforts in the city’. |

# **Planned activities and key targets for the period April – September 2018**

The following table presents the key activities for the next reporting period (April - September 2018):

| **Planned Activities for April – September 2018** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP approved April 30th** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP approved June 30th** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Mapping donor efforts | 3 cities  (Faridpur, Kushtia, and Patuakhali) | 3 cities  (Faridpur, Kushtia, and Patuakhali) |
| Participatory poverty mapping (Mahalla and Resources Mapping and Urban Poor Settlement Mapping) | 5 cities  (Dhaka North, Faridpur, Kushtia, Patuakhali, and Sirajganj) | 3 cities  (Kushtia, Patuakhali, and Sirajganj) |
| Ward Poverty Atlases prepared | 5 cities  (Dhaka North, Faridpur, Kushtia, Patuakhali, and Sirajganj) | 3 cities  (Kushtia, Patuakhali, and Sirajganj) |
| Institutional and Financial Capacity Assessment (IFCA) conducted | 8 cities | 4 cities |
| Climate Change and Vulnerability Assessment (CCVA) conducted | 8 cities | 4 cities |
| Strategic Urban Resilience Plan (SURP) prepared | 2 cities | 1 city |
| Strategy to increase municipal revenues prepared | 2 cities | 1 city |

# **Risks and planned mitigation measures (next reporting period)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risks** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Mitigation measures** |
| Delays in contracting Output 1 staff once the DPP is signed will impede progress | High | Town Managers and other city stakeholders will be motivated to continue Output 1 activities without the full Town Teams being in place. |
| Upcoming elections will disrupt the activities in some cities (*i.e.* Khulna, Barisal) | Moderate | Public engagement in NUPRP activates will brought to be low level in the city where election is an issue.  Some activities of the Output will be planned accordingly. |

# **Output 2: Enhanced Organization, Capability and Effective Voice of Poor Urban Communities**

The main challenges in terms of community mobilization have been effectively re-engaging, or re-activating, existing (UPPR) community organizations so that they can return to being effective agents of change in local communities. This was by no means an easy task considering that many had had no guidance or support for close to two years, their morale was often low, and many lacked a vision for further development. These were also CDCs and Federations that had become dependent on UPPR and support structures, such as the assistance of community facilitators, to push them forward. In other cases however CDCs, CDC Clusters, and Federations, had remained resilient and continued to display a remarkable sense of determination. Such organizations demonstrate that the existing model is indeed robust and sustainable, if adequate notice and preparation is undertaken. Thus, NUPRP is placing significant emphasis on building capacity and encouraging such organizations to develop their own vision, mission, goals and action plans to be self-resilient, independent and autonomous organizations that last beyond the project-support cycle.

# **Highlights for the period October 2017 to March 2018**

**Develop Vision, missions and capacity building action plan for Town Federations**

Nine of the twelve first-phase cities have Federations established during UPPR (Dhaka North, Chittagong, Khulna, Sylhet, Barishal, Narayanganj, Mymensingh, Sirajganj and Kushtia.) The Federation assessment report, conducted in early 2017 by NUPRP, identified that most of the Federations lack a clear sense of their vision, mission, goals, or their own capacity building strategy. In response NUPRP developed methodologies and training guidelines to develop the vision, mission and capacity building action plans of each of the Federations. Two workshops were held for each of the nine Federations between February and March 2018, the output of which was a mission, vision, and set of organizational goals, as well as a capacity building plan. Federation leaders as well as some Cluster leaders participated in the workshops.

**Develop CDC’s Capacity Building Strategies for the Cities**

The CDC capacity assessment conducted in early 2017 by NUPRP showed that CDC capacity varies greatly. This means that a one-size-fits-all capacity building approach is not appropriate. Instead NUPRP has developed a city-specific capacity building strategy for each of the 9 old (UPPR) cities. Allowing the Programme to identify which COs require most help and where that help will make the greatest impact.

Town Managers conducted workshops and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with the leaders of very weak/weak and moderately active CDCs, during the months of February and March 2018, to assess their training needs. The CDCs were selected from critically developed, very low developed, and low developed, wards. The President, Secretary and some other leaders from Town Federations along with former Community Facilitators (CF) were also invited to the workshops.

**Reformed and Reactivated Primary Groups (PGs) and Community Development Committees (CDCs)**CDCs serve as the basis for almost all NUPRP’s activities such as participatory planning and promoting savings and credit groups. CDCs in the nine old (UPPR) cities were reactivated whilst a limited number of new CDCs were also formed in Chandpur and Mymensingh. During the reporting period 459 CDCs were reactivated bringing the cumulative total to 1,004 CDCs in 9 old (UPPR) cities. In addition, 6 new CDCs, comprising 78 Primary Groups were formed during the reporting period. CDC re-activation involved the development of a set of guidelines and tools, such as posters and reporting formats, and trainings for Town Managers and subsequently Federation leaders.

**Developed Capacity Building Training Guidelines for Town Federation and CDCs**

During the reporting period five Federation training guidelines (or modules) were developed, this were: 1) Developing A Vision, Mission and Setting Goals, 2) Developing Action Plans, 3) Anti-Fraud Training, 4) Organizational Development and Management Training, and 5) Savings and Credit Management.

In addition, three CDC training guidelines were developed (in draft form), these were: 1) Community Action Planning and Re-CAP, 2) Anti-Fraud Training, and 3) Strengthening the Capacity of Community Purchase Committees.

**Conducted Capacity Building Training for Town Federations**

Three batches of capacity building training were conducted with each Town Federation, as well as some potential cluster leaders, related to Federation Vision, Mission and Goals, Action Planning, and Organizational Development and Management. In total, 27 training sessions were conducted across 9 cities, for around 550 (mostly women) participants. Each batch was made up of around 20 to 25 participants. The overall objective of these trainings was to enhance the capacity of all the old (UPPR) 9 town federations. NUPRP Dhaka level staff, along with Town Managers conducted all the training courses. Basic orientation was given to all Town Managers for building their capacity as well. Savings and Credit Management and Anti-Fraud training is planned for the period of April to June 2018.

**Developed Savings & Credit registers books for CDCs and Savings and Credit Groups (SCG)**

During the reporting period ten different S&C registers were developed to assist CDCs and SCGs to manage their activities. Some Town Managers and HQ staff finalized the registers which are now ready for printing and dissemination.

# **Progress towards LF targets**

The following table presents progress towards NUPRP’s September 2018 milestones.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **September 2018 LF milestone** | **Progress** | **Remark** |
| **Indicator 2.1**  Percentage of CDCs whose performance is judged "fully effective " on an objective and agreed scale to assess institutional effectiveness as a result of capacity building.  **Milestone: 30%** | All (1490) CDCs capacity assessment completed. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 2.2**  Percentage of Federations whose performance is judged "fully effective" on an objective and agreed scale to assess institutional effectiveness as a result of capacity building  **Milestone: 30%** | All 9 existing Phase 1 Federations have received some training (vision, mission). They also now have a capacity development plan which will be implemented after DPP signing. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 2.3**  Value of savings generated from savings and credit groups that can reduce the risk of climate shocks and stresses (ICF KPI 1) (Cumulative)  **Milestone: GBP 3.8 million** | Baseline assessment not initiated due to resource limitation. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed and after baseline developed |

The following table presents a summary of achievements (for the reporting period and cumulatively) for key activities/ indicators

| **Indicator** | **Achieved between October – March 2018** | **Cumulative achievement (as at March 2018)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of new Community Development Committees (CDC) formed in 9 towns (Old +New) | 6 | 27 |
| Number of existing CDCs reactivated in 9 UPPR cities | 459 | 1,004 |
| Number of CDCs, Clusters and Federations received mandatory[[1]](#footnote-1) training | 9 Federations[[2]](#footnote-2) | 9 Federations |
| Number of CDCs managing their savings & credit activities | 780 CDCs in 9 UPPR Cities continue their S&C activities | 935 CDCs in 9 UPPR Cities continue their S&C activities |

# **Constraints during the period**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Constraints** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Actions taken** |
| Field staff (Community Facilitator & Community Organiser) not recruited | High | Federation, Clusters and community volunteers have been engaged in community mobilization, reactivation and formation of CDCs. |
| Limited new community mobilization in cities due to shortage of resources | Medium | A focus on reactivating old (UPPR) CDCs rather than establishing new community organizations |
| Savings & Credit baseline not initiated due to resource limitation. | Medium | Baseline methodology, tools and data collection app have been developed. Piloting will take place in April/ May and will scale-up once the DPP has been signed and resources are available. |

# **Planned activities and key targets for the period April – September 2018**

The following table presents the key activities for the next reporting period (April - September 2018):

| **Planned Activities for April – September 2018** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP approved April 30th** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP approved June 30th** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Form new CDCs | 110 | 40 |
| Reactive CDCs in old (UPPR) cities | 155 | 105 |
| Develop Community Action Plans (CAP) in all cities | 195 | 50 |
| Develop Training modules for capacity building of Community Organizations (CDCs, Clusters & Federations) | 04 | 04 |
| Conduct mandatory capacity building training for Community Purchase Committee and Social Audit Committee | 14 Batches | 7 batches |
| Conduct Basic ToT for Programme staff on training courses | 7 batches | 4 batches |
| Conduct mandatory capacity building training for CDCs, Clusters & Federation | 90 Batches | 29 batches |
| Organize community-to-community and city-to-city learning visit for LGIs officials and community leaders | 20 community-to-community visits | 10 community-to-community visits |
| Conduct savings & credit baseline assessment in 9 old (UPPR) cities | 1,550 CDCs | 0 |
| Conduct progress assessment of CDCs and Federations capacity | 798 (CDCs) | 0 |

# **Risks and planned mitigation measures (next reporting period)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risks** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Mitigation measures** |
| Community Organisations (CDCs, Clusters and Federation) are engaged by Ward Councillors and Political leaders in election campaigns | Medium | * Town Manager will conduct meetings with CO leaders to make them clear about NUPRP’s position/stance during any public election. * Town Manager will inform CEOs and other key Municipality/City Corporation officials about the Program’s position during election period. * CLC and Output Coordinator will also monitor the situation and communicate with respective cities during elections. |

# **Output 3: Improved well-being in poor urban slums particularly for women and girls**

Between October 2017 and March 2018, the key activities under Output 3 focused on prioritizing the Wards with the highest concentrations of poverty to support SEF grant beneficiary selection, the orientation of community groups (Federations and CDCs) for SEF beneficiary selection, creating and populating a database for SEF grantees, the development of market assessment tools and piloting a Job Market Assessment report. The main challenges encountered during this period have been firstly the verification of SEF grantees due to inadequate staff at the ground, secondlykeeping low profile at the city due to inadequate budget and staff at the ground, and also involving community groups and local government government officials in large gatherings which is problematic due to the delayed approval of the DPP. Despite the challenges during this period, several workshops and beneficiary selection activities were conducted, and a number of tools were successfully created.

# **Highlights for the period October 2017 – March 2018**

**Finalize SEF beneficiary selection process and methodology**

NUPRP’s ward prioritization and grant beneficiary selection methodology has been tested, it is scalable, and is ready to introduce in other cities. The selection criteria for NUPRP SEF and Education Grants were finalized, in consultation with community groups, staff and stakeholders. The selection criteria considered Vulnerability, Age, Gender, Affiliation and priority groups, and also some exclusion criteria, in order to avoid duplication of services at the community-level. Based on the selection criteria, a ten-step process was finalized for the SEF beneficiary selection process that includes: 1) Priority Ward Selection, 2) Community Group (PG/ CDC) Formation/ Reactivation, 3) Agreement on allocation of NUPRP budget, by Ward, 4) Primary Group Member Registration with MPI, 5) NUPRP develops list of eligible beneficiaries, 6) Orientation of CO leadership, 7) Community validation and short-listing,8) Community-level sharing meeting, 9) Ward-level validation with Councilors, and 10) Verification.

**Orientation to the Community Groups for SEF beneficiary selection process**

NUPRP developed a short process of SEF beneficiary selection process due to the lack of availability of PG member registration data with MPI. By following the short process, Output 3 identified and selected 30,575 grant beneficiaries. Community groups were an integral part of the beneficiary selection so that they were needed orientation in order to ensure transparency and ownership. The Town Managers conducted 47 batches training, in critical and high-poverty wards, in 7 cities leading to the identification of 30,575 grant beneficiaries. After the orientation, they successfully identified SEF beneficiary from the primary groups.

**Identification of beneficiaries for SEF grants**SEF grants will be distributed to eligible beneficiaries from Primary Groups in prioritized wards. NUPRP worked in seven cities targeting priority wards and communities where poverty is concentrated, and allowed PGs and CDCs to play a significant role in deciding who were those with most need. The transparent, consensus-driven process helped ensure satisfaction of beneficiaries, and the lists were presented to Ward Counselors, thereby also included them in the validation and approval stage of the process. The process does not yet benefit from the additional verification mechanism of the HH survey’s ‘Multi-dimensional Poverty Index’ (MPI) that adds further validation capacity.

**Market assessment tool piloted, report produced and implemented in other cities**  
In order to develop local poverty reduction strategies such as understanding where apprentices can take courses, what start-up businesses are best suited for project support, and what advice to give local governments about promoting employment drives, a market assessment is useful. Output 3 developed Market Assessment Tool and tested in Mymensingh as well as produce assessment report. By using the Market Assessment Tool, the Town Manager in 8 cities collected primary data from (110 Interview & FGD with key stakeholders). Altogether, 9 cities (Mymensingh, Barisal, have completed their Market Assessment Repot. The report will make a foundation for developing Local Economic Development Plan for each city.

# **Progress towards LF targets**

The following table presents progress towards NUPRP’s current September 2018 milestones.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **December 2017 LF milestone** | **Progress** | **Progress**  **(On track, not on track)** |
| **Indicator 3.1:**  Percentage of education grantees completing the academic year in which they receive the grant  Milestone: 80% | Methodology for beneficiary selection has been completed and beneficiary selection for 7 cities completed. Grant distribution has not been started due to delayed DPP approval. | On track Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 3.2:**  Percentage of primary target groups (pregnant and lactating women) with improved awareness about nutrition issues above baseline  Milestone: 60% | NUPRP’s nutrition strategy was completed and submitted to DFID in September 2017. Due to delayed approval of DPP the staff are not at the ground to conduct the baseline. | Not on track  Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 3.3:**  Number of CDC safe community committees functioning to address VAWG and early marriage issues  Milestone:50 Committees | It requires DPP approval in order to form the committee at the ground level. | Not on track  Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 3.4:**  Number of people with improved livelihood opportunities through SEF (ICF KPI 1)  Milestone: 26,200 (20% M, 80% F) | Beneficiary selection for 7 cities completed. Grant distribution has not been started due to delayed DPP approval. PG registration is going on to verify further the list of grantees | On track  Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 3.5:**  Number of CDC leaders received training related to VAWG and early marriage  Milestone: 2250 CDC leaders | Selection of gender security audit consultant is done. It requires DPP approval to deploy the consultant at the ground. The assessment will also provide an outline of training curricula. | Not on track  Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |

The following table presents a summary of achievements (for the reporting period and cumulatively) for key activities/ indicators.

| **Indicator** | **Achieved between October – March 2018** | **Cumulative achievement**  **(as at March 2018)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Finalize SEF beneficiary selection process and methodology | 1 | 9 cities 9 cities (Dhaka North, Sylhet, Chittagong, Khulna, Barisal Sirajganj, Mymensingh, Narayangonj, Chandpur) |
| Orientation to the Community Groups for SEF beneficiary selection process | 47 batches (1500 participants) | 7 cities (Sylhet, Chittagong, Khulna, Barisal Mymensingh, Narayangonj, Chandpur) |
| Identification of beneficiaries for SEF grants | 7 cities | 7 cities (Sylhet, Chittagong, Khulna, Barisal Mymensingh, Narayangonj, Chandpur) |
| Market assessment tool piloted, report produced and implemented in other cities | 9 cities | 9 cities (Dhaka North, Sylhet, Chittagong, Khulna, Barisal Sirajganj, Mymensingh, Narayangonj, Chandpur) |

# **Constraints during the period**

Key constraints related to Output 3 during the reporting period are presented in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Constraints** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Actions taken** |
| Keeping low profile and visibility at the city level in term of engaging local government and community groups to implement SEF related takes. | High | Developed a short-cut methodology and process to select SEF beneficiary and oriented to the community groups. |
| Inadequate at the ground to collect data for assessment, report preparation and performing another assigned task. | Medium | HQ staff provided significant support like concept note, guideline, outline etc. to the town team to draft report, collect data and finalize report. |

# **Planned activities and key targets for the period April – September 2018**

The following table presents the key activities for the next reporting period (April - September 2018):

| **Planned Activities for April – September 2018** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP approved April 30th** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP approved June 30th** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Train business grantees to plan and manage their businesses | 7 cities (Narayanganj, Chandpur, Chittagong, Mymensingh, Khulna, Dhaka North City Council, and Sylhet) | -- |
| Train the CDC Clusters and CDCs on SEF contract implementation | 7 cities | -- |
| Establish partnership with the Skill Training providing Organization and Private Sectors for Job Placement | 7 cities | -- |
| Establish Socio-Economic Fund (SEF) fund flow mechanism at the city | 7 cities | 7 cities |
| Select and Verify SEF list of beneficiaries for grants | 7 cities | 7 cities |
| Facilitate CDCs to select SEF beneficiary and develop their SEF Proposals | 7 cities | 7 cities |
| Distribute SEF grants to the selected beneficiary | 7 cities | -- |
| Assess gender security in urban poor communities | 5 cities | 5 cities |
| Form Safe Community Committees (SCC) to address VAWG and EFM issues | 7 cities | 7 cities |

# **Risks and planned mitigation measures (next reporting period)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risks** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Mitigation measures** |
| Establish an agreement with the government (both central and local) may take longer time than expected | High | Senior Management needs agreement/ back-up plan for it |
| New cities may take longer time to create community groups and mobilize them accordingly | Medium | Management needs to plan approach and extra energy for new cities on how to mobilize them |
| Municipal election may slow down the process of SEF implementation | Medium | Orient and the newly elected Mayor, Ward Councilor and others.  Close coordination with the newly elected official |
| City/Municipal Authority may not appreciate/buy-in the methodology that output 3 would follow. | Low | Orient them the methodology beforehand and maintain close communication with them from the beginning of the intervention |
| Stagnant state may be taken place in outreaching Output 3 staff (Nutrition and Socio-economic Facilitator, Experts) once the DPP is signed will impede progress | High | HQ operation team, programme team and town team will play an active role in recruiting field level staff. |

# **Output 4: More secure land tenure and housing in programme towns and cities**

Securing adequate and safe housing is an essential issue for any poor community. NUPRP, through the Community Housing Development Fund (CHDF) plans to help poor communities with housing support. NUPRP will support CHDFs to build and develop their capacity in managing the CHDF’s efficiently and effectively.

Land tenure security is another concern in urban poor communities. NUPRP, in this regard, will assist participating cities and towns to prepare Land Tenure Action Plans (LTAP) which involves identifying opportunities to negotiate new and better land tenure arrangements for the urban poor. In most cities however, information about the ownership status of land is not available, and so city governments have little control and knowledge about available land that could potentially be used for housing the urban poor. For this reason, another important related activity is Vacant Land Mapping. This aims to develop a city-wide inventory of vacant land.

# **Highlights for the period October – March 2018**

**Developed Vacant Land Mapping implementation guidelines**

Through vacant land mapping, NUPRP is working with local government to better document and understand the availability of, ownership of and appropriateness of vacant land parcels within cities and towns. The information can help guide the design of a Land Tenure Action Plan (LTAP) to assist Local Governments to address land tenure and housing problems within cities.

During the previous reporting period (March – September 2017), NUPRP developed the Vacant Land Mapping methodology. During the current reporting period, the Programme developed the VLM implementation guidelines.

**Developed database and map**

During the previous reporting period (March – September 2017), NUPRP partially[[3]](#footnote-3) conducted the VLM survey in two cities, namely Chandpur and Narayanganj.

Comprehensive datasets and maps were generated to use for preparing VLM reports and provide the following:

* Availability, location and extent of the vacant lands in a city and their distribution by wards
* Identity of the vacant lands as per government mouza maps
* Actual ownership of the vacant lands by their types of ownerships and by their types of use in terms of their unused or underused state for long time
* Information is available to analyse the appropriateness of vacant lands in terms of their location and surrounding land use, condition, quality, value, availability of services, potential use, and status of court injunction (whether there is any pending court injunction on the land)

During the current reporting period (March – October 2018), the Programme developed databases and maps based on the survey data.

**CHDF Assessment Report completed**

During the previous reporting period (March – September 2017), NUPRP undertook an assessment of the existing Community Housing Development Funds (CHDFs) in five cities, namely Sylhet, DNCC, Sirajganj, Narayanganj and Chittagong. The Assessment sought to identify strengths and weaknesses so that NUPRP can not only create training materials, but can apply those in a way in which each CHDF, which resides in a different city, has its own training plan. Doing so will allow NUPRP to follow up on their progress, help CHDFs become stronger and more independent, and grow their resource base to serve more and more poor households. During the current reporting period (October – March 2018), NUPRP completed the Assessment Report. This provides a comparative analysis of the CHDFs in five different capacities/ domains, finding gaps and necessary recommendations where further initiatives should be taken.

# **Progress towards LF targets**

The following table presents progress towards NUPRP’s current September 2018 milestones.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **September 2018 LF milestone** | **Progress** | **Remarks** |
| **Indicator: 4.1.** Number of CHDFs established / revitalised for climate resilient housing upgrades  **Milestone: 12** | No CHDFs have been established/ revitalized.  The CHDF assessment/ baseline report has however been completed which will guide support to existing CHDFs. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 4.2.** Number of households using their CHDF loan to make their houses more climate resilient  **Milestone: 500** | No CHDFs have provided loans | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 4.3** Number of households with improved tenure security  **Milestone: 12,000** | The Vacant Land Mapping Implementation Guideline was completed during the reporting period. It was made available to the annual review team | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| **Indicator 4.4:** Number of households more climate resilient as a result of land readjustment, land sharing, land consolidation  **Milestone: 500** | Ditto | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |

The following table presents a summary of achievements (for the reporting period and cumulatively) for key activities/ indicators.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Achieved between October – March 2018** | **Cumulative achievement (as at March 2018)** |
| VLM implementation guidelines developed | 1 | 1 |
| Number of cities/ towns in which VLM field survey completed (Narayanganj, Chandpur) | 2 | 2 |
| Number of CHDF assessment/ baseline reports completed | 1 (for 5 CHDFs) | 1(for 5 CHDFs) |

# **Constraints during the period**

Key constraints related to Output 4 during the reporting period are presented in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Constraints** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Actions taken** |
| No designated staff to complete the VLM methodology | High | NUPRP staff who has relevant knowledge provided support in reviewing the VLM methodology |
| Lack of available budget to engage GIS expert to map the VLM data for Narayanganj and Chandpur | Medium | Internal resources used i.e. NUPRP staff to digitize the maps |

# **Planned activities and key targets for the period April – September 2018**

The following table presents the key activities for the next reporting period (April - September 2018):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planned Activities for April – September 2018** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP approved April 30th** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP approved June 30th** |
| Review the existing VLM methodology | Final VLM methodology | Final VLM methodology |
| Complete VLM survey and reports for Narayanganj City Corporation and Chandpur (including the 5 final steps) | Complete VLM survey reports for NCC and Chandpur | Complete VLM survey reports for NCC and Chandpur |
| Conduct Vacant Land Mapping survey in 8 remaining cities | VLM survey complete in 8 cities | VLM survey complete in 8 cities |
| If the need arises, and in consultation with DFID, support rehabilitation of highly vulnerable poor communities in the case of an emergency (natural disaster or forced eviction) | No target | No target |
| Develop CHDF strategy, guideline, training modules, and training plan, related to the establishment and management of all CHDFs | CHDF strategy, guideline, training modules, and training plan | CHDF strategy, guideline, training modules, and training plan |

# **Risks and planned mitigation measures (next reporting period)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risks** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Mitigation measures** |
| Poor VLM field surveyors | Medium | Careful training, close monitoring and management. Recruit local professional surveyors |
| Data quality issues with the VLM survey | High | Careful training, close monitoring and management. Recruit local professional surveyors |

# **Output 5: More and better climate-resilient and community-based infrastructure in programme towns and cities**

Many urban poor communities lack basic services and infrastructure, making life particularly difficult for women and children, who often spend their days confined to settlements and struggle to access water, sanitation, and safe access. To help address infrastructure needs the Settlement Infrastructure Fund (SIF) is designed to support local communities engage in inclusive planning processes to identify their needs and submit proposals for approval. The process is however lengthy, requiring many documents and the support of engineers to draft plans and budgets, and requires community oversight in the execution of the projects on the ground. NUPRP seeks to respond to these challenges by deploying community facilitators to better train and facilitate Community Action Planning (CAP) processes, and to provide more information to guide the development of proposals.

In the absence of an Infrastructure Coordinator, town-level experts and funding, activities in this Output were limited during the reporting period. The focus was however to complete the SIF Implementation guideline and to initiate the validation process of (758) potential projects identified in three cities during the previous reporting period.

# **Highlights for the period October 2017 – March 2018**

**Settlement Improvement Fund Implementation Guideline Completed**

The Settlement Improvement Fund (SIF) implementation guideline was completed during October 2017. The purpose of the Guideline is to support NUPRP staff, particularly Town Managers and field staff, to understand what the SIF is and how it works, so that they can better train trainers and community leaders, manage the beneficiary selection process, and orient its effective implementation.

The implementation guideline provides users with a conceptual understanding of how infrastructure relates with vulnerability and poverty, and how to connect community participation to the selection and management of community infrastructure. It provides a step-by-step overview of the SIF process, from targeting, to proposal development, M&E, the operation and maintenance of projects, and ultimately to implementation.

**Identification of small-scale priority community projects**

The Programme worked in three cities, namely Khulna, Mymensingh and Chandpur to identify potential SIF projects. In each city, community groups in highly vulnerable settlements have undertaken a Community Action Planning (CAP) process to identify sites and projects, and have developed proposals for these projects which include design drawings and budgets. In total, 758 potential projects were identified in 86 CDCs (61 CDCs in Khulna, 15 in Mymensingh and 10 in Chandpur). The know-how gained during this process will help to launch similar CAP processes in the other cities once the SIF Coordinator, SIF Expert, Community Facilitators and Organisers are on board.

**Validating proposed projects in three cities**

During the third quarter of 2017, NUPRP worked with the communities in three cities (Khulna, Mymensingh and Chandpur) to identify potential small-scale projects that could be funded through the SIF. A total of 758 projects, including water points, paths and toilets, were identified in 86 CDCs (Khulna 61, Mymensingh 15, Chandpur 10).

During the period October – March 2018, NUPRP began a validation exercise to assess whether the correct process had been followed and that the appropriate documentation to support the process was available. The documentation in 29 CDCs of Khulna was verified and found to be in order. The documentation in the remaining 57 CDCs will be verified in April 2018.

# **Progress towards LF targets**

The following table presents progress towards NUPRP’s September,2018 milestones:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **September 2018 LF milestone** | **Progress** | **Remark** |
| Indicator 5.1: Number of people with sustainable access to 1) clean drinking water, and 2) sanitation sources  **Milestone: 85,500 (water); 146,250 (sanitation)** | Out of 758 potential SIF projects identified during the last reporting period, 13 are water (tube-wells) and 342 are sanitation (latrines). The remaining projects are drains and footpaths. If all water and sanitation projects are funded then 731 people will benefit from water and 1,626 will benefit from sanitation. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| Indicator 5.2: Number of Climate Change Vulnerability Assessments (CCVAs) completed (IFC KPI 15, Innovation)  **Milestone: 12** | A draft CCVA methodology has been developed by NUPRP. This will be piloted in one city and then scaled up. The CCVA will be completed in 8 cities by September 2018. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |
| Indicator 5.3: Number of people supported to cope with the effects of climate change through SIF and CRMIF (ICF KPI 1)  **Milestone: 396,000** | A broad ‘approach’ to CRMIF implementation has been developed by a consultant. An implementation guideline will now need to be prepared. Work will begin in 3 cities and CRMIF funding is targeted in 1 city only by the end of the first quarter 2019. | Milestone to be reviewed after DPP signed |

The following table presents a summary of achievements (for the reporting period and cumulatively) for key activities/ indicators.

| **Indicator** | **Achieved between October-March 2018** | **Cumulative achievement (as at March 2018)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of towns/ cities in which priority list of SIF infrastructure projects identified | 3 | 3 |
| SIF implementation guideline developed | 1 | 1 |
| Number of training manuals developed for CDCs on ‘SIF proposal development and contract preparation’ | 0 | 1 |
| Number of CDCs prepared community action plans for infrastructure selection | 86 CDCs  (3 cities) | 86 CDCs  (3 cities) |

# **Constraints during the period**

The key constraints related to Output 5 during the reporting period are presented in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Constraints** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Actions taken** |
| The time required to identify and select SIF projects is time consuming, and requires multiple site visits and stakeholder consultation. The absence of NUPRP technical staff (Infrastructure Coordinator, City Experts, Community Organisers/ Facilitators) has resulted in slower then desired results. | High | No action possible |

# **Planned activities and key targets for the period April– September 2018**

The following table presents the key activities for the next reporting period (April– September 2018):

| **Planned Activities for April– September 2018** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP Approved April 30th** | **Key target**  **Assuming DPP Approved June 30th** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Train CDCs and relevant local government officials on the SIF implementation process | 42 batches in 12 cities | 17 batches in 12 cities |
| Train CDCs and relevant local government officials on how to manage and maintain climate resilient infrastructure (SIF) | 35 batches in 12 cities | 17 batches in 12 cities |
| Train the CDCs and LGIs in selecting and recruiting SIF masons and laborers and how to develop contracts | 35 batches in 12 cities | 17 batches in 12 cities |
| Assist the city authorities to establish SIF Fund Flow Mechanisms at the city level | 12 Cities | 10 Cities |
| Facilitate CDCs to select SIF infrastructure and develop their SIF proposals | 12 Cities | 10 Cities |
| Develop implementation guideline for Climate Resilience Municipal Infrastructure Fund (CRMIF) mechanism | 1 Guideline | 1 Guideline |

# **Risks and planned mitigation measures (next reporting period)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Constraints** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Actions taken** |
| Political instability due to upcoming city level and national elections | High | NUPRP will identify the cities in which local elections are planned and monitor the situation carefully. Workplans will be adjusted accordingly to take account of the elections. |
| The time required to identify and select SIF projects is time consuming, and requires multiple site visits and stakeholder consultation. | High | Need to prepare city wide well-advanced time bound implementation plan |

# **Research, Evaluation and Learning Unit (RELU)**

# **Highlights for the period October – March 2018**

**Online database (beneficiary and activity monitoring)**

NUPRP’s online database will provide the platform (web-based) through which achievements can be seen in real time through a ‘dashboard’ e.g. number of community groups formed, number of grants (by type) disbursed, number of infrastructure projects completed, by type etc. Where relevant and possible the dashboard will present data disaggregated by sex, age, disability etc.

The first phase of the system was awarded to a local company, Field Information Systems Limited (also known as Field Buzz). This included establishing the overall ‘platform,’ developing a mobile app for the household survey (module 1) and providing technical support. This support came to an end in October 2017.

During the reporting period NUPRP conducted a tender process for the second phase of the online database. The second phase includes digitizing the remaining reporting formats e.g. related to SEF, SIF, the savings and credit programme, primary group member registration etc. and providing technical support for seven months. Field Information Systems Limited was selected to conduct the second phase and was contracted in February 2018 using UNDP core funding.

The first module to be developed for NUPRP during the second phase has been Primary Group (PG) Member registration (see below). This is progressing well and key information about PG members is now available through the dashboard.

# **Primary Group Member Registration**

As at the end of December 2017 NUPRP had reactivated or created over 1,000 Community Development Committees comprising approximately +/- 260,000 PG members in 9 towns[[4]](#footnote-4). Despite forming all these CDCs the Programme had very limited information about the PG members. NUPRP approached DFID in February ‘18 for funding to register these PG members and clear this ‘backlog’ (in 8 of the cities). This request was duly approved.

Registration helps NUPRP to understand who the PG members are, what their profile is in terms of livelihoods, age, gender, deprivations and where they are located. More specifically, PG member registration aids NUPRP in targeting, promoting value for money, transparency, and reporting.

PG member registration began in mid-March in Mymensingh (target 10,800 PG members) and DNCC (target 30,100). During the week commencing 8th April it will be rolled out in Chandpur (target 6,100) and Narayanganj (target 16,400). It will be rolled out in Sylhet (target 17,900) and Chittagong (target 80,500) during the week commencing 15th April. Khulna (target 42,600) and Barisal (target 28,400) are on hold because of upcoming elections.

**Impact Assessment**

There were two developments related to the Impact Assessment during the reporting period. Firstly, in an attempt to fast-track the process of impact assessment methodology design, which will be led by an independent consortium, the RELU team finalized a draft version of the Impact Assessment methodology, for consideration by the Impact Assessment team. This was shared and discussed briefly with DFID during November ’17.

Secondly, in a meeting during March ’18 between DFID and UNDP it was agreed that:

* For the sake of independence, formal baselines/ impact assessment should be outsourced
* Whilst the ideal scenario would be to get formal baselines in place before any benefits are transferred, this is unlikely 1) due to the lengthy process of contracting/ mobilization/ method design/ method approval 2) the pressing need to transfer benefits
* The most likely scenario would be to accept that benefits will need to be transferred without formal baselines for Category A cities[[5]](#footnote-5). Baselines would come later in Category B cities[[6]](#footnote-6).

**Staffing**RELU’s M&E Coordinator, Md. Maskudul Hannan, left the programme in December 2017 for personal reasons. The Unit welcomed Md. Mohebur Rahman as M&E Officer in April 2018. The remaining RELU staff of one MIS Officer and four Regional M&E Officers will join NUPRP once the DPP has been approved.

**Logical Framework**There were a number of productive discussions during the previous reporting period between UNDP and DFID in relation to the logframe. This resulted in an agreed logframe. In October, it was agreed that additional ‘process indicators’ should be added to the logframe and that the 2017 milestones should be extended from September to December. This was in recognition that the initial 2017 milestones were unachievable in light of the DPP not being signed.

In November, DFID provided feedback that the logframe had been reviewed positively by EQUALS with only a few suggested refinements. EQUALS concluded ‘overall the log frame is comprehensive and fit-for-purpose.’

# **Constraints during the period**

Key constraints related to RELU during the reporting period are presented in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Constraints** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Actions taken** |
| Rolling out PG member registration with very limited Human Resources | Low | UNDP has put in place many measures to promote quality, whilst still registering tens of thousands of PG members.  There is a heavy reliance on supervisors and senior supervisors to ensure quality. |

# **Planned activities and key targets for the period April– September 2018**

The following table presents the key activities for the next reporting period (April– September 2018):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned Activities for April – September 2018** | **Key target** |
| Clear the backlog of PG members which are part of CDCs but not yet registered | Mymensingh (mid-April)  Chandpur (end April)  DNCC (7 May)  Narayanganj (7 May)  Chittagong (end June)  Sylhet (7 June)  Barisal and Khulna (within 6 weeks of starting) |
| Work with Field Buzz to implement their contract i.e. build the online database (activity and beneficiary monitoring). | Contract ends mid-September 2018 |
| Contract impact assessment team (HDRC + University of Rotterdam) | Contract in place asap after DPP signed |
| Support output 2 Coordinator to introduce savings and credit reporting format and establish baseline | The savings and credit group reporting format will be fully digitized and functional by the end of April 2018. The Regional M&E Officers and town level Experts will then train enumerators and complete the baseline in 5 cities and initiate in 3 cities. |
| Induct 4 x Regional M&E Officers and MIS Officer | 4 Regional M&E Officer + 1 MIS Officer recruited asap after DPP signed |
| Support impact evaluation team (e.g. methodology design, logistics etc.) | Immediately after signing the contract with HDRC, the draft methodology developed by RELU will be shared. RELU will support HDRC to finalise their inception report and conduct the baseline survey. |
| Scale-up NUPRP’s verification/ spot checking system | Monthly verification will be introduced. Different components will be verified as and when they are up and running |
| Introduce beneficiary feedback mechanism | When regional M&E Officers are in place and after PG member registration backlog cleared |

# **Risks and planned mitigation measures (next reporting period)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risks** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Mitigation measures** |
| RELU staff that have been selected no longer wish to join e.g. because they have found alternative posts | Medium | NUPRP is updating selected candidates so they understand the timelines. |
| A lengthy contracting and mobilization process related to impact evaluation may delay methodology design and baselines being in place for the first cohort of grantees. | High | RELU has developed a draft methodology for consideration by the impact assessment team.  DFID and UNDP have agreed that baselines are unlikely to be established for the first cohort of beneficiaries in Category A cities. Baselines will however be established for beneficiaries in Category B cities in early 2019. |

# **Operations**

# **Highlights for the period October 2017 –March 2018**

Operations includes 1) Human Resources, 2) Procurement, 3) Mutual Accountability, and 4) Finance. Highlights for the period under review include:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **HR** | * The recruitment process for the following positions was initiated and is expected to be completed by June 2018:   + Infrastructure Coordinator   + Land Tenure & Housing Coordinator   + Nutrition Coordinator   + Housing Finance Coordinator   + Communications Coordinator   + Infrastructure & Housing Expert (12 positions) * The selection and mobilisation of one Monitoring & Evaluation Officer * The selection of one Monitoring & Evaluation Coordinator * Terms of reference developed and initial lists of potential candidates prepared for Community Organizer and Community Facilitator positions at the city-level * During the reporting period one staff (Land Tenure & Housing Coordinator) left the Programme. NUPRP began the process of finding a replacement. * The following table shows the number of positions for which individuals were identified but not contracted. It also shows those positions for which people were identified and contracted:  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Position** | **Selected but not contracted** | **Selected and contracted** | | M&E Coordinator | 1 |  | | M&E Officer |  | 1 | | Finance and Admin Expert | 6 |  | |
| **Procurement** | * Procurement contract issued to Field Information Solutions Ltd. for 2nd phase of the online database development (funded by UNDP) |
| **Mutual Accountability** | * Socio-economic Fund Anti-fraud Training Manual developed * Draft Settlement Improvement Fund anti-fraud training manual developed * Draft Anti-fraud and transparency training module for Federations * SEF process risk mapping completed * Incorporating audit section in SIF Implementation Guidelines * List of Do’s and Do Nots in relation to SEF fraud and corruption * Guidance Note on the declaration and registration of Conflict of Interest (CoI), Gift and Hospitality |

# **Constraints during the period**

Key constraints related to Operations during the reporting period are presented in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Constraints** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Actions taken** |
| NUPRP unable to offer letters and contracts to the selected candidates due to DPP not being approved | High | UNDP, project management along with GoB and donor are working to expedite the DPP approval process. |
| NUPRP unable to issue contracts to the selected consultants/firms due to DPP not being approved | Medium | UNDP, project management along with GoB and donor are working to expedite the DPP approval process. |
| Due to the delay of program implementation compliance check/routine audit couldn’t be done | Medium | Staff awareness regarding fraud and corruption issues. |

# **Planned activities and key targets for the period April 2018 – September 2018**

Key activities for the next reporting period (April 2018 – September 2018) include:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **HR** | * Issuing offer letters and contracts to 72 selected candidates against 21 positions (Infrastructure & Urban Services Coordinator, Land Tenure and Housing Coordinator, Nutrition Coordinator, Housing Finance Coordinator, M&E Coordinator, Communication Coordinator, Governance & Mobilization Expert, Socio-Economic & Nutrition Expert, Infrastructure and Housing Expert, Finance and Admin Expert, Town Manager, Gender Expert, Urban Planning & GIS Officer, Climate Resilience Officer, Finance Specialist, Finance Officer, Internal Audit Officer, Admin Assistant, Regional M&E Officer, Driver and MIS Officer). |
| **Procurement** | * Issuing consultancy contract for impact evaluation * Hiring consultancy firms for Mahalla & Resource Mapping, Urban Poverty Profiling, developing Ward Poverty ATLAS * Recruiting National Consultants for Institutional and Financial Capacity Assessment and Climate Change and Vulnerability Assessment |
| **Mutual Accountability** | * Finalizing the draft SIF and Federation’s anti-fraud training manual * Conducting anti-fraud training for the Community leaders, and GoB counterparts * ToT to NUPRP field staff on anti-fraud and corruption issues * Conducting spot checks * Developing compliance guidelines on developed internal control/compliance policies, procedures, and guidelines of UNDP and NUPRP under different functional areas such as cash and bank management, procurement management, fixed asset and inventory management, SEF grant management, SIF Project Management, etc. |

# **Risks and planned mitigation measures (next reporting period)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risks** | **Impact on delivery**  **(High, Medium, Low)** | **Mitigation measures** |
| **Human Resources/ Procurement** |  |  |
| Candidates that have been selected, but not contracted, may no longer be interested or available to join. | Medium | Regularly updating the candidates about the status of the programme so they have full information. |
| The time taken between consultant/ firm selection has been long. Once the DPP has been signed some may no longer wish to join NUPRP or work with NUPRP. | High | Consulting with the selected consultants/firms regarding the DPP approval process and NUPRP’s limitations in issuing a contract. |
| Expiry date of proposal/bid validity | Medium | Requesting Senior Management of UNDP to extend the expiry date of bid validity in consultation with the selected consultant/firm |
| Due to resource constraint in MAU coverage of Anti-fraud training and spot check may not be in optimum level | Medium | Conduct TOT on Anti- Fraud and Corruption issues to Town Managers and Finance Experts.  NUPRP’s HQ staff will cover certain % of spot check on selected beneficiaries. |

# **Annex 1: NUPRP Risk Register**

# 

| **Risk category** | **​Risk description** | **​Risk owner** | **Initial Likelihood** | **Initial Impact** | **​Gross risk rating** | **​Mitigation** | **Residual Likelihood** | **Residual Impact** | **​Residual risk rating** | **Change** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Operational risk* | Governance structures are not fulfilling their terms of reference (PIC, TPB, TSC) impacting on delivery of the programme | TM | *2 = Unlikely* | *3 = Moderate* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | Better elaboration of TOR  Monitoring and support from NUPRP  Follow the process | *1 = Rare* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -4 |
| *Fiduciary risk* | Political pressure for selecting beneficiaries may lead to inclusion and exclusion error (SIF and SEF) | NPD | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | PG Registration  Tighter criteria  Awareness about the criteria  Verification and validation of lists  Disclosure of information  Decision-making in open forums  Engagement of Counsellors | *2 = Unlikely* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -5 |
| *Operational risk* | Lack of coordination between Community and Local Government can lead to delays and confusion | TM | *2 = Unlikely* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | Regular coordination meetings of Counsellors and clusters  Raise awareness of roles of PIC and COs  Regular meetings btw Federation and TPB  Ensure functioning TLCC | *1 = Rare* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -2 |
| *Reputational risk* | Corruption and misuse of funds can jeopardize the Program’s reputation | IPM | *3 = Possible* | *4 = Major* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | Raise awareness/ training of all stakeholders  Introduce systems  Spot checking of grants/ infra  Clear selection criteria  Audits at comm. Level  Strengthen PC and SAC Committees  Intro cashless transfer  Hire qualified and quality people | *2 = Unlikely* | *3 = Moderate* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -6 |
| *External risk* | Delay of DPP approval can lead to lowered morale, frustration, and inability to reach targets | IPM | *2 = Unlikely* | *3 = Moderate* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | Engage UNDP Senior Management to follow up on the process  Engage lobbyists in Min of Planning | *1 = Rare* | *3 = Moderate* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -3 |
| *Operational risk* | Delay in appointing NPD can lead to further implementation delays | UNDP Country Office | *3 = Possible* | *4 = Major* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | UNDP Senior Management work with LGD to identify the right people  UNDP Senior Management lobby Min. of Public Admin. for the selection of identified people  Give responsibility to NUPRP staff to follow up | *2 = Unlikely* | *3 = Moderate* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -6 |
| *External risk* | Upcoming elections (BCC, KCC and SCC) and National Elections, can lead to delays in implementation of Program activities | IPM | *4 = Likely* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | Adjust work plans accordingly, lower profile where necessary  Stay informed of elections timing | *2 = Unlikely* | *1 = Insignificant* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -9 |
| *Delivery risk* | If recruitment of CO and CF is late it can delay targets | UNDP Country Office | *3 = Possible* | *4 = Major* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | ToRs shared with cities  Recruitment Guidelines shared with Mayors  Formation and Orientation of selection Board  Briefing of Local Gov. officials involved in recruitment  Orientation of community | *2 = Unlikely* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -8 |
| *Delivery risk* | If quality standards are not maintained SIF and SEF grant selection we can suffer from selection bias | IPM | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | Sample monitoring  Spot checking of identified projects and beneficiaries  Ensuring community participation during CAPs  Maintain documentation of processes | *2 = Unlikely* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -5 |
| *Delivery risk* | If Assessments are not completed on time, and with quality, it can delay activities and achievement of targets | IPM | *2 = Unlikely* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | Mobilize local participation through outreach strategy  Tight management of deadlines  Train facilitators to ensure quality  Develop appropriate tools and methods  Validate data used in assessments | *1 = Rare* | *1 = Insignificant* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -2 |
| *Delivery risk* | Conflict between the Town Federation/CHDF versus mayor/ruling/ opposition parties can create delays and implementation issues | TM | *3 = Possible* | *4 = Major* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | Resolve conflicts by bringing parties together  Provide clear ToRs and orientation for stakeholders  Train stakeholders in conflict resolution techniques  Orient Counselors about NUPRP process | *2 = Unlikely* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -8 |
| *Reputational risk* | Overlap of similar activities with other development organizations (e.g. World Bank, JICA, and BRAC) causes duplication, confusion and problems | IPM | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | Push Mayors to lead coordination efforts  Provide donor efforts analysis to Local Government  Provide advisory role to Local Gov.  Advocacy and coordination at Dhaka-level | *1 = Rare* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -7 |
| *External context* | The need for baselines (conducted by a third party) will delay programme activities | IPM | *4 = Likely* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | DFID + NUPRP have agreed to implement in Category A towns during 2018. Baselines to be conducted in Category B towns in early 2019.  RELU has developed a methodology for consideration by the impact evaluation team when contracted | *2 = Unlikely* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -8 |
| *Operational risk* | The NPD does not play a supportive role to project delivery | IPM | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | The IPM will work hard to orient the NPD and to develop strong professional working relationship. | *3 = Possible* | *2 = Minor* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | -3 |
| *External context* | ECNEC does not approve the DPP resubmission | LGD | *3 = Possible* | *5 = Severe* | *13 - 16 = Major* | UNDP senior management is liaising closely with key stakeholders e.g. LGD, LGED, City Mayors to increase the likelihood the DPP resubmission will be approved. | *2 = Unlikely* | *5 = Severe* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | *-5* |
| *Reputational risk* | Relationships with local government are negatively impacted because of implementation delays | IPM | *3 = Possible* | *4 = Major* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | Town Managers are building close working relationships with town mayors and LG officials. Town Managers are keeping counterparts updated about the programme’s status | *2 = Unlikely* | *3 = Moderate* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | *-6* |
| *Operational risk* | NUPRP staff turnover increases due to delays in DPP signing | IPM | *4 = Likely* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | NUPRP staff are being kept up-to-date about the status of the DPP signing. | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | *-3* |
| *External context* | There is a deterioration in the security situation | UNDP Country Office | *3 = Possible* | *4 = Major* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | The United Nations Department of Safety and Security carefully advises UNDP staff about security issues. UNDSS works closely with other development partners, embassies etc. to understand the security situation and threat levels. | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | *-3* |
| *Delivery risk* | Resource allocation to climate change resilience funding interventions are insufficient against the needs and incremental costs of adaption | IPM | *4 = Likely* | *4 = Major* | *13 - 16 = Major* | The focus will be on strategic infrastructure within, or serving low-income communities and therefore are oriented away from major trunk infrastructure.  Additional funds will be targeted from other DPs or through the Bangladesh Municipal Development Fund, when insufficient.  Active engagement with local governments on the importance of climate resilience funding will be conducted. | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | *-7* |
| *External Context* | Political interference around measures to secure tenure | National Project Director (NPD) | *4 = Likely* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | Verification of land records for settlements deemed eligible under the project will be conducted.  Component 4 is well supported through TA at the PMU and Town.  Frequent engagement and monitoring of communities securing land tenure will be conducted.  Land Tenure Action Plans will provide detailed and pragmatic foundation to agree with viable options. | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | *-3* |
| *Delivery risk* | Slow growth in LGI revenues and/or LGIs fail to allocate funds to pro-poor/poverty reduction activities | NPD | *4 = Likely* | *4 = Major* | *13 - 16 = Major* | Best options for raising revenue will be identified at the LGI level with central government buy-in. National Board of Revenue (NBR) also will be consulted.  Support will be provided for systems strengthening.  Evidence from UGIIP-1 and 2 and from successive diagnostic and scoping studies clearly indicate there is considerable scope to enhance own-source revenue.  A mechanism for sustaining the targeting of funds to the urban poor by LGI will be developed during implementation and will be based on matching funds from GoB through ADP allocations.  Incentives to perform will inform continued inclusion in the programme. Access to SIF funding will be contingent on a contribution from LGI. | *3 = Possible* | *4 = Major* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | *-4* |
| *Fiduciary and reputational risks* | Fraud, corruption and misuse/ misdirection of funds by community and/ or LGIs | IPM | *4 = Likely* | *4 = Major* | *13 - 16 = Major* | Approaches tested during UPPR will be improved and used in the first instance.  Lessons learned from UPPR will also inform strategies to mitigate financial risks.  As with UPPR, a Mutual Accountability Unit (MAU) will provide an additional oversight mechanism. MAU will monitor the programme activities closely.  Strong financial systems will be introduced through automated financial reporting.  Project expenditure will be audited by FAPAD and OIA and Chartered Accountants firm periodically.  Financial and anticorruption training will be conducted for NUPRP staff, LGI Representatives and officials.  **At community level:**  Purchase Committee and Social Audit Committee at the community level are established to ensure transparency and accountability.  Spot check by MAU and Town Team will occur.  Regular monitoring by field staff (community organizer and technical expert) to verify appropriate beneficiaries are selected according to the guidelines.  Grants distribution through electronic transfer (Mobile Banking) is introduced to ensure disbursement of grants to appropriate recipients. This can be distributed through opening bank accounts.  Federation will oversee the activities of the CDC Cluster, while CDC Cluster will oversee the activities of CDC.  **At LGI Level:**  Project expenditure is checked by UNDP appointed Finance Officer and Town Manager, is verified by Member Secretary and approved by the Mayor to ensure the proper use of funds.  Bank transactions are authorized jointly by Member Secretary and the Mayor to ensure sound internal control system.  MAU provides compliance monitoring through frequent field visits and periodic audit.  Financial Reporting system / Town Project Board/Project Implementation Committee to review and approve periodically.  **At NPD Office through NIM Modality:**  Project expenditure is certified/verified by UNDP appointed Operations Manager, Programme Manager, GoB- assigned Deputy Programme Director and finally approved by the National Programme Director to ensure proper use of funds.  Bank transactions are authorized jointly by National Programme Director and Programme Manager to ensure sound internal control system.  Spot check by UNDP Country Office Team (Cluster, Finance and Senior Management).  Financial Reporting system to Project Board/Project Steering Committee to review and approve periodically. | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | *-7* |
| *External Context* | LGIs are unable to adopt pro-poor policies because they are constrained by national policies, they refuse, or they lack the capacity to take forward initiatives | NPD | *3 = Possible* | *3 = Moderate* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | LPUPAP, UPPR and other DP urban sector interventions have demonstrated that progress is possible and desired.  The Local Government Acts (2009) have paved the way for building the ability of city corporations/Pourashavas to manage their affairs.  The well-established community based procedures in partnerships with local government will mitigate the likelihood of the risk of non-participation.  A community-to-community mentoring approach will ensure that know-how is readily available and will encourage momentum at city corporations/Pourashavas. | *2 = Unlikely* | *3 = Moderate* | *1 - 6 = Minor* | *-3* |
| *External Context* | Lack of coordination, or important differences within/ between LGD, other Ministries and LGIs | NPD | *4 = Likely* | *4 = Major* | *13 - 16 = Major* | As National Programme Steering Committee will bring together the main institutional stakeholders, it will maintain momentum and actively engage all stakeholders to ensure coordination and to solve any disputes.  Programme will support leadership and coordination within Municipalities as a fundamental part of the approach.  The principles of decentralization and ownership at the local level are embedded in the design of local level implementation.  The Bangladesh Urban Forum (BUF) Inter-Ministerial Committee will further support a collaborative approach to urban sector workings. | *3 = Possible* | *4 = Major* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | *-4* |
| *External Context* | Political instability and/ or a deterioration in the political environment constrains both the ability of NUPRP to influence national urban policy and operationally the implementation of the programme at city/town level | NPD | *4 = Likely* | *4 = Major* | *13 - 16 = Major* | NUPRP will follow strategies deployed during UPPR that will retain satisfactory delivery during times of political unrest (Hartals).  The decentralized delivery at the city/town and community levels and supported at the divisional level will ensure continuity in implementation. | *3 = Possible* | *4 = Major* | *7 - 12 = Moderate* | *-4* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk rating** | **Description** |
| **Minor** | 1 to 6 = Minor |
| **Moderate** | 7 to 12 = Moderate |
| **Major** | 13 to 16 = Major |
| **Severe** | 17 + = Severe |

# **Annex 2: Value for Money Report (October 2017 – March 2018)**

# 

The below table offers of examples of the ways in which NUPRP is finding ways to economize and promote efficiency in the ways that the program is procuring services and spending resources.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Economy**: *lowest price inputs of the required quality* | **Competitive tendering process followed**  Contracting of Field Buzz: The UNDP procurement process evaluates proposals based on each company’s ability to offer quality service, based on their experience and technical know-how, and Field Buzz (service provider for NUPRP’s online beneficiary/ activity monitoring system) was able to demonstrate that it had the necessary capacity and at the lowest cost. |
| **Efficiency**: *inputs produce outputs of required quality for lowest cost* | **Digitization of data and use of ICT**  NUPRP has introduced ICT into a number of areas of our operations in order to increase efficient data analysis and use. This can provide benefits in quicker data access, higher capacity analysis, and more transparent and effective data collection. The digitization of the PG Member Registration data collection process is one example, together with monthly programme reporting, and Savings and Credit reporting. |
| **Impact Evaluation Methodology**  In an attempt to avoid delays the RELU Team developed the methodology to initiate the Impact Assessment. It is intended that the consulting compay will develop the methodology. It is hoped that the methodology developed by RELU will contribute to cost reductions and a faster process. |
| **PG Member Registration**  Collecting information about beneficiary households NUPRP is able to evaluate and approve the qualification of beneficiaries for grants. The digital database of information from poor communities allows the programme to identify eligible beneficiaries quickly, transparently, systematically, and accurately. |
| **Training of Community Organizations**  Instead of contracting other organizations to conduct training the NUPRP team has developed training materials and given trainings using existing staff resources. This has helped to ensure better trainings (Community Organizations are already familiar with the trainers) and lower costs by not contracting this activity. |

# **Annex 3: Financial Progress Report (October ‘17 – March ‘18)**

NUPRP has spent $ 3.4 M for the period of March 2016 –March 2018 against the budget/fund received of $ 3.5 M which is 99% of total budget/fund received. The expenditure for October 2017-March 2018 is $ 1.1 M and summary is given below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Oct 2017- Mar 2018 Expenditure ($)** |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | 32K |
| Training & Workshop | 19K |
| Subcontract/Assessment | 18K |
| Individual Consultants | 1K |
| Personnel Cost | 848K |
| Equipment & Operations cost | 91K |
| General Management Service | 81K |
| **Total** | **1.1 M** |

1. **CDC’s Mandatory Training** (5 training) SEF & SIF Contract Management, Savings & Credit, CAP and Organisation development. **For Cluster (3 Trg.)**: Anti-Fraud, Democracy & governance and Organisational Development.

   **For Federation** (3): Advocacy & Networking, Partnership development, Basic computer operation and Internet use. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. All Federation received 3 training on Vision/Mission development, Capacity building Action Planning and Organization development and management. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The surveys still need confirmation of land ownership from the Government Land Office and to check with Court to see if any injunction is pending on that land. This requires DPP approval [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Barisal, Chandpur, Chittagong, Dhaka, Khulna, Mymensingh, Narayanganj, Sylhet, Sirajganj [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Narayanganj, Chandpur, Chittagong, Mymensingh, Barisal, Khulna, Sylhet [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Dhaka North, Faridpur, Kushtia, Patuakhali, Sirajganj [↑](#footnote-ref-6)