



## 1. Project Data

<b>Project ID</b> P125447	<b>Project Name</b> BD: Community Climate Change Project		
<b>Country</b> Bangladesh	<b>Practice Area(Lead)</b> Environment & Natural Resources	<b>Additional Financing</b> P155106	
<b>L/C/TF Number(s)</b> TF-12721	<b>Closing Date (Original)</b> 31-Dec-2016	<b>Total Project Cost (USD)</b> 12,500,000.00	
<b>Bank Approval Date</b> 17-Jul-2012	<b>Closing Date (Actual)</b> 31-Dec-2016		
	<b>IBRD/IDA (USD)</b>	<b>Grants (USD)</b>	
Original Commitment	13,000,000.00	13,000,000.00	
Revised Commitment	12,975,073.70	12,975,073.70	
Actual	12,975,073.70	12,975,073.70	
<b>Prepared by</b> Kavita Mathur	<b>Reviewed by</b> Fernando Manibog	<b>ICR Review Coordinator</b> Christopher David Nelson	<b>Group</b> IEGSD (Unit 4)

## 2. Project Objectives and Components

### a. Objectives

The Project Development Objective (PDO) was "to enhance the capacity of selected communities to increase their resilience to the impacts of climate change" (Grant Agreement page 6 and Project Appraisal Document para 10).

### b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?

No



**c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?**

No

**d. Components**

**Component 1. Community Climate Change Fund** (appraisal cost US\$10.40 million; actual cost US\$11.04 million). This component would establish a US\$10.40 million fund to finance community-based climate change adaptation projects to be implemented with the assistance of NGOs subsequently named project implementation partners (PIPs). The fund would be managed by Palli Karma-Sahayak Foundation (PKSF) through a separate Project Management Unit (PMU), to be set up and supported (with staffing, equipment, and operation costs) under Component 3. PKSF would invite project proposals from NGOs to address climate change impacts in (a) salinity affected coastal areas; (b) flood affected char-lands and river basins; and (c) drought affected or rainfall-scarce areas. Each project proposal had to be located within a vulnerable zone (a list of *upazilas* in these zones was provided in Annex 2 of the PAD), and would address at least one of the following six pillars of the Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (see Section 3a below).

**Component 2. Knowledge Management, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Capacity Building** (appraisal cost US\$ 0.44 million; actual cost US\$0.45 million). This component would promote the sharing of lessons on best practices among the participating NGOs, as well as in the wider NGO community and in regional and global forums. This component would also support a structured learning process of capturing lessons and incorporating best practices into the design and implementation of community-based interventions, including the preparation of a toolkit and guidelines, and visits to adaptation activities in different vulnerable zones. This component would provide technical assistance to develop options for institutionalizing lessons learned.

This component would also: (a) build the capacity of NGOs to prepare eligible community based climate change adaptation sub-project proposals; (b) operationalize an M&E system to ensure effective monitoring of project outcomes at the project and community levels; and also to enable an independent third party monitoring and impact evaluation of financial system performance, and a comprehensive review and evaluation of outcomes at project completion; and (c) establish a grievance redress system to handle any issues raised by stakeholders about the implementation of the project or any sub-project.

**Component 3. Project Management** (appraisal cost US\$1.66 million; actual cost US\$1.51 million). This component would finance technical assistance to: (a) establish a PMU within PKSF to manage the project and monitor the implementation of subprojects; (b) finance the operating costs of the Fund, including equipment, financial management, procurement, technical assistance, and administrative expenses; (c) build the technical capacity of PKSF to appraise sub-project proposals submitted by NGOs; and (d) operationalize the procedures for Fund management outlined in the Operational Manual.

**e. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates**

**Project Cost:** The actual total project cost was US\$13.0 million, slightly higher than the appraisal estimate of US\$12.5 million.



**Financing:** The project was financed by Bangladesh Climate Change Resilience Fund. The actual financing is US\$13.0 million, which included the appraisal commitment of US\$12.5 million and an additional financing (AF) of US\$500,000 approved in August, 2015. There were no co-financiers.

**Borrower Contribution:** There was no actual or planned borrower contribution.

**Dates:** The project closed as scheduled on December 31, 2016.

### 3. Relevance of Objectives & Design

#### a. Relevance of Objectives

Bangladesh is very vulnerable to flooding during monsoons that cause substantial damage to infrastructure, housing, agriculture and livelihoods. Two-thirds of the country's land area is less than 5 meters above sea level and low-lying coastal areas are at risk from tidal floods and severe cyclones, and susceptible to river and rainwater flooding, particularly during the monsoons. Crops and livelihoods of the rural poor in the low-lying coastal areas are also devastated by saline water intrusion into aquifers and groundwater and through land submergence (PAD para 1). The Government of Bangladesh had recognized that climate change is both an environmental and developmental issue, and had prepared a number of strategy documents to guide the country's response. The 2009 Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (BCCSAP) outlined measures to protect people from the impacts of climate change, and makes adaptation a priority. This strategy and action plan included following six pillars: (a) address the impacts of climate change on food security, social protection and health; (b) further strengthen the country's comprehensive disaster management capacity; (c) climate proof existing infrastructure; (d) improve research and knowledge management to predict the likely scale, timing, and impact of climate change on different sectors; (e) incorporate mitigation and low carbon opportunities for future growth; and (f) focus on capacity building and institutional capacity (PAD para 5).

At appraisal, the project objectives were aligned with the second strategic objective to "Reduce Environmental Degradation and Vulnerability to Climate Change and Natural Disasters" of the Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) for the period FY11-14 (CAS para 70). The CAS would support disaster preparedness by: (a) further strengthening and institutionalizing preparedness, especially at the sub-national level; (b) mobilizing resources for improved local preparedness and response management; (c) mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and mitigation across sectors and down to lower levels of government; and (d) extending key risk mitigation infrastructure such as shelters and coastal and river embankments. The Bank would also support government efforts to empower communities (CAS page 42).

At project closing, the project objectives were aligned with the third pillar "Climate and Environment Management" of the Country Partnership Framework (CPF) for the period FY16-20. The CPF would support the government's efforts in adaptive delta management, which sought to ensure that sectoral investments considered the long-term uncertainties related to climate change and growth. The Bank's activities would



focus on boosting Bangladesh’s resilience to climate change and natural disasters, and promoting agricultural productivity with climate-smart farm practices and technology (CPF page iii).

The project objectives are highly relevant to country priorities and the Bank’s strategy for Bangladesh.

**Rating**

High

**b. Relevance of Design**

The PDO statement to “enhance the capacity of selected communities to increase their resilience to the impacts of climate change” was clear. The project was designed to specifically address climate resilience. The project components were appropriate and well designed and collectively contributed toward meeting the PDO. The most important design feature of the project was to establish the Community Climate Change Fund to channel funding to the selected PIPs who would then implement the selected subprojects that met the selection criteria at the field level.

The three PDO indicators adequately captured the outcomes of capacity-building at the community level and increased resilience. However, the project’s results framework was weak, especially the first PDO indicator which referred to community mechanisms that should “respond effectively to specific climate risks” but provided no guidance on how to identify the risks or how to establish the community mechanisms to address the specific risks. A second design shortcoming was that the project preparation did not carry out economic and financial analyses. On balance, despite the design shortcomings, this innovative project with its built-in features for learning and institutionalization of lessons, was well designed.

**Rating**

Substantial

**4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)**

**Objective 1**

**Objective**

To enhance the capacity of selected communities to increase their resilience to the impacts of climate change.

**Rationale**

**Outputs**

- Six toolkits and guidelines were prepared (against the target of 3) to help PIPs implement and streamline



operations, including the Operation Manual; Implementation Manual; Activity Implementation Guideline; Procurement Guideline; Financial and Accounts Management Guideline; and Monitoring Manual, including (a) baseline questionnaire, (b) beneficiary profile format, and (c) community profile format.

- Community Mechanisms (CM) were established and functional in 78% of the communities (or 32 communities) against a target 70% (or 29 communities). (Note: A CM was deemed functional when a group collaborated to produce adaptation action plans and investment plans to effectively address climate risks specific to that group. The CM is judged continuously functional when the group continued to meet its bimonthly meeting targets to discuss climate risks on its livelihoods and troubleshoot challenges faced by the group).
- 84% of communities applied adaptation practices compared to the target of 70 percent. (Note: Adaptation practices refer to subprojects designed and implemented to address specific climate risks, such as goat rearing in slatted houses, crab fattening, and plinth raising to protect households and community grounds).
- A Community Climate Change Fund was established. 41 community-based adaptation sub-grants were awarded against the target of 40.
- In the flood areas, a total of 8,539 participants received technical training, while in the drought areas it was 10,024 participants. These families have been trained to grow vegetables all year round on their raised and protected homesteads (ICR para 52). At project closing about 96 percent beneficiaries expressed their satisfaction at the quality of training (ICR para 51). The external evaluation found that the slatted housing for goats was the most popular activity with 17,155 or 45 percent of the households having adopted this practice. However, there was a significant difference in adoption between the three risks zones (26 percent in the saline zone, 72 percent in the flood zone, and 79 percent in the drought zone). Household plinth raising was adopted by 32 percent beneficiaries in flood and salinity zones. This is an indigenous practice but an improved design was introduced by the project to cope with the additional stress caused by climate change (ICR para 54).
- Deep tube wells were installed for 5,000 families in the flood areas.
- Shallow tube wells were installed for 18,000 families in the drought areas.

## **Outcomes**

- About 6,000 families in the saline areas and 7,000 families in the flood affected areas are now protected from storm surges.
- In the saline areas, about 10,000 families are no longer drinking unsafe water.



- According to the external evaluation conducted, at project closing 11,415 beneficiaries were familiar with climate change and have a technically better understanding of resilience in the saline areas (ICR para 52).
- Communities identified lessons and shared these lessons during annual workshops. 35 of 41 PIPs (85%) identified and shared lessons learned during annual workshops compared to the target of 80%.
- The project had significant demonstration effects at the community level. For example, activities promoted in the project communities such as homestead plinths, constructing slatted house, producing vermi-compost, installing improved cooking stoves, building sanitary latrines, undertaking poultry and duck rearing, starting crab fattening activities, and cultivating drought and salinity resistant crops – were adopted by other communities (ICR para 53).

**Rating**  
Substantial

## 5. Efficiency

The ICR reports (para 56) that the project benefits included an increase in monthly household incomes from the income-generating activities (IGAs) promoted by the project. There was reported average increase in household income of BDT 2,110 per month during the project period.

Slatted houses for goat and sheep rearing was taken by 60 percent of the beneficiaries and reported to have resulted in an average incremental monthly income of BDT 1,718 per month due to a reduction in diseases and higher productivity. However, the ICR does not provided cost comparison of construction of slatted houses. Crab fattening, which can be practiced in saline areas only, was reported to have led to an additional income of as much as BDT 5,500 per month. However, no quantitative analysis of the counterfactual was carried out. The ICR reports that this was largely due to the transfer of knowledge on these IGAs, which the beneficiary households obtained from the project.

Regarding cost-effectiveness, for some sub-projects, costs were much higher than what was common practice. For example, latrines financed by the project typically cost BDT 12,000 – 15,000 per latrine. The latrine cost is higher than the usual cost BDT 3000 – 4000. However, the quality of CCCP implemented latrines is superior to government construction with the cost difference arising from the quality of the materials chosen (ICR para 57). The latrines financed by the project were more expensive because of the use of rust-proof materials in saline areas, which would contribute to the sustainability these latrines. The ICR does not provide any information on life of latrines constructed using government funds.

There were no implementation delays and the project closed on schedule. Sub-grants were disbursed to the



NGOs in a timely manner.

Taking into account the absence of any economic or financial analysis both at project preparation and closing, which prevents an assessment of reported income increases in relation to costs, project efficiency is rated **modest**.

**Efficiency Rating**

Modest

a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR) and/or Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation:

	Rate Available?	Point value (%)	*Coverage/Scope (%)
Appraisal		0	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
ICR Estimate		0	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

\* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

**6. Outcome**

The relevance of objectives is high and the relevance of design is substantial. The efficacy of the project's objective "to enhance the capacity of selected communities to increase their resilience to the impacts of climate change" is rated substantial. The project's efficiency is modest. The project's overall outcome is moderately satisfactory.

**a. Outcome Rating**

Moderately Satisfactory

**7. Rationale for Risk to Development Outcome Rating**

The risk of inadequate maintenance is high. Although Pond Management Committees, Pond Sand Filter Management Committees, and Deep Tube Well Management Committees were set up in project areas to raise funds from the users for repairs, the ICR reports (para 66) that experience shows that these committees do not always manage to complete their repair tasks on time or to effectively seek and receive support from the local government. During the monsoon months, the people in coastal areas drink pure rainwater and the pond sand filters remain unused until the next dry season. Without proper maintenance, the risk that these will not be functional is very high. Some Climate Change Adaptation Groups (CAAGs) have opened bank accounts for



future maintenance expenditures (ICR para 66).

**a. Risk to Development Outcome Rating**

High

## 8. Assessment of Bank Performance

**a. Quality-at-Entry**

The project design was based on (i) comprehensive analyses of similar projects undertaken by NGOs at the community level and (ii) studies on climate change impacts in Bangladesh, covering affected geographical areas, consequences on people's livelihoods, and how the poorest population were affected (ICR para 15).

Project preparation was cognizant of PKSFs inexperience in implementing a grant mechanism and monitoring sub-projects, and had identified this institutional weakness as a risk. Appropriate measures were identified and integrated into project design to mitigate these risks. For example, the PMU was set up with high-quality staff members, including a project coordinator, dedicated project officers for each climate zone, accounts and procurement staff, an M&E specialist, and secretarial staff (ICR para 20). A Technical Review Committee (TRC) was created to support the PMU to review subproject proposals. The project's results framework was weak. It referred to community mechanisms that should "respond effectively to specific climate risks" but provided no guidance on how to identify the risks or how to establish the community mechanisms to address the specific risks. This weakness had to be addressed during implementation.

The project's preparation failed to carry out economic and financial analysis. This was justified given that the details of the subprojects were not known, although the activities that were funded had been already in practice in Bangladesh. However, this significantly limited the project's efforts to evaluate the cost-effectiveness and financial performance of the subprojects (ICR para 25).

**Quality-at-Entry Rating**

Moderately Satisfactory

**b. Quality of supervision**

The ICR reports (para 69) that the project team undertook supervision missions regularly (twice a year) and agreed-upon follow-up actions were recorded in the Aide Memoires and duly implemented. The Bank team reviewed the project proposals submitted by the PKSf and provided extensive comments. The Bank staff participated in workshops organized by the project and visited some of the subprojects in the field.

During the early stages of implementation, the Bank team identified the design gaps and contributed to the





conceptual development of the project and clarified what distinguished a “climate adaptation project” from a more traditional livelihood project in a poor rural context (ICR para 69). Moreover, international expertise on climate adaptation and community development was also mobilized to support project implementation.

The ICR reports that safeguards and fiduciary supervision performance was satisfactory (ICR para 69).

### **Quality of Supervision Rating**

Satisfactory

### **Overall Bank Performance Rating**

Moderately Satisfactory

## **9. Assessment of Borrower Performance**

### **a. Government Performance**

The ICR reports (para 71) that the government was committed to the project and started disbursing shortly after the signing of the project. The Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) provided clearance to the Additional Financing as part of the Management Committee and hosted wrap-up meetings at the end of each implementation support mission. The MoEF is responsible for the Bangladesh Climate Change Resilience Fund, which is a multi-donor trust fund set up in 2010 to build country capacity and reliance to meet climate change challenges over the next few decades.

### **Government Performance Rating**

Satisfactory

### **b. Implementing Agency Performance**

The implementing agency for the project was Palli Karma-Sahayak Foundation (PKSF). The PKSF adapted the Results-Based Monitoring (RBM) for the project requirements and developed guidelines for environmental and social safeguards. A Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) system was put in place. The Project Management Unit (PMU) modified the financial management and procurement procedures quickly and in accordance with the Bank standards. PMU guided the Project Implementing Partners (PIPs) during implementation and conducted site visits, monitored progress, identified problems and found solutions. For example, the PKSF organized seminars on desalination plants with relevant Project Implementing Partners (PIPs) to facilitate a better understanding of the desalination technology and to find the best design option, which was finally adopted by the project (ICR para 72). There were no major staff changes and the same project director continued for most of the project’s lifetime.

Intercommunity visits were undertaken (22 compared to the target was 20) to allow cross-learning between communities and individuals working on adaptation initiatives. Community visits were especially useful in the case of sanitary latrines and goat rearing. These community visits enhanced learning and reduced errors in construction (ICR page vi).



## **Implementing Agency Performance Rating**

Satisfactory

## **Overall Borrower Performance Rating**

Satisfactory

## **10. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization**

### **a. M&E Design**

The institutional framework for M&E included: (i) a dedicated subproject monitoring officer in each PIP who would report to the chief executive or to a senior official not directly entrusted with implementation of the subproject; (ii) an M&E officer in the central M&E unit of PKSf who would provide technical guidance to program officers on monitoring of the sub-projects and (iii) a third-party monitoring to be conducted as necessary, to assess the effectiveness of PKSf as the implementing agency and monitor the sub-projects implemented by NGOs for addressing the climate risk for each of the selected regions (PAD 34). At appraisal, a detailed M&E manual consistent with PKSf's overall results-based monitoring system had been prepared (PAD para 34). The second component of the project included a sub-component to provide funding to operationalize an M&E system to ensure effective monitoring of project outcomes at the project and community levels, and to enable an independent third party monitoring and impact evaluation.

The indicators were adequate but complex and were not explained clearly. The PDO indicator 1 ("community mechanisms established and functioning in selected communities to respond effectively to specific climate risk") was designed to capture the outcome of capacity building at the community level, and increased resilience. However, terms such as 'established and functioning', 'effective response', 'climate risks' were not explained (ICR para 36).

The PDO indicator 2 ("communities to have applied sustainable adaptation practices to address specific climate change risk") and PDO indicator 3 ("sub-grants implemented in the selected communities are assessed to have achieved the targeted objectives"), both captured the outcome of resilience building.

### **b. M&E Implementation**

During implementation, a climate resilience index (CRI) was developed to measure the achieved resilience. The CRI development exercise refined terms such as 'climate resilience' and translated theoretical concepts into practical and measurable indicators. The ICR reports (para 37) that during implementation the original Results Framework (RF) was divided into four detailed RFs. A 'mother RF' was developed to measure the CRI, which was supplemented by three other RFs for three distinct risk zones, that is, flood, salinity, and drought. Furthermore, 41 PIPs developed their own RFs to measure outcome and impact of their interventions.



Two Results-Based Monitoring (RBM) reports were created - one in March 2015 (11 PIPs were covered and the household sample size was 84) and one in June 2016 (11 PIPs but with a larger sample size of 300 households). Eleven PIPs were selected as being representative of the three climate risk areas.

Training of PKSF and PIP staff in M&E was conducted under the project. The ICR reports that the Activity to Output Monitoring (ATOM) data (gathered by PIPs) was adequate but the data aggregation and analysis could have been improved at the PKSF end (for economic efficiency calculations at project closing and for future reference).

### c. M&E Utilization

The ICR reports (para 39) that Activity to Output Monitoring (ATOM) data was used to continuously measure progress through (i) tracking utilization of funds in relation to budgets allocated to each PIP and (ii) corrective measures that were taken early on when needed. PIPs also shared their experiences, which helped other PIPs make design changes when needed.

### M&E Quality Rating

Substantial

## 11. Other Issues

### a. Safeguards

**Environmental:** The project was classified as Environmental Category “B” and to avoid adverse environmental impacts the Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01 was triggered. The implementing agency, PKSF, had prepared an Environmental Management Framework (EMF) which provided screening tools to identify potential environmental risks in sub-projects (at appraisal); procedures to conduct an Initial Environment Examination (IEE) if potential negative environmental impacts were identified; procedures to mitigate any potentially adverse environmental impacts; and a monitoring mechanism (PAD par 51). The draft EMF was disclosed both in country and in the World Bank Infoshop before appraisal.

The ICR reports (para 42) that project site visits during the implementation found that the environmental management measures had been complied with and a system of community monitoring and reporting had been introduced and followed. The PMU organized awareness-building workshops to train the communities in maintaining project interventions in an environmentally sustainable manner. The ICR does not have an explicit statement on compliance with OP/BP 4.01 Environmental Assessment

**Social:** The PAD specified (para 44) that the project would not fund any activity involving resettlement. Therefore, OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement was not triggered. OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples was triggered for sub-project areas inhabited by tribal people. PKSF prepared a Social Management Framework (SMF) to address any social issues that may arise during sub-project appraisals.



During implementation, the ICR states (para 43) that no adverse social impacts were reported. The ICR does not have an explicit statement on compliance with OP 4.10 Indigenous Peoples. The project established a functional grievance redress mechanism (GRM). The GRM received 42 written complaints and 234 verbal complaints. These complaints were resolved by the community in the presence of local government representatives and relevant NGO focal persons (ICR para 43).

**b. Fiduciary Compliance**

**Financial management.** The ICR reports (para 40) that the financial management of the project was satisfactory. The financial reports were submitted to the Bank on time and with acceptable quality. Financial statements were audited by private audit firms on an annual basis with unqualified opinion for all the audits.

**Procurement:** The ICR did not report any procurement irregularities. The PMU distributed simplified procurement documents and instructions for the PIPs. The ICR reports (para 41) that PIPs used public procurement rules for the first time under this project and the training sessions and hands-on support provided by the PMU were very helpful.

**c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)**

---

**d. Other**

---

**12. Ratings**

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	The relevance of objectives is high and the relevance of design is substantial. The efficacy of the project “to enhance the capacity of selected communities to increase their resilience to the impacts of climate change” is substantial. Project efficiency modest. Overall, project outcome is moderately satisfactory.



Risk to Development Outcome	Modest	High	The risk of inadequate maintenance is high. See section 7 for details.
Bank Performance	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Both the ICR and this ICR Review rated the quality at entry as moderately satisfactory and quality of supervision as satisfactory. According to the harmonized OPCS/IEG guidelines, the overall Bank Performance rating, should be moderately satisfactory.
Borrower Performance	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	---
Quality of ICR		Substantial	---

**Note**

When insufficient information is provided by the Bank for IEG to arrive at a clear rating, IEG will downgrade the relevant ratings as warranted beginning July 1, 2006. The "Reason for Disagreement/Comments" column could cross-reference other sections of the ICR Review, as appropriate.

**13. Lessons**

The following lessons are adapted from the ICR (para 74):

- Awareness-building on climate change consequences was critical for project implementation as for many beneficiaries, the negative consequences were laid out in terms of increasing damages and risks to their livelihoods. Without this conceptual linkage, their participation would not have been as complete. Building climate resilience in highly vulnerable and poor communities depends on the communities first understanding that instead of responding to almost yearly disasters, they need to respond to permanently new and different climatic conditions. This shift in mind-set is important as a base for discussing and finding new climate-resilient activities.
- Beneficiaries are more receptive to innovations and new initiatives for income generating activities (IGAs) when: (a) their basic needs were met first; and (b) indigenous knowledge was merged with IGA innovations. Community contribution is a key factor behind continued engagement and project sustainability beyond closing.
- M&E needs careful attention at the design and the implementation stage. The project design should be flexible to allow refinement in the results framework and adequate resources must be allocated for M&E training and data collection when a project involves so many different partners with varying capacities.



#### **14. Assessment Recommended?**

No

#### **15. Comments on Quality of ICR**

The ICR is comprehensive and well written. The quality of evidence presented is adequate and the analysis is clear and well focused on results. The lessons are well formulated. The ICR is inconsistent with the OPCS guidelines, in rating Bank Performance. The ICR rated the quality at entry as moderately satisfactory and quality of supervision as satisfactory. According to the OPCS guidelines, the overall Bank Performance rating, should be moderately satisfactory and not satisfactory as the ICR had rated. The ICR does not provide an explicit statement on compliance with the safeguards policies. The ICR made several useful references to findings from an external evaluation at project completion, but did not provide the necessary bibliographic reference. There were other shortcomings. Although the ICR indicate 96 percent of the beneficiaries were satisfied with the training, the type of training provided, the resulting behavioral changes, and the uptake rates of new skills were not delineated. The ICR does not explain whether differences in adoption rates in three zones was a planned (and proven to be correct) approach or just serendipitous. The ICR also did not provide a baseline to its assertion that, at project closing, 11,415 beneficiaries were familiar with climate change and have a technically better understanding of resilience in the saline areas. It would have also been useful had the ICR provided more information on (i) the investments that were made to ensure that families in saline areas were no longer drinking unsafe water, and (ii) the kind of international expertise on climate adaptation and community development that was mobilized to support project implementation.

##### **a. Quality of ICR Rating** Substantial